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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

"The first of them that eldest was, and best,
Of all the house had charge and governement,
As Guardian and Steward of the rest:"

--The Faire Queen, Book 1, Canto 10

Project Aim

The English discipline has a need and hunger for pedagogical discussions. In the introduction to the first volume of the recently published journal *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, the editors describe the essays comprising the first issue as "represent[ing] a starting point: they engage the idea of devoting our scholarly energy to teaching. Because there is little tradition of critical work on teaching, we lack a language for speaking about it" (Holberg and Taylor 5). The present project also aims to engage itself at that starting point--contributing to a discourse that develops scholarly discussions about teaching in the English discipline. It does this by first building a conceptual framework around a pedagogy of stewardship. Next, three key pedagogical principles are outlined that together construct a space for stewardship in the classroom. These principles focus attention on discourse and discursive practice, theory for both teachers and students, and the role of emotion in the classroom. Finally, this project applies the framework of stewardship and these principles to the practice of teaching two texts, *Macbeth* and *Fools Crow*, in a literature classroom.

Admittedly, any project that concerns itself specifically with pedagogy, especially one that seeks to be heard at academic levels, faces a number of difficulties. One of the
most troubling obstacles is the de-valuing of pedagogy that occurs in higher education. Because pedagogy involves a "practical" realm, it is often stigmatized as less "academic" than those areas of study that can avoid the stigma of practice. Within the academy, a hierarchical system values those who seek "pure" knowledge over those who deal primarily with "applied" knowledge. Pedagogy is viewed at worst as not worthy of serious study and at best as an object of serious study, but an area in which one focuses at the risk of losing status in the academy. George Levine comments on the system of values at work in the academy by writing, "Prestigious professional journals virtually never publish material on the teaching of literature. Essays about teaching are often regarded as the academic equivalent of 'how-to' literature, not intellectually strenuous, not, somehow, very serious" (7-8).

Thinking about education as not "very serious" may be a result of the ways in which education continues to be gendered today as Jane Roland Martin, a specialist in the philosophy of education, argues in *Coming of Age in Academe*. She concludes that one of the reasons for devaluing education is the cultural association of education (in addition to nursing and homemaking) with women and thus also the home and family. The association of these practices with the private realm "sullies them"; it also stains those who choose to make them their area of specialization. According to Martin, "a discipline has only as much status as its objects of study, and each scholar has only as much status as his or her discipline," thus, those whose object of study is teaching (which is culturally associated with women) are tainted with "second-class citizenship" (53). Perhaps, then, the lack of academic material that focuses on pedagogy reveals the stigma attached to scholarship related to it.

In addition to the devalued status of pedagogy in most scholarship, other obstacles complicate discussions of pedagogy. These include a wide range of issues from a teacher's own insecurities to students' resistance to non-traditional means of instruction to the
obvious problem that strategies that work for one teacher might not work as well for another. As Marshall Gregory notes, "Few teachers feel that they have either the intellectual or professional grasp of teaching that they have of curriculum" (69). In some cases, we may resist discussing subjects of which we are insecure. (Understandably so, since in many cases pedagogical training isn't necessarily a part of the Ph.D. process, while in secondary educational training, pedagogy is typically equated with methodology.) Furthermore, in *Teaching to Transgress*, bell hooks comments that progressive pedagogical practices face critique from both inside and outside the academy; as a result, some teachers are fearful of trying non-traditional pedagogies in their classrooms (143). Other instructors may not see need to theorize pedagogy because their habits are deeply ingrained, and they see no need to change structures that, after all, served well in their own education.

**Need for Theorizing Pedagogy**

Combating the gendered, hierarchical treatment of pedagogy begins with efforts like that of the scholarly journal *Pedagogy*, where contributors bring their ideas and struggles with the practice of teaching to a larger public audience. Forums like these can prompt a re-vision of the scholarly worthiness and importance of pedagogy. At the same time, teachers reading and writing in these spaces become more invested in their own practices and development of pedagogical theories. In part, through theorizing practice, educators become more conscious of the structures, discourses, and practices that both enable and disable them as educators. Thus, as we begin to theorize, discuss, and publish what it is that we do *in the classroom*, we may begin to reframe the ways in which pedagogy is seen and understood in the academy.

One aspect of re-framing the "why" of pedagogy involves defining the term. The definition of pedagogy offered by feminist scholar Jennifer Gore marks an important
distinction between understanding pedagogy as *instruction* and understanding it as a *process* of knowledge production (68). The difference between these two definitions impacts how we view students in the classroom; pedagogy as instruction connotes a passive student while pedagogy as process implies that the students are active participants in their learning. As Gore explains, "Indeed if pedagogy is conceived as the process of knowledge production, a meaning consistent with much critical and feminist work that tends to deny constructions of pedagogy as 'instruction,' than we can argue that empowerment must be pedagogical—a process of knowledge production" (68). For those educators who wish to do more than instruct, for those who wish to involve students in their own learning, defining pedagogy in the framework of process is an essential starting point.

Reframing pedagogy as more complex than instruction also entails consideration of the politics of pedagogy. Henry Giroux has done much work in developing an argument that describes how teaching is not a neutral, value-free practice. Giroux addresses throughout his work how pedagogy, in addition to being devalued, is depoliticized. Teachers frequently consider pedagogy to be just a series of methods they use in the classroom, or even more detrimental, it is seen solely as a means of training students or as a means of transmitting knowledge to them. These explicit or implicit understandings are problematic because they ignore pedagogy's political, social, and moral implications. They also disregard the fact that pedagogy is "a moral and social practice through which knowledge, values, and social relations are deployed within unequal relations of power in order to produce particular notions of citizenship, subject positions, and forms of national identity" (Giroux, *Impure Acts* 92). Hence, to view pedagogy as only practice or just methods ignores its ideological base and function as a social practice. Instructors who willingly contribute to scholarly debates surrounding the material they teach without also asking critical questions about how that material is taught risk both complicity with social
practices that may be oppressive and losing the opportunity to make their teaching itself, in addition to the subject matter they teach, a tool for encouraging students to develop agency in their process of knowledge production and in the development of social relations.

Composition scholars, in spite of their delegation as the "service" arm of the English department, have begun and continue to develop conversations about the relationship between practice and content in their classrooms. The willingness of the practitioners of this specialization to interrogate both theory and practice while teaching writing offers an important model to those who are engaged in teaching literature. For example, in a recent article by Kevin Porter in CCC entitled "A Pedagogy of Charity: Donald Davidson and the Student-Negotiated Composition Classroom," Porter not only articulates a theoretical basis for his work (using Donald Davidson's interpretive principle of charity) but he also includes a discussion describing the interaction of his pedagogical theory with his students and his classroom practices. By doing so, he makes clear the implications of his pedagogy for both himself and his students.

While pedagogical work like Porter's in composition studies is far from exhausted, the written conversations in Literary Studies tend to be dominated by textual engagements and have not as a whole exerted the attention to pedagogy that we see in composition studies. Certainly the works of well-known and respected scholars such as Gerald Graff and Robert Scholes have made significant contributions in addressing issues related to teaching literature. However, their contributions (specifically Scholes's *Textual Power* and Graff's *Professing Literature*) fall short of asking questions that move beyond the texts we teach to the dynamics of the place in which we teach them. For instance, Susan Horton, in responding to a paper given by Scholes (later to become part of *Textual Power*), comments that in addition to making students more aware of the semiotics of the texts, we also need "a recognition that the classroom is also a text, produced by teacher and student
in collaboration. There is a semiotics of that text, too, and it is time we studied it" (53-54). Graff's development of "teaching the conflicts" also largely remains above questions of daily practice in the classroom and "works more effectively as a theoretical answer to a set of questions forced on us by 'theory' than it does, so far at least, as a pedagogy enacted daily in classrooms and reflected on in writing by teachers and critics" (Levine 11). Both scholars then, while clearly making efforts to address some aspect of pedagogy, fail to consider pedagogy at the classroom level.

To be certain, the institutional valuing of theory over practice may make focusing on more specific pedagogical theories less attractive to scholars, especially those just building their careers. English instructors may find themselves rewarded more by what they do with literature and critical theory through research than by how they teach it. However, as pressure increases on the educational system for producing "competent" students and as the debates surrounding the value of the humanities and traditional canons rage, those who teach English have an opportune moment for beginning to articulate how and why we teach literature in the classroom. Articulating these practices can become a means for resisting frequent calls for standardization as well as resisting the construction of an educational system that measures students primarily through competencies and deficiencies.

Furthermore, many teachers in secondary schools, colleges, and universities observe at a variety of levels the enormous influence of popular culture on their students; in fact, it functions as a pedagogical force shaping desire, identity, and values (Giroux, Impure Acts, 29). If engaged intellectuals wish to offer resistance or an alternative pedagogical force to popular culture (not to imply that all popular culture is inherently dangerous to students' minds), then we must begin to do the work of theorizing our pedagogical "forces." hooks calls for exactly this type of intellectual work, writing, "It is crucial that critical thinkers who want to change our teaching practices talk to one
another, collaborate in a discussion that crosses boundaries and creates a space for intervention" (129). In the spirit of hooks' challenge, this project engages in developing a pedagogical force for the English discipline by focusing on the dynamics of teaching literature in a classroom space that involves teachers, students, discourses, myths, emotions, curriculum, theories, and texts.

**Difference Between Critical Theory and Pedagogical Theory**

While a large body of published materials on critical theory and teaching literature exists, we less frequently read articles in print focused on pedagogical theory in the literature classroom. The distinction between conversations and practices that engage with critical theory and those that seek to articulate a pedagogical theory is important to note in order to support my claim that teachers of literature need to focus on pedagogical theory as well as critical theory. Arguably, most teachers do bring particular critical stances (i.e. Marxist, feminist, new historicist) to the teaching of literature and use these theoretical approaches to ask certain questions of the text. Indeed, for some instructors, particularly those engaging with feminist theory, their critical approach does influence their classroom practice. However, relying on critical theory alone, or even primarily, can be problematic because it fails to interrogate the practices of the classroom.

First, critical theory does not subject to scrutiny the role of the instructor in the classroom or the way that knowledge is produced in the classroom. In aiming to move beyond critical theory, Horton asks this question: "Why do we talk about what texts we should teach, ignoring the one text we must all teach: our own action in the classroom?" (55). I find this neglect especially troublesome in a case where an instructor might use post-structuralist or post-modern theories in order to open up an interpretation of a text and to call into question the Western ways of knowing while at the same time failing to
interrogate his or her practices which may be complicit to the ways of knowing and knowledge that he or she aims to question.

Second, excluding pedagogical theory leaves no space for dealing with students' resistance to or acceptance of the theoretical questions critical theory asks of texts. Certainly, it is possible to use a particular theoretical framework in a classroom for reading a text and yet completely disregard students' reactions to that theory; indeed, I fear this is a picture of too many "typical" literature classrooms. In the case where the teacher is attentive to students' reactions, he or she may be either frustrated by students who "don't get it" or ecstatic with those who use theory for new and insightful readings. However, between these two extremes a whole range of student responses exists. By theorizing pedagogy, instructors participate in a discourse that serves to examine student reactions, regardless of where the students are positioned. Ultimately, focusing on pedagogy generates more possibilities for making critical theory accessible for students because teachers begin to imagine ways that they might meet students "where they are" with their questions and various positionings relating to critical theory.

Pedagogical work of this type begins when teachers reconsider their practices and theories in light of context-specific classroom interactions. Consider a situation where students may intellectually assimilate a theory or idea, while on the level of lived experience the theory makes no difference in how they engage with their world. By asking what this gap reveals about the students, the teacher, the theory, and their worlds, pedagogical theory attempts to maneuver in the space between intellect and lived action. What makes these questions so interesting and in need of scholarly attention is that this space is filled with ambiguities, complexities of time and situation, and all the diversity of identity that one classroom contains. Yet, for many teachers, dealing with the complexities of texts and critical theory often seems enough for one semester, and "[t]he reality of engagement with students makes the already difficult questions about the nature
of literature and literary study even more difficult than they seem at the level of high theory, in graduate seminars, at international conferences" (Levine 14). However, if literature teachers envision critical theory functioning in a world outside of the text, the increasingly complex and difficult questions that pedagogy brings to the surface should be addressed.

From Freire to Critical Pedagogies and Beyond

As one of the most influential educators whose thoughts on pedagogy have had significant ramifications in bringing issues of pedagogy to the forefront, Paulo Freire developed his theories of education in resistance to what he termed the "banking concept of education." Critical literacy, he argued, does not take place when students are expected to merely consume and "bank" the knowledge passed on to them from texts or teachers. Rather, students who produce knowledge together in social contexts based on their own experiences will engage in a process of conscientização, meaning "learning to perceive social, political, and economic contradictions, and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality" (Freire 35). This is a more empowering educational process.

Pedagogy of the Oppressed is distinctive for its discussion of the specific educational methods Freire developed as the means for fostering conscientização, including problem-posing and generative themes. This praxis, in combination with his moral and social philosophy, originated in the historical contexts of his teaching situations, namely working with Brazilian peasants. Because his work examined the intersections of students, teachers, texts, historical situations, teaching methods, and educational structures, it provides an example of the kind of pedagogical work I am advocating for the English discipline.

Many have explored the implications of Freire's ideas since he first wrote Pedagogy of the Oppressed, and, in particular, the school of critical pedagogy traces some
of its origins to Freiron thought. Critical pedagogy defines itself as "an attempt to alter experience in the interest of expanding the possibilities for human agency and social justice" (Giroux, Disturbing, 20). Yet, as the school of critical pedagogy influenced by Freire's thinking has continued its development, particularly in the academy, its connection to specific teaching and learning contexts has arguably weakened, primarily because the language constructing its discourse has functioned increasingly at the level of theory. This impulse concerns me as the conversations within critical pedagogy are one of the limited spaces where pedagogy is seriously engaged as an academic topic. As these conversations disengage from practice, we are brought back full circle to a theory/practice binary that limits growth for both teachers and students.

The primary conversations in critical pedagogy have been developed by Peter McLaren, Henry Giroux, Roger Simon, and Stanley Aronowitz among others. Through their attention to the politics, ideologies, and praxis involved in teaching, they have begun to challenge many of the discourses shaping education currently and emphasize the importance of developing pedagogies of empowerment. McLaren, for example, describes critical pedagogies as looking to transform "the relationship among classroom, teaching, the production of knowledge, the institutional structures of the school, and the social and material relations of the wider community, society, and nation-state" (10). And Giroux writes that "critical pedagogy self-consciously operates from a perspective in which teaching and learning are committed to expanding rather than restricting the opportunities for students and others to be social, political, and economic agents" (Disturbing 18).

As the statements by both McLaren and Giroux reveal, those involved in developing these pedagogies typically look at the broad context of the system of education, and their ideas are only occasionally brought into direct relation with specific subject fields or practices. While those working to develop critical pedagogies have made tremendous progress in bringing the political, social, cultural, and moral implications of
pedagogical practices to the attention of the academy and the public, the lack of specific engagement with classroom and disciplinary practices limits the function of critical pedagogies to yet another theoretical debate in the academy. For instance, Giroux's texts tend to make broad calls for what pedagogy "ought" to be without offering suggestions as to how a teacher might actually construct a critical pedagogy in his or her classroom. Consider, for example, an abbreviated list of "musts" for a postmodern pedagogy given by Giroux in "Slacking Off: Border Youth and Postmodern Education":

- must address the shifting attitudes, representations, and desires of this new generation of youth being produced within the current historical, economic and cultural conjuncture (74)

- must be more sensitive to how teachers and students negotiate both texts and identities, but it must do so through a political project that articulates its own authority within a critical understanding of how the self recognizes others as subjects rather than as objects of history (75)

- [needs] a more specific understanding of how affect and ideology mutually construct the knowledge, resistance, and sense of identity that students negotiate as they work through dominant and rupturing narratives attempting in different ways to secure particular forms of authority (75)

After discussing each of these "musts" (in addition to others) in slightly more depth, the article ends. An instructor is left with a long list of ideals for his or her classroom practice, but with little evidence of how these ideals might be enacted. Therefore, even in the school of thought that articulates the importance of acknowledging the implications of practice, one rarely finds a contextual discussion of actual classroom practice. This phenomenon actually opposes the original aims of critical educators because it limits the changes that can be made in the material circumstances of the classroom or in broader cultural life. As a result, the discourse's appeals to moral action collapse upon themselves.

Elizabeth Ellsworth confronted the limitations of critical pedagogical discourses when she began developing a class called "Media and Anti-Racist Policies" in which she...
initially intended to address many of the central concerns of critical pedagogies—justice, racism, marginalization of the other, and development of critical consciousness, to name a few. She found that the language of critical pedagogies was "more appropriate (yet hardly more helpful) for philosophical debates about the highly problematic concepts of freedom, justice, democracy, and 'universal' values than for thinking through and planning classroom practices to support the political agenda of C&I [Curriculum and Instruction] 607" (92).

In Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy, Ellsworth and others present important additional critiques to critical pedagogy that developed as its theory interacted with the practices of their classrooms. Summarizing their critiques is useful as it provides further context for my departure from critical pedagogies, a school of thought I initially intended to use as a basis for this project. Their work opens a space for this project as they articulate the limitations of critical pedagogies.

Ellsworth's primary criticism centers on the argument that the principles underlying critical pedagogies "are repressive myths that perpetuate the relations of domination" (91). In her words we find that critical pedagogies' stated goals defined earlier by Giroux as "expanding possibilities for human agency and social justice" are in fact reversed and become instead repressive, dominating, and limiting. This reversal is a result of the broad, rationalistic, and abstract nature of critical pedagogies.

Ellsworth notes that the levels of abstraction present in the theories can result in classroom discussions that ignore historical contexts and political positions (92). Certainly, addressing both agency and justice require contextualization according to time, place, and situation. She also contends that critical pedagogies fail to address important issues of classroom practice (95). That is, critical pedagogies often proclaim themselves as empowering without actually examining how classroom practices either support or challenge that assumption. Additionally, the absence of critical educators analyzing the power structures that shape their own positions in the classrooms and their relationships
with students essentially results in giving students (and instructors) the illusion of equality in the classroom (98). Finally, Ellsworth argues that critical pedagogies rely upon rationalistic assumptions and discourses that have the potential to oppress the very Other they seek to liberate (97).

Along similar lines, Jennifer Gore wants to problematize the construction of empowerment by both critical and feminist discourses looking for "their dangers, their normalizing tendencies, for how they might serve as instruments of domination despite the intentions of their creators" (54). These "normalizing tendencies" occur primarily through the construction of the term "empowerment" and its unreflective use for describing the process of empowering students. Gore contends that both the broad and decontextualized use of empowerment is problematic as well as the way in which the term sets up the teacher and/or academic as the owner of power and agent of empowerment (61). Gore, like Ellsworth, struggles with the conversion of the "macro" theoretical discourse into the "micro" of daily practice in the classroom (59).

A Pedagogy of Stewardship

Both Ellsworth's and Gore's analyses of their experiences with the discourse of critical pedagogies, along with my own increasing discomfort with the exceedingly political and theoretical aspects of the discourse, prompted me to reconsider using the critical pedagogical discourse in my own work. Instead, I began to search for a way in which I might construct a discourse that disrupts the theoretical, rationalistic, and highly political language of critical pedagogies while encapsulating the emphases of what I will argue might construct a useful pedagogy for a literature classroom. To this end, I offer a pedagogy of stewardship.

The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) defines stewardship narrowly, the primary definition being "the office of steward" ("Stewardship," def.1). "Steward" itself has
several definitions; the original sense of the word included "an official who controls the domestic affairs of a household, supervising the service of his master's table, directing the domestics, and regulating household expenditure" ("Steward," def. 1a). Today, the literal definition of stewardship is less associated with the term than a metaphorical definition stemming from Biblical usage. The term's broad definition in this sense connotes the Christian's responsibility to care for God's creation and its resources in ways that are pleasing to Him. This idea has been applied to primarily stewardship of financial resources and stewardship of creation. The later application founds the theoretical basis of a large Christian environmental movement. More recently, the term has been appropriated in business discourses, environmental ethics, and even in world health policy. In this project, I appropriate it for an educational discourse because it opens up a language for discussing ethics, authority, responsibility, and care giving (among other ideas).

In reconsidering the literal definition of stewardship, how might conceptualizing the teacher in the role of a steward offer a useful alternative to the discourses of critical pedagogies? We can replace several words from the OED definition with educational words. Is it useful to think of the teacher as an "educator who controls the educative affairs of a classroom, supervising the service of the curriculum, directing the students, and regulating learning experiences"? Certainly, the terms employed by the OED in its definition of a steward--"controls," "supervising," "directing," and "regulating"--are loaded to some degree in the context of any educational philosophies that aim to resist banking approaches to learning. However, educators conscious of the various ongoing interactions in a classroom can probably admit that these terms do, in fact, present themselves in classroom dynamics, in both positive and negative instances. What is important to note in terms of this definition is that the steward does not control, supervise, direct, or regulate for his or her own gain; rather, the steward is ultimately responsible to the "landowner." The obvious question then becomes, if we are to consider teachers as
stewards, who functions in the role of landowner? I would argue that this role functions at multiple levels, that teachers are responsible to many landowners—their institutions, the communities in which they teach, the nation and democracy at large, their own ethical and moral convictions, and their abilities and education. In this context, stewardship shapes responsibility through its call to interrogate classroom practices to determine the ways in which they enable or restrain students from participating in expression and dialogue in any of the multiple-levels of community, classroom, institution, personal convictions, or nation. Thus, drawing on the metaphor of steward emphasizes the responsibility of a teacher to others while at the same time it acknowledging the teacher's own interests and authority in the classroom. Critical discourses, on the other hand, have a tendency to mask the unequal power relationships at play in any classroom through the language surrounding terms like "empowerment."

Second, authority is reframed through stewardship in the sense that it is not an assumed right of the teacher, but instead is granted to the teacher-steward by multiple bodies including institutions, communities, and curricula. Again, this understanding holds the teacher-steward responsible for the exercise of authority and power while also acknowledging that the teacher is also subject to the same larger authorities as the students. With this consideration in mind, the empowerment central to critical pedagogies becomes problematic because the teacher-steward does not have in his or her hands the "power" to empower students as the discourse so often suggests. Gore uses Foucault's articulation of power to argue that teachers do not necessarily empower students so much as they "help others to exercise power." Foucault's discussion of the ways in which power is exercised, not held, is worth quoting at length:

Power must be analysed as something which circulates, or rather as something which only functions in the form of a chain. It is never localised here or there, never in anybody's hands, never appropriated as a commodity or piece of wealth. Power is employed and exercised through a net-like
organisation. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target. They are always also the elements of its articulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application. (Power/Knowledge 98)

Teacher-stewards, then, are not the dispensers of power, but "vehicles of power" in the same sense as their students are. However, as stewards they have the ability to assist students to also become "vehicles of power," not by empowering students but by helping students to develop the tools of empowerment that they already own.

Third, stewardship reconstructs traditional patriarchal structures in the classroom. Ideally, the idea of steward involves humility that comes from the conviction that one's own interests are not the highest interests at stake in any given situation. (I do not mean to suggest that a teacher can dissociate himself or herself completely from self-interest or that we should not also bring self-interest into the discussion of pedagogy.) In an article discussing stewardship and the environment, Jennifer Welchman describes stewardship as "a social role individuals adopt toward some other, a role sustained over time. To be a steward is to devote a substantial percentage of one's thoughts and efforts to maintaining or enhancing the condition of some thing(s) or person(s), not primarily for the steward's own sake" (415). Again, the construction of teacher as steward changes the ways in which we are able to talk about power and authority in the classroom, issues central to pedagogical theory. Peter Block, well-known for articulating stewardship as a management style in the business world, writes that "Stewardship is the choice for service. We serve best through partnership, rather than patriarchy" and that "It's [stewardship is] a willingness to act without needing to control those around us" (qtd. in Laabs 27). To see teachers as stewards, who are in the traditional sense also servants of a landowner, reverses the traditional patriarchal structure of the classroom because a teacher chooses to serve the students while patriarchal structures demand service from the students. At the
same time, naming the teacher as steward acknowledges that teacher and students are not, and possibly never can be, on completely equal footing in a classroom.

Fourth, the articulation of a stewardship principle in the context of environmental movements reveals two more spaces in which this term opens possibilities for pedagogy. The environmental movement highlights motivations for stewardship that are rooted in caring deeply about the earth's future and the conviction that its general future directly affects our personal future. Furthermore, environmental stewardship works to put forth concrete, practical actions that concerned citizens can utilize in their own efforts to be better stewards of resources. I argue that both the motivations and practical actions that are at stake in environmental stewardship also have a stake in a pedagogy of stewardship. This pedagogy recognizes the importance of caring, collective futures, and the interaction between practical actions and theoretical principles in learning for both teachers and students.

Finally, a pedagogy of stewardship frames the questions critical pedagogy asks in a significantly different manner. Gore argues that critical pedagogies too often assume "we can do for you" rather than asking "what can we do for you?" (61). In a pedagogy of stewardship, the teacher-steward asks the second question at a variety of levels--of students, of institutions, of communities, of democracy, and of the values such as justice and freedom that comprise their own ethical and moral subjectivities. Getting to the point of framing the "empowerment" question differently requires that we seek "ways to exercise power toward the fulfillment of our espoused aims, ways that include humility, skepticism, and self-criticism" (Gore 63). For Nicki Verploegen Vandergrift stewardship is motivated by "reverence rather than guilt" and its development is promoted through "a disposition of awe, renewal through contemplation, unitive sensitivity and humility" (Abstract). The values outlined by Gore and Vandergrift provide an alternative model to the rationalistic, theoretical, and self-assured proclamations currently constructed in the
discourses of critical pedagogy and also form the basis of the theoretical principles that I will outline briefly next (and in more detail in Chapter 2).

**Pedagogical Principles**

For the scope and purpose of this project, I articulate theoretical principles that might compose a pedagogy of stewardship specifically concerned with teaching literature. However, these principles alone are not sufficient for contributing meaningfully to a pedagogical discourse and for fulfilling the values of stewardship unless they are also intimately tied to the practice of teaching literature. To this end, I "apply" these principles to two case studies, the play *Macbeth* and the novel *Fools Crow*. The aim of this practice-oriented application will be to emphasize that the process of teaching and its interaction with theory is equally as important as the texts that make up a syllabus. In other words, conversations about pedagogical theory should also be inherently conversations about practice (the "action" discussed earlier in regards to environmental stewardship). In the negotiation between the theory and practice in the classroom we can begin to engage education most meaningfully for our students and ourselves. To be clear, the pedagogy and practice outlined here are not meant to become a prescription for all times and all places but rather an exploration of what pedagogy and practice framed by stewardship might offer a literature classroom.

By bringing theory into direct relationship with classroom practices and student experiences, this project begins to conceptualize a language about teaching that is both scholarly and tied to practice. While secondary education tends to place too much emphasis on practice and the methods of teaching, post-secondary education frequently prioritizes discussions of theory over those on practice. Therefore, I envision that this project could be useful for both those who teach advanced grades in secondary schools (i.e. 11th or 12th grade) and for those who teach in institutions of higher education.
My earlier discussion, following the lead of Gore and Ellsworth, illustrated how the discourse inherent to critical pedagogies limits their applicability to specific material and historical contexts. The attention to and awareness of discourse modeled by Gore and Ellsworth comprises the first pedagogical principle for a pedagogy of stewardship. Part of the process for becoming aware of subjectivities and agency involves examining discourse and discursive practices, from those that students encounter in their readings to those that construct their schooling. Language shapes subjectivities in subtle yet pervasive ways; exploring how it constrains experiences and ideologies offers possibility for the development of a deeper understanding of all the "texts" (including literature) that we encounter in our lives. In addition, in order for students to answer our question "what can we do for you?" they may need to first come to a fuller comprehension of the ways in which their identities are being constructed (often without their "consent") by the discourses that surround them in the media, schools, at home, and at work.

Second, one of the means through which we examine discourse, as well as another central tenet for this pedagogy, is engagement with theory in relation to practice for both teachers and students. Students' educational paths are usually filled with an abundance of activity but contain little in the way of theoretical frameworks used to ask critical questions of those educational activities. Teachers, on the other hand, often engage with theory and practice, but frequently they exist in separate spheres. Both teachers and students can benefit from a view of theory and practice that specifically concerns itself with how one affects the other. For students, theory initially provides tools for the development of critical thought. Later, or simultaneously, students begin to apply this critical thought to the practices of their everyday lives in and beyond the classroom. Furthermore, theory helps teachers and students to construct new understandings of knowledge they may already have and also to conceive and imagine new knowledges. In order to avoid including theory as just another type of canonical text, the pedagogical
reasoning for theory should be clearly linked with practice, just as practice should be clearly tied to theory. Through this dialectical relationship, theory and practice ideally complicate one another as the theoretician reconsiders his or her theory after engaging it with practice and the practitioner reconsiders his or her practice through engagement with theory. The goal here is for both teachers and students to begin seeing themselves as practitioner-theorists. Those who have the tools to begin articulating their own subjectivities, interests, and desires in the context of their individual situations can enact these articulations.

The final principle in this pedagogy aims to theorize both the role of and a place for emotions and subjective knowledge in the classroom. Theorizing pedagogy in the context of stewardship opens a space for this because stewardship concerns itself with the actions that result from caring deeply about a place, issue, or cause. Because of stewards' emotional investments, they work to preserve, strengthen, enrich, or enable particular locations, institutions, values, and so on. Stewardship, in either the religious, environmental, business, or pedagogical sense, flows from a reservoir of personal beliefs, convictions, values and emotions, none of which currently have much of a discursive space in the academy outside of feminist discourses. Therefore, arguing that emotion does have a place in scholarly theory and writing challenges the prioritizing of objective discourses over subjective discourses. bell hooks notes that the classroom is generally seen as a place for the public self and that we expect the private self, for both teachers and students, to remain outside of it. Bringing the private self to the classroom, however, builds a space in the classroom to more fully answer humanity's lived experiences. Ultimately, it is more stewardly to incorporate both intellect and emotion in our classrooms (not that they are separate entities entirely). To neglect to do so fails to engage one of most important resources that teacher-stewards are entrusted with: the student as a human being filled with loves, hates, frustrations, stories and ideas.
And yet, even the language we have at hand constrains to some degree our ability to theorize this space in the classroom. Words like "emotion" and "feeling" are vague and associated primarily with the individual. However, beginning to struggle with this language will, I believe, lead to other equally critical questions about "emotions" and teaching. If we can't incorporate words like "love" "erotics" or "friendship" into theory and/or academic discourse, what does this reveal about the ways in which we construct ourselves (and by default our students)? How can teachers talk about their love for students, texts, and teaching and what would be the implications of this for learning? How can acknowledging desire help students and teachers understand their subjectivities? How could it prove destructive for teachers or students? How will deconstructing the myth of objective knowledge and objective teaching open a space where students develop more agency in their learning and knowledge production? By foregrounding emotion in a pedagogical theory, I hope to engage with these questions and others.

**Implications**

Perhaps one of the reasons that teachers have been reluctant to bring their private selves to the classroom is their concern about what this would do to their Authority. While authoritarian models of teaching have no place in a pedagogy aiming to develop student agency and critical, self-reflective thought, this pedagogy does not intend to eliminate the idea that the teacher can function as an authority in the classroom (as the discussion of teacher as steward aimed to show). For example, a teacher's education and experience have contributed to expertise that is useful for students and that makes them authority within their subject matter. Furthermore, especially in the secondary classroom, the teacher needs to accept the role of the authority figure simply as a result of how the educational system is structured and in order to manage the everyday details of the classroom. For instance, grading, by its nature, places the teacher in a position of
authority. We often ignore how these more mundane details also construct our own identities and our students' identities in the classroom. Acknowledging material limitations of the classroom situation and then working through the tension that results when they are compared to more theoretical principles is a necessary part of engaging both theory and practice in scholarly discussion.

Just as a pedagogy of stewardship impacts the role of teacher, it also challenges canons, the status of texts, and the structure and system of education. The case studies as they develop in this project should begin to address the implications of the pedagogy for texts, teachers, curricula, and canons. However, while I was confronted with the need to make direct challenges to structures that limit student and teacher engagement in education and also to offer suggestions on a larger scale within the system of education, I was also confronted with the need to theorize a pedagogy that might be effective within the structure and realities of education as they exist now. In the end, I decided the latter direction would be a more meaningful project for myself (and I hope others); accordingly, I focused the pedagogical principles to a classroom level.

If critical pedagogies, a school of thought concerned with the moral and political implications of practices, as they actually interact with specific classroom contexts, have a tendency ultimately to limit the space where students (and teachers) encounter critical consciousness and empowerment, what are the chances that all discussions of pedagogy will have similar effects? Any pedagogy must be aware of and leave space for the ways in which interaction with practice complicates, questions, and possibly leads to the revision of theoretical stances. Indeed, perhaps it is most useful to consider any pedagogical theory as constantly shifting, a work in flux, as the particulars of students, institutional structures, and the instructor's subjectivities also shift and evade efforts of naming and codifying. The more I involve myself in pedagogy, the more it complicates itself as it deals with the intersections of student, teacher, classroom, curriculum, texts, and
institutions. Both broad theoretical statements and prescriptive methods erase these intersections. Perhaps the academy's disdain for discussing issues of pedagogy also stems in part from these complex intersections. Is it simply easier to ignore how exploring pedagogy ultimately forces us to ask questions about ourselves, the system in which we work, our relationships with students, and the students who fill our classrooms each day?

As someone who considers herself a teacher before an academic, I am more than fascinated by these questions and complications; they haunt me after almost every class that I teach. Barbara Christian once wrote, "But what I write and how I write is done in order to save my own life" (2265). I might paraphrase her statement as "But what I teach and how I teach is done in order to save my own life." It saves my life because teaching constantly asks me to be self-reflective while at the same time it confronts me with questions about who I am in relation to other people and who I am in relation to communities and the society at large. It asks questions about the texts I love, questions about the institutions in which I teach, and questions about my complicity and responsibility at all these levels. For these reasons, I use this project to begin exploring possible answers to these questions—questions in which I am deeply invested, and I believe others are as well.
CHAPTER 2

PEDAGOGICAL PRINCIPLES

Myth and (in) Education

"Myth does not deny things, on the contrary, its function is to talk about them; simply, it purifies them, it makes them innocent, it gives them a natural and eternal justification, it gives them a clarity which is not that of an explanation but that of a statement of fact. [. . .] In passing from history to nature, myth acts economically: it abolishes the complexity of human acts, it gives them the simplicity of essences, it does away with all dialectics..."

—Roland Barthes, "Myth Today" (117)

Education, perhaps more than any social institution, is influenced by a number of myths: "Knowledge is rational and objective." "Emotion distorts objectivity and rationality and thus does not have a place in the classroom." "Schools are politically neutral social institutions." "Multi-culturalism threatens the quality of education." "Textbooks and curriculum present objective and value-free knowledge." "Education itself is the great equalizer, blind to race, sex, class, etc."

Educators, perhaps more than any professionals, have the power to "de-mythicize" what they do by challenging the "naturalized" methods, discourses, and practices that make up education by re-establishing complexity and dialectics in their work. Many educators are engaged in this work at present. For example, John Smyth and Geoffrey Shacklock look at how teaching has been shaped by economic discourses arguing for an examination of schooling that reads its "ideological and economic agenda" (28). Henry Giroux has written extensively on politicizing teaching and pedagogy, while feminist scholars question the natural and eternal justification of masculine and Western ways of knowing, thinking, and writing in education. These writers and others construct
lenses through which we can re-examine educational practices and discourses at large. They show us how seemingly benign and taken-for-granted discourses and practices can mask ideological and political agendas. Pedagogical theory can also be used as a tool for examining the myths that exist in our classrooms because theorizing pedagogy reveals the complexity and complications that exist beneath the surface of everyday classroom life. By confronting the contextual specifics of a classroom, the relationship between theory and practice, and the interplay of discourse and practice, we begin the process of de-mythicizing education for ourselves, for our students, and for the communities in which we work.

In the following sections I explore three principles for a pedagogy of stewardship: I examine the possibilities for the classroom of bringing attention to discourse, of developing a dialectical relationship between theory and practice, and of reconsidering the place of emotions in education. These contribute to the task of examining myths at play in the classroom because they interrogate three locations in the English discipline where exposing the complexity of pedagogical acts reveals how various myths limit educational possibilities for our students. Thus, the process of de-mythicizing creates choices for teachers and students where we can become more aware of the consequences of our actions. To be clear, these principles are not meant to be exhaustive, but rather they are three that I consider to be foundational for developing teaching practices and theories in the literature classroom that include the values of stewardship.
Discourse and Discursive Practices

"The true mirror of our discourse is the course of our lives."
--Montaigne, "Of the Education of Children"

Educators, particularly those who speak of empowering their students and/or those, like myself, who wish to develop pedagogical practices that provide students with an education that encourages them to act, take responsibility in their learning, and participate fully in their communities, can look to Michel Foucault's theories on discourse and power for insight. His theories suggest that one cannot address the practices and power relations in a classroom without also examining the discourse and discursive practices that characterize it. Foucault articulates how the discourses of a community and the practices of that community are intimately related: "Discursive practices are not purely and simply ways of producing discourse. They are embedded in technical processes, in institutions, in patterns for general behavior, in forms for transmission and diffusion, and in pedagogical forms which, at once, impose and maintain them" (Language 200).

Discourse, in this sense, while inclusive of language, also concerns broader practices in a wide range of social institutions. Furthermore, Foucault's writings describe the ways that "relations of power cannot themselves be established, consolidated nor implemented without the production, accumulation, circulation and functioning of a discourse" (Power 93). His work then points to the ways in which practice, discourse, and power implicate one another and intertwine together.

An awareness of how discourse functions to shape our practices and our subjectivity is a central part of having power to make choices that build up and restore full humanity and diversity in our communities rather than destroying them. Furthermore, stewards recognize their position as one that does not hold ultimate power, while also
recognizing that they do have *some* power to act in the interest of a larger goal. For example, in the Christian environmental movement, stewardship implies having power and responsibility to make choices that affect the environment and communities positively, while also recognizing that no one person or group has the power to control the ecological fate of the planet. Understanding these parameters leads neither to a distorted view of power, a false optimism in the power of the individual, nor a pessimistic belief that there is no action anyone can take to make a difference. Teachers who can develop this type of critical consciousness in their own practices and theoretical positions will then also help to develop it in their students. In this way, teachers and students both may begin making stewardly choices involving discourse, practices, and power.

Indeed, if educators remain unconscious with regards to the power relations contained in the dominant discourses that construct education, their discipline, and even their own values and language, they risk becoming accomplices in the reproduction of existing societal class, race, and gender discrimination (O'Loughlin 337). Suzanne Clark writes that "Ideology works not as the private agendas of individuals but as a kind of unconscious within the very forms of communication, and to ignore the unconsciousness of that operation is to leave us at its mercy" (105). Thus, the unreflective practitioner of a discourse risks unconsciously taking on a specific world view, regardless of whether he or she ethically or morally agrees with it. However, examining discourse develops explicit consciousness about practices, institutions, and society, thereby allowing us to resist divisive processes and destructive ideologies. This process of de-naturalizing practice, language, and social institutions develops what Freire termed *concientização*, or critical consciousness—being aware of one's subjectivity while also understanding that subjectivity does not necessarily involve being subject to societal structures, powers, institutions, and discourses that helped to shape it. In other words, it is important to recognize that subjects are also agents. When students and teachers develop critical consciousness, in
part through discursive examination, they are better able to meet the goals like action and participation because of the emphasis on understanding that being a subject also implies being an agent in our own contexts.

In order to meet these goals, identifying hegemonic discourses, in some cases, presents no problem, nor does naming the ways in which they can oppress. For example, one does not have to look hard for evidence supporting the work of Smyth and Shacklock (mentioned previously). They examine the economic discourses shaping education and their potential harms (i.e. the discourse surrounding standards and testing and the discourse surrounding university administration). However, an example of a less apparent, and perhaps equally problematic, discourse that shapes educational practice stems from Piagetian developmental psychology. While this discourse acknowledges the role an individual plays in constructing his or her knowledge, it fails to take into account the social nature of that knowledge construction. In general, it views students in terms of innate, individualized, and cognitive terms that tend to ignore social and economic factors. Both of these examples, the former, well-known and debated, and the latter, relatively insidious, compose only a small sample of the numerous discourses that affect educational practices. Importantly, they also illustrate that as we begin to understand how discourse functions at both visible and subtle levels, we glimpse the complexity of the language and practices with which we engage. We see that the choices we make are never entirely free of the competing ideologies inherent in discourse. Therefore, when I suggest using stewardship as a framework for pedagogy, I want to be careful about contributing to a myth that constructs pedagogical choices along a continuum of binary oppositions—good/evil, black/white, empowering/disempowering, oppressive/liberating—because the choices are rarely that clear cut. However, I do contend that the paradigm of stewardship can serve as a tool for examining and evaluating the complexities of discourse and
discursive practices so that we and our students might make choices that build just relationships.

In order to perform these decisions with the integrity that stewardship demands, we must be as aware as possible of the implications of these choices. What is at stake in discourse is a variety of ideologies that are engaged in a struggle to give meaning to social institutions as well as to "offer the individual a range of modes of subjectivity" (Weedon 179, 181). In considering the two examples named above, we see how both discourses, the one relying on economic values as well as the one rooted in developmental psychology, seek to represent education and position an individual in specific ways. Through making concerted efforts to bring the subtle struggles for position that occur in discourse out into the open, we are freer to make choices that reflect our values and ethical stances.

The literature classroom in particular provides a useful arena for exploring discourse as contested terrain. Novels, non-fiction, short stories, journals, and all the texts we study can be excellent examples of the ways in which discourse contributes to the construction of subjectivity, politics, social institutions, and so forth. In addition, it may be easier to first identify, for example, how a character is being defined and shaped by the discourse that surrounds him or her before bringing the same lens to our own identities and specific historical and cultural contexts. Once educators and students begin to conceptualize discourse as a site of contested terrain, why examining discourse in the classroom and making a discursive choice is so important becomes more clear—that is, we are choosing a subjectivity, a political interest, a representation of an institution, and so on.

Determining the range of meanings and ideologies at play in any text or in our own world is difficult, as I pointed out earlier, because hegemonic, authoritative discourses present themselves as if they were unitary and monologic; in other words, they construct a
myth that seeks to disguise the plurality of meanings as well as the availability of choice in any given utterance. Refuting this myth is important for teachers and students because, once again, doing so opens the possibilities of becoming stewards of language through the decisions we make. In order to deconstruct this particular myth, I will rely on the work of M.M. Bakhtin concerning the discourse of the novel as he theorizes heteroglossia and dialogism.

Bakhtin writes that "a unitary language is not something given but is always in essence posited—and at every moment of its linguistic life opposed to the realities of heteroglossia" (270). The realities of heteroglossia include the condition of language where at any time or place a set of conditions "will insure that a word uttered in that place and at that time will have a meaning different than it would have under any other conditions" (Bakhtin 428). While authoritative discourses of school, church, and politics present themselves as unitary and monologic (often convincingly), according to Bakhtin, because of heteroglossia, this monologism is a purely theoretical construct. The unitary language seeks to enact ideological unification and centralization but then confronts the realities of dialogized heteroglossia and splinters. Therefore, because social and historical contexts create "a multitude of concrete worlds, a multitude of bounded verbal-ideological and social belief systems," language is never unitary (288).

If heteroglossia and dialogism characterize discourse, then as users of discourse become aware of the multiple ideologies and belief systems at play in language, they face the prospect of having to choose. As Bakhtin words this condition, "Consciousness finds itself inevitably facing the necessity having to choose a language. With each literary-verbal performance, consciousness must actively orient itself amidst heteroglossia, it must move and occupy a position for itself within it, it chooses, in other words, a "language" (295). For instance, one might consider a teacher occupying a conscious position by choosing to resist the highly individualized and scientific discourse of developmental
psychology in favor of social-constructionist language in describing his or her students and classroom learning environment. Ultimately, in these choices we and our students become "vehicles of power," and we share an opportunity to use language in stewardly ways that enrich and restore that which we care about—our communities, our peers, our students, our subject matter, or our relationships.

Jon Klancher's considerations of Bakhtin's rhetoric in the classroom add additional insights into why discourse should be a central concern in a pedagogical theory. Specifically, in choosing a language, students and teachers alike come to realize that the choices we make concerning discourse inherently involve "self," but "self" as situated within the context of social languages. According to Klancher:

He or she can only adopt a language that others already share, making a choice that is at once stylistic and ideological. To be 'social' is not to don a range of masks or impersonate a repertoire of roles, but to declare oneself situated among the existing languages of heteroglossia. This choice means becoming aware of the ideological commitments signified by the various styles that circulate among us. It also means giving up the illusion [. . .] that the reader/writer's 'self' can be defined or held apart from the conflict of social languages that constitute our individually expressed words" (91).

In short, for Bakhtin, having to choose a language refutes the myth of individual autonomy; the speaker realizes that his or her participation in social contexts, in communities, is part of language use. In selecting from the plurality of discourses (not necessarily the same discourse all the time), the individual joins a community of users of that discourse.

In my experiences, one of the more deeply held myths that high school students and first year college students profess involves their "true" selves. Many students write and talk about their "true" selves in terms of fixed, natural, inherent identities without taking into consideration the ways their "true" selves may have been shaped by class, family, race, gender, sexuality, education, friends, and so forth. As Klancher's interpretation of Bakhtin reveals, even choosing a social language illustrates the
untenability of this articulation of the self since we cannot define our selves "apart from the conflict of social languages that constitute our individually expressed words" (Klancher 91, emphasis mine) Using Bakhtin's and Klancher's theories in the context of discursive examination is an important pedagogical tool because they encourage students to initiate a process of reconceptualizing the "self" (both for themselves and for the characters they study) in a way that more accurately encapsulates their historical and social contexts.

Furthermore, this type of examination relates to stewardship because it encourages students and teachers to consider themselves and their language in relation to others and in relation to their contexts. A pedagogy of stewardship values, even relies upon, the realization that our by our choices and actions we participate in social contexts, and, furthermore, that we are also accountable to these communities. Stewardship calls for the interrogation of classroom practices, including discourse, that limit participation in the communities to which the teacher is a steward of authority and the students are members. In the end, the understandings that result can more fully enable those involved to act as conscious Subjects who act with care, responsibility, and ethical judgment in the classroom and in their world. This critical awareness of subjectivity enables individuals to act, to transform their realities into "a new situation, one which makes possible the pursuit of a fuller humanity" (Freire 47). If we want to create a space where choice can be as "free" as possible, we need to be aware of the structures that limit possible choices for ourselves and our students.

For example, one of the structural limitations or classroom practices receiving some attention today is the language of schooling itself. James Paul Gee's work in the field of social linguistics describes how as a result of the increasing ethnic, class, and social diversity in our schools, more and more students struggle with the language of schooling (typically white, middle class) as if it were a foreign tongue. He writes: "Children from
non-mainstream homes often do not get the opportunities to acquire dominant secondary discourses. Thus, when coming to school they cannot practice what they haven't yet got" ("What is Literacy" 57). Gee also contends that there is an ethical dimension to addressing this issue, an ethical dimension that relates to stewardship. He argues that teachers have a responsibility concerning discourses in their classroom to create a place where students can have maximum participation in their communities: "It is the job of the teacher to allow students to grow beyond both the cultural models of their home cultures and those of mainstream culture" (Social Linguistics 89). For Gee there is a moral obligation to make tacit theories or ideologies explicit, and discourse analysis, formal or informal, provides an avenue for this project. In his work, then, we see just one example of the importance of examining discourse for classroom participation.

Gee's argument also reveals how discourse is ultimately connected to power and authority, an observation that brings us back full circle to Foucault's foundational theories that bind discourse, power, and practices. When teachers and students use discourse to reflect upon how the school structure, the textbooks, the curriculum, the classroom, and even themselves are all deeply political and value-laden tools, all involved become aware of the explicit and implicit discourses that are shaping an individual's and a community's development. Cleo Cherryholmes in the conclusion of her book Power and Criticism: Poststructural Investigations in Education articulates beautifully why this process, in the end, is so critical for educators. Her words contribute to a pedagogy of stewardship as they emphasize justice, community, and choice:

These privileged structures [i.e. textbooks, curriculum, classroom], however, can be identified, read, interpreted, criticized, talked and written about, accepted, rejected, modified. If we can be critically pragmatic in the construction, deconstruction, construction [...] of how we live and together build communities using our best visions of what is beautiful, good, and true, then the unreflective reproduction of what we find around us, including some of its injustices, might be tamed and changed a bit (186).
As we begin, in the English discipline, to give scholarly attention to and account for the complexities that teaching involves, we will also constantly construct, deconstruct, and reconstruct our pedagogical theories and practices. Because the relationship between our practices and the discourses that surround us is so close, I contend that any pedagogical theory, and in particular a pedagogy of stewardship, needs to examine the role of discourse and the choices we can make in respect to it. Indeed, literature as an area of study is itself subject to a wide range of discourses that seek to position it from William Bennett's list of cultural artifacts to multiculturalist movements. Perhaps considering the effects of these discourses on the literature we study and how we teach and learn it offers us a place to begin our work of taking a deeper look at literature and pedagogy in our classrooms.

The Theory-Practice Dichotomy: The Theory-Practice Dialectic

**Dichotomy:** 1. Division of a whole into two parts.

**Dialectic:** 2. In modern Philosophy: by Hegel the term is applied (a) to the process of thought by which such contradictions [mutually contradictory characters of the principles of science] are seen to merge themselves in a higher truth that comprehends them; and (b) to the world-process, which, being in his view but the thought process on its objective side, develops similarly by a continuous unification of opposites.

---Oxford English Dictionary

In the introduction to this project I was careful to redefine pedagogy, as Gore does, as a process of knowledge production rather than as merely instruction (68). In the part of this chapter just previous to this section, I described the process of devoting attention to discourse in our classrooms as part of the process of demythicizing education and as central tenet for pedagogical theory. Examining discourse is inherently a process because classroom contexts, social contexts, cultural contexts, and political contexts are always in flux for teachers and students; thus, the focus on discourse as part of the process of knowledge production is ongoing and can never be "finished." Along the same lines,
as certain myths become de-naturalized others arise to take their place. This section examines how educators and their students can consider developing a relationship between theory and practice that emphasizes process and also confronts specific educational myths. Again, as a result of varying social and historical contexts, the interplay of theory and practice is a continually evolving process that also resists, to some degree, finalized codification or prescriptions.

Unfortunately, theory and practice are not often considered together as forming an important component of pedagogy. More frequently, particularly in the university, theory is dealt with entirely separately from daily classroom life. One need only consider a few educational structures to see how deeply ingrained the separation of theory and practice can be. For example, guidelines for theses and dissertations generally recommend separate sections for the discussions of theory and practice (or in the sciences of theory and results). However, a thesis focused on the subject area of literature (such as this one) could be, and perhaps typically are, devoted entirely to theoretical discussions without mentioning pedagogical or practical implications. My own thesis, while trying to challenge the dichotomy these structures construct by considering theory in light of practice and including a section devoted to practice, still follows the pattern of separating one from the other.

Another example of the dichotomy between theory and practice in the academy is exemplified by the large number of classes in a wide range of disciplines taught under the label "Curriculum and Instruction." These classes usually focus on the what and how of teaching without considering the why of teaching. In this case, practice, the what and how, can be prioritized over theory, the why. Unfortunately, many future teachers rely upon these classes for their professional training; therefore, classes like Curriculum and Instruction build an understanding where what occurs in class is most often thought of in
terms of activity or method. This dichotomy limits educational choices and possibilities for both theory and practice.

In fact, theory and practice are not contradictory parts of life in education, although an implicit myth might construct them that way. Rather, theory and practice can be brought together into a kind of synthesis, maybe not always an entirely coherent one, but still a relationship where each influences the other. Indeed, the relationship between intellectual practice and teaching can perhaps best be articulated as dialectical in the sense that theory transforms practice and practice transforms theory as they constantly spiral through mutual transformations. Without this understanding, theory and practice both present obstacles to the educational process--theory as it becomes an end in itself removed from strategies that connect it to social, historical and cultural contexts, and practice as it becomes a routine set of methods. Teaching, at all levels, that uses strategies without theory, or practice that does not have a dialectical relationship with theory, does not contribute to the practice of education but rather more likely contributes to the reproduction of knowledge.

The recognition that a singular focus on theory has the potential to be destructive has been addressed recently by numerous scholars from various fields including feminism, composition, cultural studies, education, Afro-American studies, and post-colonial studies. The arguments include, for example, that the language of theory alienates students, marginalized groups, and the public from the academy: "perhaps we should ask whether theory written in dense, impersonal sentences of unnecessarily complicated syntax, is appropriate for a discipline that claims commitment to extending access to literacy, education, and ideas" (Daniell 136). Feminists worry that the language of theory, a necessary obligation if one wants to gain status in the academy, distances them from their roots in political activity while also requiring them to appropriate Western and masculine ways of knowing and thinking. Others are concerned that the new emphasis on
theory merely replaces a literary canon with a theoretical one and therefore does nothing to actually make theory a "material force" in teaching radical pedagogies (Morton and Zavarzadeh 55). Barbara Christian is concerned with the "race for theory"—how it can silence minority groups, its prescriptive nature, and its dismissal of the political and social contexts of writers who only recently have gained attention in the academy. She writes, "My fear is that when Theory is not rooted in practice, it becomes prescriptive, exclusive, elitish" (2262). Certainly for educators interested in reaching their students, prescription, exclusivity, and elitism are not positive goals as compared to engagement, critical thought, involvement, and agency.

While the allegations leveled at theory are serious, are these criticisms suggesting that we should dismiss theory? No, as I read these arguments, the writers all believe, as I do, that theory has the capacity to ask questions, use language, and imagine possibilities that would not be possible without the work of the theoretical "stars" (Foucault, Derrida, Freud, Lacan, Kristeva, Marx) and "non-stars" alike (a.k.a. those to whom one cannot refer only using the last name). Furthermore, hooks is also careful to note the danger of rejecting theory and the anti-intellectualism that occurs as a result (69-70). Indeed, most of the writers who point out the dangers of theory also attempt to bring theory to their classroom practices in order to combat the negative tendencies the writers themselves outline. In the end, these critics of theory are concerned with taking a step back to ask, "For what purposes and for whose benefit are we employing theory and theoretical language?"

This question is also essential for a pedagogy of stewardship because it implies that our knowledge or education comes with a number of responsibilities—to our students and the communities in which we work to name just two. The world of literature is filled with theory, from feminism to post-structuralism to New Criticism. Calling for attention to pedagogical theory asks that we bring theory to our classrooms not only for the questions
it asks of the text but also for the questions it asks of our classroom practices and interactions with students as texts. Integrating theory into pedagogical practices is also concerned with introducing theory to students so that they also might use it as a tool for their reading practices in order to read both texts and their cultural, social, and historical contexts. If our theory cannot be employed for either of these purposes, perhaps the time has come to re-evaluate its use. I offer a theory-practice dialectic as a means for building these goals, not only for teachers (as is most often argued) but also for students.

Bringing theory into relation with practice, for myself, infuses theory with meaning and purpose that it otherwise might not hold for me. In fact, I came to theory a little later than many in the academy, but perhaps much earlier than most secondary teachers who may not ever find themselves exposed to theory in depth. After teaching for a few years, I felt that I needed a deeper understanding of English as a discipline, so I quit my job and enrolled in a graduate school. I can now testify how my encounters with theory complicate and challenged my ideals, understandings of education, and teaching practices. As I look back, I believe my pedagogical preparation should have included more exposure to theory, at least more than the brief outline of three critical approaches I received in my English Methods class. (I actually dug out my old binder and notes from college to determine if I had had any theoretical background because I certainly did not remember any.) At the time, the half-page summaries on key theoretical terms didn't mean much to me while trying to teach *A Midsummer Night's Dream* to a group of low income, racially diverse students. Now, however, I wonder if a greater theoretical base might have helped me face those ninth grade students in a way that could have made my teaching experience then, and later in my career, more meaningful for my students and for myself by giving me the critical tools I needed to begin constructing a foundation for a pedagogical theory that includes a dialectical relationship between theory and practice and that could grapple with the complex social issues I faced and would face in the future in my classroom.
Theory and practice when considered together first offer educators a beginning place to combat the gendered and hierarchical attitudes towards the "practice" of education. As outlined in the introduction, these attitudes associate teaching with the lesser-valued feminine spheres of work and value "pure" knowledge like theory over "applied" knowledge like education. Theory is important for challenging these attitudes not because it is somewhat more intellectually valued inside the academy, but because theory gives educators the language and tools for articulating the ways in which teaching involves more than "applied" knowledge. The theories that we rely upon to read texts can also be used to read our practices. In this way, applied knowledge, or practice, exists in a relationship of mutual transformation with the so called "pure" knowledge, or theory. In theorizing practice in journals and conferences we will encourage conversations that value not only critical theory but also pedagogical theory, thus revising the myth that teaching is mere practice. Especially at a time when there are increasing pressures on education to meet uniform standards and to produce marketable degrees, literature teachers need to develop pedagogical theories that explain how what we do in our classrooms is not so easily measured by standardized tests and multiple choice exams.

Second, a theory-practice dialectic is important for teachers because it is a means of enriching both. When theory and practice remain dichotomous, there is little likelihood that we can use theory to interrogate practice and use our experiences in the classroom to challenge our theories. Our theoretical work too often belongs to the sphere of scholarly research, writing, and publication while our practical work, or the teaching aspect of our jobs, is limited to the hours spent preparing for class, teaching, and meeting with students. While the structures of education do not encourage them to mingle, if we can begin to consciously bring theory and practice into direct contact with one another, I suggest that we will find both our scholarly theoretical work and our pedagogical work challenged in new ways and enhanced by the relationship.
Indeed, as George Levine suggests, the classroom may be the best place to engage with our theoretical work: "Might it not be that the experience of actually trying out the ideas of 'my work' for undergraduates at any level could tell us something important about what the problems with the ideas might be?" (13). As I outlined in the introduction, both Ellsworth and Gore reconsidered the theory of critical and radical pedagogies after actually putting them into practice in the classroom. They found that although the theories pronounced themselves empowering, their students' experiences and their practice in the classroom revealed that the theories could in fact be oppressive. As a result, they critically re-examined both the theories and their classroom practices. The articles they both published in *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy* encourage others to move beyond the rhetoric of theory—a task that can only be done when we are willing to take a hard and honest look at whether our classroom practices and theories are in accord. In doing so we take ownership, become better stewards, of our theoretical positions and our classroom practices.

Third, a dialectic between theory and practice also fosters reflective thinking. In one of my first classes as a graduate student, Composition Theory and Practice, I recall constantly re-evaluating my own present and past practices in light of the current theoretical approaches I was reading. In doing so, I not only began to "crave" theory for how it challenged my teaching, but I also became more reflective and aware as a teacher of the implications tied to my practices, the texts I choose, and my position in the classroom. Once I began to think about theory and practice in this relationship, it became almost impossible not to read theory without thinking about what it meant for my classroom and equally impossible to teach without theorizing my practice. Teachers often bring to the classroom numerous biases, beliefs, norms, values, and even unconscious theoretical approaches that go unexplored and unarticulated. By examining practice in combination with theory we provide a means for this exploration and develop a habit of
self-conscious and structure-conscious reflection integral for reconsidering potentially detrimental myths. It is also essential for a stewardly pedagogical theory concerned with better understanding student participation, subjectivities, and the impact of the teacher's interests and position in the classroom.

In addition, integrating theory with practice is equally important for our students as it is for ourselves. Yet, ironically, theory itself can limit the development of a relationship between practice and theory. Often, professors are reluctant to introduce complex theoretical language and corresponding theoretical concepts into the undergraduate classroom. For example, how does one begin to explain Baudrillard's "simulacra" or Barthes' "sign, signifier, signified" to a college sophomore, much less a senior in high school? Thus, theory often remains the privileged terrain of graduate programs. While some universities have brought theory into the terrain of the undergraduate class, it largely remains polarized from practice. All too frequently in-depth exposure to theory is delayed until graduate studies, and undergraduates concern themselves largely with texts and reproducing lecture notes because theory is thought to be beyond them.

I admit that much of theoretical language is dense and seems difficult for students, especially undergraduates. However, by connecting theory with meaningful work inside and outside the classroom and putting it into practice with specific texts, it becomes less abstract and more likely to be viewed as a usable tool. Certainly, the instructor might have to do some scaffolding with the language and terms--this occurs even in graduate programs--but I believe undergraduates, in meaningful contexts, can and will engage with theory in constructive ways when it is tied to practice. In my experiences giving first-year composition students exposure to theory (reading brief excerpts along with providing peer and instructor scaffolding), I found that students do in fact use the theory to ask insightful questions about the texts, the conversations, themselves, one another, and their lives.
Finally, constructing the relationship between theory and practice as a dialectic, rather than a dichotomy, is important for pedagogical theory because together they more accurately represent the complexity that characterizes our classrooms, our relationships, our subjectivities, our texts, and our theories. Standing alone, both theory and practice have the potential to over-simplify the variety of factors that contribute to the educational process. Theory, as complex as it might be, is reductive, for instance, when it proclaims a truth that may silence the experience of a person or group (even while challenging the very notion of universal truths). Cornel West describes this problem in responding to Baudrillard's theory of hyperreality, the simulation that has no reference in reality: "There is a reality that one cannot not know. The ragged edges of Real, of Necessity, not being able to eat, not having shelter, not having health care, all this is something that one cannot not know. The black condition acknowledges that" (388). Christian has a similar criticism for feminist theories: "And seldom do feminist theories take into account the complexity of life--that women are of many races and ethnic backgrounds with different histories and cultures and that as a rule women belong to different classes that have different concerns. Seldom do they note these distinctions, because if they did they could not articulate a theory" (2263). For both West and Christian, their own experience, or practice, has given them cause to question the over-simplification that theory, existing only in a theoretical world, might produce.

Practice, when standing alone, also has the capacity for oversimplifying the realities of our classrooms, especially when an instructor does not work to theorize his or her pedagogy. In this case, it is easy to teach literature and writing by means of methods that "work" while failing to engage in questions about why what we are teaching matters for the students in our classroom this particular day and also what the methods we are using implicitly teach our students. In fact, it may be very easy to stay in this "practice bubble" continuing to use what has worked to educate us and what seems to work as we
now teach. However, delivering good lectures, grading papers, and leading engaging discussions about literature is not enough. It is not sufficient because we have the responsibility to interrogate these practices and to consider the complexities of race, class, gender, religion and sexuality that may complicate them. On any given day, our classrooms, texts, and students are filled with a variety of fears, desires, conflicts, hurts, and joys that we will probably never fully appreciate. However, to fail to begin the effort to do so, to deliver the same lecture to different groups of students year after year, is to fail the process of education of which we are stewards.

Hence, the theory-practice dialectic is essential in so much as it helps teachers and students to construct new understandings of knowledge they may already have and to conceive and imagine new knowledge. The ideas that have enriched our thinking and reading are more than theoretical language; they offer to students, in addition to their teachers, the language for mapping and re-envisioning cultural and social practices. Introducing students to this vocabulary provides them with tools for critique and for transformation of the hegemonic structures that constrain their social contexts, including those structures that exist within their education in the university. Students can think critically about the ways in which they might be either accomplices to or victims of the dominant power structures and also about the ways in which they have the capability to transform them.

When practice and theory perform dialectically, we begin to confront the questions that have no utopian answers, our theories unravel, and our practice is problematized...and the same happens for our students. The result is a classroom where pedagogy is a process and where students and teachers together build understandings--not necessarily communal or final understandings--but ways of knowing that begin to address the complexities of each individual's situation. Ellsworth also came to this conclusion as her own experiences with critical pedagogical theory and classroom practices caused her to re-theorize
empowerment and her critical practice. She writes: "A recognition, contrary to all Western ways of knowing and speaking, that all knowings are partial, that there are fundamental things each of us cannot know—a situation alleviated only in part by the pooling of partial, socially constructed knowledges in classrooms—demands a fundamental retheorizing of 'education' and 'pedagogy'" (101-102). In the unruly and messy dialectic of theory and practice, we can at least begin to theorize pedagogy and make meaning of the complexities which surround us.

"What's Love Got to Do with It?: Reconsidering Emotions in the Classroom

"It is not excess of thought but defect of fertile and generous emotion that marks them [Men without chests] out. Their heads are not bigger than the ordinary: it is the atrophy of the chest beneath that makes them seem so."

--C.S. Lewis, The Abolition of Man

"Emotion defies language, and education discursively denies language to emotion. To leap off this precipice into uncharted discursive space is an act of courage."

--Megan Boler, Feeling Power

In addition to traditionally separating theory and practice, and thereby limiting the possibilities of both, education has also explicitly and implicitly created an opposition between emotion and reason. As typically articulated, education develops reason, i.e. critical reasoning skills, and emotion is best left out of the picture as it can "muddy" the rationality that is a sign of clear and careful scholarship. This construction, I argue, is one, like the theory/practice dichotomy, that limits educational potential and limits pedagogical choices in our classrooms. In the following section I develop an argument where attention to emotion comprises a central component of a pedagogical theory by first deconstructing a series of myths that tend to limit the incorporation of emotion in learning and second by articulating how bringing emotion into the classroom creates possibilities for teachers and students, particularly concerning stewardship. In doing so, I am practicing a kind of
examination of discourse and discursive practices that I advocated as an important pedagogical practice in the first section of this chapter.

Feminists concerned with constructing feminist pedagogies have contended that the dichotomy between emotion and reason has had negative effects for educating women. Some feminists argue that the academy in general, and academic discourse in particular, constrains women's ability to express themselves and forces women to think, speak, and write in traditional male and Western ways of knowing. For example, Jane Roland Martin in *Coming of Age in the Academy* argues that academic discourses have estranged women in the academy from each other and from their roots in activist feminism because of its tendency for "aerial distance." These feminist theorists would like to see what they claim as women's language included in the academy. The exclusion of feminine discourses or alternative ways of knowing, they claim, limits the capability of women scholars to be fully humanized in their work and also limits the ability of female students to fully engage in their studies.

These arguments have made much progress in getting educators to reconsider educational discourses and the ways in which they might oppress some students. However, while arguments for alternative discourses have been largely concentrated in feminist camps, they can also serve larger educational goals not limited to gender politics. To limit these discussions about the role of emotion in learning to feminist theories essentially constrains their ability to effectively challenge the structures they criticize. Allow me to use a personal example to illustrate this point. My first exposure of any depth to feminist theorists making the arguments outlined above consisted of reading *Coming of Age in the Academy* by Martin, *Nourishing Words* by Nancy Atwell-Vasey, and *Plain and Ordinary Things* by Deborah Anne Dooley. My initial reaction to these texts was one of extreme skepticism and even annoyance with concepts such as finding the song from "my mother's garden" (Dooley). (Although I did wonder at one point, however,
if I had been so thoroughly brainwashed by academic discourses as to have lost all contact with my feminine voice, at least as it was being described to me.) I realize now that I take issue with the strain of feminist thought that holds emotion and feeling to be particularly the realm of the feminine rather than the realm of the human. The academy does not represses my femininity through language; instead, the emphasis on the rational and objective can repress part of my humanity. In short, the argument to include emotion and feeling, one that I believe in, at first alienated me because it seemed to imply that the inclusion of emotion and discourse of feeling would particularly benefit females. If others have had similar experiences, the effort to include emotion in pedagogy as contained specifically in feminist pedagogies is limited in its ability to serve the needs of the academy.

A pedagogy interested in theorizing a role for emotion in learning needs to address how both men and women suffer from discourses that distance us from life and from the range of emotions that life involves. A pedagogical theory should consider how the prioritizing of objectivism, rationalism, and scientism is not only detrimental for females but for all students. Certainly, it is damaging for female students and scholars because it devalues characteristics traditionally associated with females and thereby devalues females through "guilt by association." Yet, the emphasis on rationality is also detrimental for men because they strive to uphold a model of rationality and objectivity that is also a myth. Importantly, male scholars have also considered feminist theories and have dealt with the effects of prioritizing rationality while degrading emotions. For instance, Victor Seidler writes about how rational discourses have been particularly damaging for men because males often face cultural expectations that limit their ability to express emotions to an even a higher degree than women do. He describes how when men only express themselves through rational language, they cut themselves off from part
of their human identity, that part of their identity that feels life and that can serve to develop deep and meaningful connections with others who similarly have such emotions.

To be clear, I do not want to dismiss feminist theories that seek to name and resist oppressive patriarchal structures and discourses nor to diminish the experiences of that oppression. To do so would be to devalue and ignore the feminist scholarship that has shown how a patriarchal Western culture has erroneously relegated emotion to the female sphere while simultaneously subordinating it to the "male characteristics" of reason and objectivity. Thanks to the effort of these scholars (and their work continues), we might be at a place today where we can begin to re-value sentiment and reconsider emotion not only for females but also for males. Therefore, in this project, I aim to shift the discourse of the role of emotions and feelings from the realm of gender politics to the realm of what it means to humanize one another through education. By doing so, the argument will have more impact for all of those, both men and women, who fill our classrooms.

At this point, it is necessary to define the terminology of emotions more specifically. As I began to develop this position, I had to struggle with decisions over language. Was I talking about erotics, desire, passion, love, feelings, or emotions? Each term obviously carries with it a number of connotations. Initially, terms like "erotics" and "desire" appealed to me because they have a sort of academic currency and theoretical depth. However, it seemed difficult to untangle both erotics and desire from their sexualized connotations. While sexuality is certainly a part of the classroom, other emotions are equally as present. Therefore, these terms seemed to limit my discussion. Love and passion also are specific to a certain type of feeling. In the end, I settled on using "emotions" as a way of including passion, desire, love, erotics, as well as the entire range of other feelings present in a classroom situation such as fear, excitement, anger, and frustration.
Even after settling on terminology, the language of emotion (i.e. that of feeling and sentiment) is difficult to incorporate into the academic discourse that characterizes projects such as these as well as most of what gets published in academic journals. After all, don't we encourage our writing students to avoid "I feel" in their papers because it lessens their authority and credibility? In the academy feelings are not an acceptable form of proof or evidence. Thus, I face the paradox of arguing for more attention to emotion while utilizing a discourse that considers itself above emotion. I do understand, however, the ways in which emotion informs my argument—that my love for teaching, my passion for learning, my desire to better reach my students, my fear of alienating some students, and my frustration with the lack of theoretical discussions of pedagogy in the English discipline all have contributed to my position in relation to this subject matter. It is the understanding of these connections between reason and emotion that I seek to establish in the classroom in order to build a space where talking about emotion undergirds literary discussions of subjectivity, ideology, history, character development, and so on.

Before addressing why these types of discussions create pedagogical possibility in the classroom, it is first necessary to foreground several of the myths that make the exclusion of emotion from the classroom possible. One of most prevalent and deeply ingrained in student consciousness is the myth of the ideal rational person. This ideal rational person, or in students' minds, the ideal student, relies on rationality to develop all the right answers, which are, of course, universally valid. The myth of the ideal rational person encourages students to dismiss their emotions as a source of knowledge; it tells them to rise above their emotions to the realm of reason, and, that once there, they will finally have found the "right" way to answer all the questions in front of them. Unfortunately, teachers themselves can contribute to mythologizing the ideal rational person by over-emphasizing critical reasoning and thinking skills, and by relying on emotions in the classroom merely to get students interested in the topic at hand. While
post-structuralist thought in theory has done much to critique the emphasis on rationality and has worked to develop the understanding of thought as partial, in classroom practice the myth maintains a tight grip on students and teachers serving to, as Barthes says, "abolish the complexity of human acts" by erasing the complications that emotions bring to the picture ("Myth Today" 117).

A second subtle myth limiting a discourse of emotion stems from the construction of the teacher and of education as somehow autonomous and objective. hooks writes on the disappearance of the body in the classroom (in the context of a mind/body binary) noting that, "[t]he erasure of the body encourages us to think that we are listening to neutral, objective facts, facts that are not particular to who is sharing the information" (139). Teacher-standing-behind-podium, or a teacher that appeals solely to rationality, contributes to this myth because students see the teacher as a transmitter of objective knowledge and do not understand the process of learning as one that is transformed by a series of class, gender, race, and sexual filters. In reality, teachers come to the classroom and to their subject matter shaped by their own emotions; they are not, nor can they be, objective in their instruction. hooks also comments on how erasing the body of the instructor hides "the role of the university settings [and secondary schools] as sites for the reproduction of a privileged class of values, of elitism" (140). Most students do not, because of the prevalence of rationalism, think to question the objectivity of the content of their education as something that has also been filtered through time and that can be subject to critique and debate. To be fair, in some college classrooms the content of education is open for debate, but at the secondary level critique along these levels is rarely the norm. However, when we do admit emotion to these contexts, we are forced to consider the variety of interests at play in any given classroom setting.

Finally, the myths surrounding a series of well-known binary oppositions function to promote and prioritize discourses of reason and objectivity that exclude subjectivity and
emotion. One of the most obvious dichotomies in the academy is that of reason versus emotion itself. This construction upholds the two as mutually independent of one another, implying that one can somehow separate reason from emotion and emotion from reason. Thus, we have students who engage in a futile and frustrating quest to be the ideal rational person by denying sentiment. However, as Suzanne Clark argues, the dichotomy between emotion (or the sentimental) and reason is misleading because both participate in the irrational: "This fear of the sentimental, I suggest, is itself a form of sentimentality, a mark of how academic discourse at its most critical is still grounded in a kind of foundationalism—a nostalgia for objectivity" (105). Appeals to reason, therefore, are intimately tied to emotion—to desire and fear to name just two—and the myth behind this binary is made clear.

The fear of the sentimental stems from other traditional binaries, including those of male/female and mind/body. Emotion and sentimentality have traditionally been associated with the less valued members of these pairs—females and the body. The intellectual heritage that distrusts sentimentality and the female body remains subtly entrenched despite the progress made as a result of feminist and post-structuralist critiques. Therefore, in order to bring emotion to the classroom, we must first work at deconstructing the myth that separates emotion from rationality, masculinity, and the mind while simultaneously devaluing it.

Furthermore, the binary that places public against private also contributes to silencing emotion in education. The public/private binary works to create a belief that emotions are private and therefore should not be shared or discussed in the public realm of education. As a result, students and teachers alike continue to suppress emotions in the classroom. However, it is possible to consider emotions as also part of a public realm and to blur the distinctions between private and public. Megan Boler, in her book *Feeling Power*, argues that emotions are a collaboratively constructed terrain and have been both
a site of social control in education and also a mode of resistance to dominant cultural norms. This assertion creates a space for re-examining the presence and absence of emotions in the classroom because Boler moves emotions from their traditionally private designation and resitutes them in the public sphere by outlining how emotions can be used for social control and resistance. This shift from private to public (while not denying that emotion can also be very private) is essential because emotions are so often defined and understood as only private. In order to begin creating a space for them in our pedagogy, we will need to begin theorizing and developing, as Boler does, how we can also deal with emotions as socially constructed and shared. Redefining emotion in this way is also important pedagogically and for stewardship because it creates possibilities for transforming "our cultural values and violent practices of cruelty and injustice, which are often rooted in unspoken 'emotional' investments in unexamined ideological beliefs" (Boler xvi).

The separation of the academy from the popular, in a similar way, fosters a system where what is done at school can be held apart from (and above) the popular culture of everyday life. The binary in this case is dangerous because it leaves the powerful influences of popular culture on ideology and subjectivity unexamined since popular culture may be deemed "lowbrow" and not worthy of study. The polarization of the academy from the popular and the academy's distaste for discourses that invoke emotion also weaken the power of the academy to bring its messages to the public (Clark 106). When the academy ignores the power of the popular or chooses to disdain emotion, unexamined discourses of civic debate and advertising, for example, can hold much more sway than the educative process in our schools.

Therefore, if we would like our pedagogical efforts to reach our students more effectively, it is necessary to begin addressing the ways in which the myths just outlined restrict our ability to include emotions in our classrooms and to begin theorizing how
rescuing emotion from its exile from the academy and resisting the myths surrounding rationality create possibilities for educators. It is to this subject that I now turn.

Rationalism, or at least the constant appeal to reason embedded in the discourse of schooling and even in the discourse of critical pedagogies, assumes that all students can engage in rational argument about the diverse world views, moral understandings, and opinions that they find within and among themselves and within the literature that they read. Ironically, this assumption may in fact serve to silence many of the non-mainstream voices it is supposedly attempting to "empower." Ellsworth notes that even for critical pedagogies, "rational deliberation, reflection, and consideration of all viewpoints has become a vehicle for regulating conflict and the power to speak" (94). The regulation of conflict and the power to speak occurs when there is no space in the classroom for "irrational" reflection or consideration—irrational in the sense of its being driven, at least in part, by emotion. Because a highly charged conflict would seem to evoke irrationality, students and teachers may feel compelled to engage consistently in more "civilized" and "reasonable" argument and leave issues that would elevate the level of emotion in a discussion unaddressed or unspoken. They may also dismiss their own initial and personal responses to a text or a classroom conversation because that response does not, in their minds, meet the abstract criteria for rationality. Therefore, much of what contributes to their voice is suppressed.

Creating a space for emotionally-charged discussion may at least release some students from a narrow focus on rationality that can silence them. To be clear, I do not mean to demonize reason but rather to suggest that by polarizing it from emotion and excluding emotion, we risk shutting down some of the very students we most want to reach with our teaching. As Ellsworth later insightfully concludes, "As long as the literature on critical pedagogy fails to come to grips with issues of trust, risk, and the operations of fear and desire around such issues of identity and politics in the classroom,
their rationalistic tools will continue to fail to loosen deep-seated, self-interested investments in unjust relations of, for example, gender, ethnicity, and sexual orientation" (105). Ignoring emotions, as Ellsworth argues, prevents us from meeting our pedagogical goals. Perhaps devoting our scholarly attention to emotions may offer those interested in critical pedagogies, and particularly a pedagogy that embodies stewardship, a powerful means of addressing issues of injustice and exclusion.

Victor Seidler also describes how rationality silences. While his argument describes the damage done by men because of the pressures they face to be rational, its critiques can also can be applied to the academy and education because similar pressure exists in these locations:

Often we use reason to define "what would be best in the situation," and so get others to agree. In this way we often assume to take the interests of others into account without really giving others a chance to identify and define their own interests. It is in the name of reason that we often, as middle-class men, silence others at the same time as giving them no chance of getting back at us. Often this remains a potent source of power, as we can in all honesty present ourselves as working out the most 'rational' way of doing things. Our rationality is often a hidden weapon, since it allows us to assimilate and control the interests of others. It also puts us beyond reproach. (634-635)

Seidler is astute here in warning men of the possible oppressive nature of the ubiquitous appeal to reason, and although he doesn't do so, his warning might also extend to educators, even critical educators. To heed his critique we would examine theories, discourses, classroom methods, and pedagogy for potential places where appeals to rationality dominate and restrain student response. Stewards are interested in encouraging students to share power in their own learning, education, and reading practices, not restraining or dominating them in these tasks. Indeed, performing this examination is not optional for a pedagogy of stewardship because of its responsibility to
students and to various communities to care for resources we are entrusted with, including students and their emotions.

Rationality is not necessarily oppressive, nor do I contend that it has no place in our classrooms. Rather, I take issue with how prioritizing reason tends to limit emotion in higher levels of education because students and teachers "learn to automatically discount our individual emotions and feelings as having no part of our 'true rational self'" (Seidler 634). This "true rational self" is one of the greatest myths that permeate student consciousness; and upholding it through our pedagogical practices, rather than resisting it, distances students from their education and, ultimately, from themselves and others. Denying the prevalence of emotion in our classrooms creates a simulated world, where students think and act in abstraction from the desires, fears, and hopes of their "real" lives.

Indeed, because the classroom situation is so inherently fraught with emotion, we can no longer afford to ignore it. While we may act as if our classrooms are safe places for dialogue and discussion, in practice most of us might admit that at times we are disappointed because we do not hear often enough what we ideally imagine as meaningful dialogue surrounding literature, subjectivities, identity, and world views. Some of the reasons for this silence can be traced back to a whole range of emotions that are present in the class, yet left unstated. To name only a few, these include: resentment towards the instructor, the class, the subject matter, the institution, and other students; fear of being misunderstood; confusion and self-consciousness; and, guilt for being a member of the group, class, sex, and/or race named as oppressive or inferior in the texts or discussions. (Note that this range of emotions has only to do with the immediate classroom context, and, in addition, students are filled with other emotions related to contexts outside of the classroom.) In "exposing" these and other emotions, we reveal that we are partial and situated. From this starting point we have a better chance of engaging students in the type of dialogue that brings subjectivities and worldviews, for example, to the forefront in
relation to the literature that we are reading—a dialogue with more integrity and less abstraction from the lived emotional lives that are always with us.

One of the difficulties of refuting the reason/emotion dichotomy is developing pedagogical strategies that deal with emotion as more than mere expressionism or sharing of experiences. Both of these tendencies do not make the best use of emotion's pedagogical possibility because they construct situations where students do little more than share their emotions with one another, nod and smile, and move on to the next personal expression. Emotion, like personal experience, may be difficult to discuss because one cannot challenge a person's emotional response. After all, what else can we say except "thanks for sharing"?

Importantly, expression of this type most likely occurs in our classrooms because we have not seriously thought, written, and talked about other ways of dealing with emotion, including considering their private and their public aspects. Therefore, I suggest using expression and sharing to initiate a dialogue that begins to reveal what is at stake for whom in the texts we read and in our responses to them. Dialogue about private and public emotions can also help us to uncover and talk about how our knowings are limited and partial and where we are situated.

Boler believes, for example, that "we can develop strategies that don't assume experience as authoritative or inherently 'real' or 'true'; we can introduce analytical approaches that frame emotional experience as a 'window' into ideology" (123). In this statement Boler does not oppose analytical thinking (reason) with emotion, rather she sets them up as tools that together produce a learning situation with more potential for both. She also shifts the emphasis from individual experience to ideology, a shift that creates a space for examining emotions as socially influenced and shared. Too often we expect students to discuss ideologies at a level of rationality that fails to delve into their more deeply held values and beliefs. Emotional experiences, however, as Boler notes, do
provide considerable insight into these values and beliefs, for we react most strongly, with most emotion, when our most sacred beliefs are at stake. This is not to suggest we exploit students' volatile emotions in our classrooms, but that we begin acknowledging and exploring them, as Boler suggests, as a "medium, a space in which differences and ethics are communicated, negotiated, and shaped" (21).

Just as emotional experiences create possibility in the classroom by becoming a "window into ideology," they also generate learning possibilities by revealing gaps between theory and practice for both teachers and students. While theory typically relies heavily on rationality, practice may more often be informed by emotion. We may find it relatively easy to distance ourselves in theoretical discussions from our emotional lives, but this is more difficult to achieve with practice.

I experienced this phenomenon recently in a graduate seminar that centered on issues of authorship and collaboration. After reading Barthes' "The Death of the Author" and Foucault's "What Is an Author?" as well as other texts that gave theoretical framework to the questions at hand,10 most students argued to some degree that for the English discipline it was no longer relevant or useful to talk about the model of the Author in terms of a singular and original genius, at least in theory. However, the discussions after reading Angle of Repose, by Wallace Stegner, and A Victorian Gentlewoman In the Far West: The Reminiscences of Mary Hallock Foote, edited by Rodman W. Paul, revealed significantly different reading practices for several students. The controversy surrounding these texts provided a clear illustration of how emotional investments tied to practice do not always align with theoretical stances. At issue was whether Stegner borrowed and used literary license with Foote's journals and letters or outright plagiarized a novel (for which he won the Pulitzer Prize) and in the process defamed and distorted the real-life historical figure of Mary Hallock Foote. The class discussions on this debate were heated and emotion-ridden as several students expressed feelings of hurt, anger, distrust,
rage and betrayal in response to Stegner's writing and feelings of sympathy, support, and injustice for Foote and her ancestors. These emotional responses are revealing because they stem from a model of authorship that views Stegner as Author, as original genius. His deviation from that model, one that most students theoretically rejected, prompted the strong emotional responses in class. In examining these emotions, then, we have a wonderful pedagogical moment for discovering the space between our theoretical positions and reading practices. The gap between the two can provide insight into what is at stake for students as they read texts and articulate their theoretical stances.

While I was a member of the seminar just discussed, my description of the incident bears the tones of a rational observer as I explain my peers' reactions using "aerial distance." In some ways I did, in fact, have a less emotional reaction because I had been researching the relationship between Stegner and Foote's ancestors for part of a presentation on the two texts and thus had more information than many of my peers did on the controversy. Many of their emotional reactions were not issues for me because I had additional insights that explained some of Stegner's actions. Yet, throughout the class discussion my emotions were engaged, primarily in a response of frustration—and this too is revealing. I was frustrated with the interpretations of my peers that I believed were theoretically inconsistent and even immature. Positioned in some ways as an instructor, at least in terms of knowledge of the issue, my emotions reveal to me that my own pedagogical theory and practices are not entirely consistent. While I might theoretically espouse a student's right to interpret a text and to respond to the text outside of authorial intent, my frustration with students who did so reveals that in practice I may still be unwilling to release control of my "more informed" readings. Thus, bringing these emotion-based responses to the forefront can help both teacher and student to consider with more clarity what is at stake for them in particular theoretical stances, readings, and discussions.
Furthermore, classrooms that avoid or ignore emotional undertones do students an injustice by constructing misleading contexts where decisions can supposedly be reached beyond the auspices of emotion rather than creating a place where reason and emotion together inform discussion and decision making. Louise Rosenblatt, well-known for her articulation of Reader-Response criticism, also recognized the pedagogical importance of emotion and of including it, along with reason, in a literature classroom. She argues that rational thinking alone is not particularly useful in the classroom because "it lacks that conflicting impulses or emotional perplexities out of which thinking usually grows in real life" (216). Discussions involving emotion are important, among other reasons, because students live "through something analogous to the inner conflict that must often attend choice in life" (219). The emotional seminar discussion centering on Stegner and Foote illustrated this point, as students put themselves in the place of Foote's relatives or in the place of Stegner and experienced the inner-conflicts that identifying with either side involved.

Unfortunately, too often we subscribe to the assumption that emotional responses can not serve academic purposes and that the intellectual is not emotional. Yet hooks asks a pointed question that challenges this notion: "If we are all emotionally shut down, how can there be any excitement about ideas?" (155). The excitement about ideas does exist for most of us; it just may remain unnecessarily muted. For example, most of us who are devoted to literature talk enthusiastically about our favorite books in intensely personal and feeling-ridden terms. Perhaps the characters, the plot, or the language connected to an emotional need or desire in us, or perhaps we identified with the feelings of a character. Whatever the case, these books, characters, and their stories became deeply important to us—even having the power to change how we live our lives. Thus, reading literature can be an intensely emotional experience—an experience we can get excited about—and these emotions can become an important part of our pedagogical theories. Emotional responses
can and will serve academic purposes when we can use them to engage students with the subject matter and issues at hand, when as teachers we communicate through our own emotional responses to literature that we too are excited about ideas, learning, and participating in the educative process.

Marshall Gregory also addresses the importance of teacherly emotions:

If the teacher exhibits an ethos of passion, commitment, deep interest, involvement, honesty, curiosity, excitement, and so on, then what students are moved to imitate is not the skill or the idea directly, but the passion, commitment, excitement, and interest that clearly vivifies the life of the teacher. Everyone—we teachers included—loves imitating an ethos that says, "I love knowing this stuff about opera or calculus or chemistry." Such enthusiasm justifies our efforts as learners because we, too, want to know things that will make us love our lives more. Then, at that point, and only at that point—when we are moved as students to want what the teacher has and is as a person—do we as students begin to place high value on the skill or the idea that the teacher is trying to teach us.

While I would contend that a teacher's passion engages students in ways beyond the mere imitation that Gregory suggests, this passage makes an important point regarding how teachers' emotions are important because they can be infectious and can motivate student learning. He is also astute in writing about knowing things that "make us love our lives more," rightly noting that a teacher's passion inspires students not only in the classroom but also in their lives outside the school building.

It is also important to recognize the importance of encouraging students to show and express emotion because in doing so they become less detached from the subject matter at hand. When students consistently attempt to express only their "rational side," they more easily reduce their involvement with literature to their minds, leaving their emotions out of the discussion. Reading with only our minds limits the educational potential of literature and, more generally, the power of literature to affect us for life beyond the classroom.
Furthermore, we may also consider the potential of emotion as an alternate source of knowledge for students and teachers. The emphasis on rationality in education most often implicitly suggests that one can separate emotion from reason and then use reason for a better "academic" response. The result is a dichotomy between emotion and reason where each functions separately from the other. However, we might consider how emotion and reason continuously influence one another and that our responses may be most often composed of both reason and emotion. Acknowledging and bringing affectional interests to the forefront along with reason becomes an alternate source of knowledge because they reveal, for example, that reason is not always as objective and impartial as it appears. We then can begin to discuss knowledge under a different set of assumptions that focus on how people (characters, students, teachers) view themselves, their social and historical contexts, and their understandings of the past and the future.

Boler, in her study of emotion in education, notes that there is little work in education that examines the role of emotion, especially in relation to power. She begins a study to address this need in her book *Feeling Power*, a title that, as she explains it, works two ways to suggest why feelings are important sources of knowledge for educators: "Feeling power refers to the ways in which our emotions, which reflect our complex identities situated within social hierarchies, 'embody' and 'act out' relations of power. Feeling power on the other hand also refers to the power of feeling—a power largely untapped in Western cultures in which we learn to fear and control emotions" (3-4). Our classrooms are the place to unlearn this fear of emotion and to stop trying to control emotions. Our pedagogical work is the space to begin exploring the power of emotions for learning.

For me, one of the most compelling powers of feeling is its capability to build connections between students and texts, between students and theories, between students and their classmates, between students and teachers, and even between students and their
understandings of themselves. One of Seidler's most penetrating critiques about rationality and masculinity is that it destroys a sense of connection with others (637). Because reason tends to observe the world from a distance, it impersonalizes and objectifies the world and others in the world. Seidler comments, "In a very real sense, as men, we are fundamentally estranged from this world we can only observe from a distance. [. . .] We become historically obsessed with the truthfulness of our perceptions of a world that is estranged and distant. We are systematically estranged from a world we can only 'observe'" (633). When emotion is brought to the surface, however, it becomes much harder to maintain the pretense of objectivity and distance. We are, in some way, forced to deal with our partialities and personal investments (as, for instance, in the case of the graduate class on authorship). If we can create a space where we deal with emotion with honesty, respect, and integrity, we may build and strengthen connections between one another as emotional human beings, rather than viewing one another as disembodied minds. Furthermore, these types of connections are integral for developing a pedagogy of stewardship because they lead to caring, responsibility and a search for justice in relationships.

The Brazilian educator Paulo Freire recognized and made explicit how emotion, particularly love, is essential for building connections, or as he described it, for dialogue. Indeed, for a reader accustomed to academic discourse, especially of the post-modern, post-structuralist schools, the language of Pedagogy of the Oppressed stands out because of its humanistic overtones and references to concepts such as love and hope. Freire's text, while critiqued at times for a male bias, shows no inclination for the aerial distance Martin describes since its premise involves dialogue based on love between the oppressed and those who aim to help the oppressed, as well as between the oppressed and their oppressors. The work is grounded in a language that affirms the intellectual and the emotional dimensions of what it means to be human. In this way, the text paves the way
for later theories that wish to incorporate emotions into pedagogy and challenge the dominant rational and objective discourses that characterize the academy. Freire's text develops a pedagogical theory that touches on what it means to be human and live with love and hope in relationships with others. Thus, his work also offers possibility for how a pedagogy of feeling and emotion can be useful for educational practices.

At this point, after detailing what emotion can do for the classroom, it is also important to briefly discuss possible dangers or problems that might arise with this theoretical position. To be certain, "real" conflict is more likely when emotions are in the open; and by suggesting that emotion builds connections, I don't mean to suggest that connection and agreement are synonymous. Rather, I contend that even conflict of this type, when it occurs in an environment of respect, can build connections because, at the very least, we can recognize in one another similar human emotions and can come to know one another better by exploring together the specific situations that give rise to our various emotions. If we can first get students to express their emotions, such as righteous indignation, and then help another student to recognize that feeling in the first student, we may, for example, prompt the second student to explore the motivations for that particular emotion. In doing so, he or she desires to know and understand the first student's life and context better. This very act strengthens connections between the students.

Perhaps the most prevalent barrier is students' own resistance to this type of pedagogy; emotions will initially be uncomfortable for students to discuss because they have learned the lesson well of reason and rationality. Students have bought into the myth that education is, or should be, neutral and objective; suddenly introducing a pedagogy that emphasizes the ways that it is not may meet with some resistance. In addition, as hooks has found, some students fear love as a legitimate emotion in the classroom because they see love as an exclusive emotion instead of an inclusive one. Their fear is that they
may somehow be left out of being loved, so they resist the idea altogether (198).
Especially if students are working under the myth that education is neutral and objective, introducing an emotion like love seems to through the classroom terribly out of balance. In addition, students understandably fear exposing vulnerability and losing control, or at least seeming to be out of control, which is culturally associated with expression of emotion. These student fears, like other emotions, can no longer remain unmentioned and under the surface where they have the potential to disrupt our pedagogical efforts; we must begin to address them in our classrooms and to develop our classrooms as spaces where emotions can be used and understood as an important part of the learning process rather than as something to be ashamed of and kept hidden.

Because of the vulnerability that this pedagogical emphasis inherently asks of students and teachers, instructors have to be particularly cautious about the ways in which they handle feelings in their classrooms. We must be wary of "imposing emotional rules or prescriptions, stemming either from particular values embedded in the curricula or the teacher's own arbitrary emotional values" (Boler 81). In order for the teacher to avoid imposing his or her own emotional values and in order to handle student vulnerability, he or she needs to be very aware of and be continuously working with his or her own emotional life. To be blunt, an instructor who is emotionally troubled himself or herself can mishandle this pedagogical emphasis and the power of the emotional situations. Nor are teachers or fellow classmates trained as counselors; thus, we should caution against bringing emotion into the classroom context as a form of therapy.

Yet even an emotionally-aware teacher faces other potential dangers. Bringing feeling fully into the classroom changes the traditional educational understanding of Authority—that is, objective, rational, impartial, and untouchable. Challenging these characteristics can confuse students who are accustomed to and comfortable with teacher as Authority and may result in a few students resisting the pedagogical theory and/or
resisting the instructor's institutional authority which includes classroom management and evaluation.

Finally, at the beginning of this section I was careful to define emotions as including the whole range of emotions associated with classroom activities, including erotics and desire. Yet, I must also acknowledge their particular relation to this topic although there is insufficient time to discuss the issues surrounding desire and erotics in the classroom in depth.11 Too frequently we read about teacher-student relationships in which passion and desire have traversed the boundaries of propriety into sexual relationships. Perhaps more frequently, both students and teachers struggle with thoughts and impulses that may cross boundaries, although neither may actually act on these thoughts. Does advocating a pedagogy that uncovers the tangled complexities of passion, fear, desire, and vulnerability risk encouraging these tendencies? Not necessarily. Perhaps these impulses are more destructive because they are never talked about. Rebecca Pope suggests that "one way to recognize and 'control' desire is to teach about it, to teach students that literature is all about desire, to teach students about the kinds of desire that [. . . ] have been purged from literature and falsified in history. [. . .] Students need teachers who know and are unafraid of their own desire and who can thus respond to students' desire with sensitivity and care" (47-48).

Naming the risks, as Pope writes, may be our best chance in minimizing them, for they cannot be completely erased. However, the issues and complexities surrounding emotion in the classroom can no longer be left out of pedagogical theorizing or remain solely in the realm of feminist arguments. Stewardship is not only based upon deeply held values and emotions but also entails a care and concern for restoring and maintaining justice and right relationships. The myths that proliferate in respect to emotion in education distort relationships between students and teachers, between students themselves, and between students and texts. As stewards of education, we can bring
emotion out of its exile and use it to restore and to uphold our responsibilities to those we teach, to the communities in which we teach, to our curricula, and to ourselves.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, let us return to the ideas of myth that Barthes develops and that were mentioned at the start of this chapter. Barthes also writes, "myth is constituted by the loss of the historical quality of things; in it things lose the memory that they once were made. [...] it has turned reality inside out, it has emptied it of history and filled it with nature, it has removed from things their human meaning so as to make them signify a human insignificance" (117). I have suggested in this chapter that discourse, theory and emotion have in some sense all been emptied of "their human meaning" in part as a result of the myths that surround them. Furthermore, in our own classrooms and pedagogical theories we have the power to de-mythicize and de-naturalize education and invest it with the memory of its making.

Participating in this process has pedagogical possibility because teachers and students become "vehicles of power" who take more participatory roles in their learning, develop stronger connections between each other, confront the complexities of theory and experience, and increase awareness of the consequences of discourse and discursive practices. The ideas brought out through the discussion of discourse, theory, and emotion are important for a pedagogy of stewardship because they resist myths that are embedded in discourses that prioritize theory over practice and reason over emotion. These myths construct a model of learning and authority that evade questions of ethics and responsibility in pedagogy. On the other hand, dismantling the myths reveals the emotional complexity, the multiple levels of responsibility, and the partial nature of classroom contexts. In dealing with these issues, the teacher and students both can better
focus on a question lying at the heart of stewardly education, phrased by Gore as "what can we [educators] do for you [students]?" (61).
CHAPTER 3

A PEDAGOGY OF STEWARDSHIP WITH MACBETH AND FOOLS CROW

Theory Meets Practice

Stewardship, by its very nature, does not exist solely in the realm of the theoretical. When a person embraces the values of stewardship, those values are performative. For example, someone who adheres to environmental stewardship will most likely recycle, buy products that are eco-friendly, drive a car that gets good gas mileage, and financially support organizations that also aim to preserve the earth's resources. The definition of "steward" given by the Oxford English Dictionary in the introduction to this thesis contains several action verbs: control, supervise, direct, and regulate. Thus, if I were to end my project after a lengthy discussion outlining the theoretical principles involved in applying stewardship to pedagogy, I would fail to uphold one of the core values of stewardship: the necessity of theory spurring action. I would produce a project similar to some of those that I criticized since several of my primary criticisms of critical pedagogies and the academy in general centered on their failure to engage meaningfully with practice and with the action of teaching. Additionally, I am obligated to develop a section on my theory in practice because throughout this project I have been working to re-value practice, to argue that it is sufficiently complex for our scholarly attention. Finally, because one of my pedagogical principles calls for developing a dialectical relationship between theory and practice, I could not complete this project without exploring the dialectic in my own theory and practice.

In this chapter, then, I will engage two texts, Macbeth and Fools Crow, with the theoretical principles outlined in the previous chapter. Ideally, I would be discussing this
theory-practice interaction after having taught the texts in a literature classroom using the principles of stewardship. If this were the case, I would be able to consider not only how the theory influenced my teaching of the works, but also how teaching both books caused me to reconsider and reformulate my theoretical approaches. In this way, I would most fully be performing the interplay between theory and practice that I advocated in the previous chapter. Unfortunately, the practical limitations of time and situation (including a system where theses and dissertations are written in virtual isolation from the practices of the classroom in the final semesters of graduate school) do not allow me these performative benefits, and I willingly acknowledge this limitation. The most I can do is to imagine the classroom in which this literature would be taught and to use my previous teaching experience to create hypothetical student responses and reactions to the texts and theories.

However, while limited to some degree, imagining this pedagogy in practice is still an important first step. Teachers who initially imagine or predict student response to their pedagogical theories can, after enacting them, compare those predications with actual classroom experiences and use that comparison to reconsider and reconstruct both their pedagogical practice and theory. In this spirit I contend this chapter, despite its hypothetical nature, is an essential part of a pedagogy of stewardship. Although in practice, the attention to discourse, theory, and emotion inform one another and are not presented in isolation from one other, for the purposes of organization and exemplification, I find it useful to maintain the divisions set up in the previous chapter between the three foci.

In developing this chapter, I chose to use two texts from opposite ends of the canonical spectrum. Macbeth embodies the traditional canon; the play is taught frequently in both secondary schools and at the university level. Fools Crow, on the other hand, often categorized under the growing genre of Native American Literature, may be
considered representative of the "revised canon" that includes more works from minority cultures and fewer of the "great, white male" authors. While I do not have the space to delve into the canon debates at this point, I do want to make clear that I intentionally selected these texts because they may be considered representational of different impulses within the English curriculum. I wanted to illustrate that developing pedagogical theory allows us to teach in ways that support our educational goals regardless of the texts that make up the curriculum. While in some cases teachers themselves do not have complete freedom to structure curriculum, we do have freedom to structure and practice our pedagogical theory.

Discourse

One of the first considerations in bringing attention to discourse within specific texts and classroom contexts involves looking carefully at the ways in which the discourses about the texts and the discourses surrounding the texts shape discursive practices. This examination unmasks many of the subtle ideologies struggling for power in education, in curriculum, and in schools. By more clearly understanding the values at stake in the conversations surrounding the texts we teach, we will be able to make more informed choices about the discourses that we choose to use in teaching those texts. In the end, teacher-stewards are responsible to their students for the choices that they make and have the responsibility to make choices that create possibilities for students to also make informed choices.

Certainly, in regard to *Macbeth* and Shakespeare's works in general, there exists a whole range of spoken and unspoken assumptions. Possibly one of the most damaging is the assumption that "getting" Shakespeare requires special training and/or talent and that most students will never "get it" without the help of their teachers. This discourse can be reinforced by the practices of teachers and students alike. Seemingly innocent acts like
explaining to students what Shakespeare meant in a certain passage, paraphrasing the text for students, or providing extensive contextual, historical, and social background information can send the message that a teacher has the special training required for "really" getting Shakespeare. Also, for example, the common practice of giving reading quizzes, often a necessary motivation for holding students accountable to their assigned readings, subtly suggests that the teacher has found the important passages and information in the text. Thus, students who do not do well, at least for those that have done the assigned reading, have "failed" in their reading to identify what really matters for the text. While none of these teaching strategies used with Shakespeare are inherently negative, considered as a set of discursive practices they can imply that Shakespeare's works are elite and that students must rely on a teacher's interpretation in order to really engage with a text. A situation such as this also implies that in "good" literature the one "true" or "real" interpretation (usually given by the teacher) uncovers what the author really meant and that discovering this interpretation is the end of reading the text itself. Certainly, not many teachers desire to give such a message; however, the discourse and practices we use may be doing so.

When dealing with texts like *Macbeth*, being conscious of the discourse and discursive practices that construct the text as untouchable can help teachers to develop strategies that resist this classification. For example, a teacher might assign groups of students to research pertinent historical or social background information and then present that information to the class. In this way, the students become the fellow experts on particular issues, rather than viewing the teacher as authority on all topics. Another useful strategy might be for the teacher to explicitly resist students' imploring to interpret passages and instead to re-direct the questions back to the class. Then, in groups or as individuals, students working together could struggle to determine the meaning by themselves. While this might seem laborious, I suggest it would foster confidence in
students in their own reading abilities and in their own interpretations. Developing this confidence, especially for the texts that have the reputation of being elite, meets the goals of stewardship because as students develop confidence they become more willing participants in their own education and in their communities.

The discourse surrounding *Fools Crow* as a text reveals additional reasons why exploring discourses about or surrounding texts creates learning possibilities. As I mentioned, the novel is often classified in the growing literary group called Native American Literature, or, at the very least, it may fall into the category of multi-cultural literature. Exploring the discourse surrounding these categories alone may be instructive for teachers and students. For example, how does placing a novel like *Fools Crow* in these categories shape a reader's expectations and the reception of the book? Do we have different expectations for multi-cultural literature? What characterizes the discourse surrounding multi-cultural literature and what values and ideologies may be at play in this discourse? Questions like these reveal how our reading practices are shaped by the discourses surrounding texts as much as they are shaped by the experience of actually reading the text itself.

The recent introduction of *Fools Crow* into the curriculum of several high schools in Montana exemplifies another discourse surrounding the text that deserves careful attention. The novel faced challenges in two separate school districts because of scenes involving graphic sex and violence. Those who wished to see the book removed from the required reading lists argued that it "has too much graphic sex and violence for a young audience" and "might incite students to violence," and suggested that "we need to focus on things that are decent and good and uplifting" (Schontzler 9). On the other side of the debate, teachers and supporters contend that the characters "suffer terrible consequences for immoral acts" and that the novel "dispels some old myths [regarding Native Americans]" and gives students an "understanding of the world through non-white
eyes" (Schontzler 9). Because the controversy centers on issues of censorship, curriculum, and values, it provides a useful example for illustrating how examining discourse can become part of teaching literature.

By foregrounding the issues involved in the debate as well as by closely looking at what lies behind the language used by both sides, teachers can readily discuss with students the values, assumptions, and world views at stake in education, in the English classroom, and in literature. For example, teachers and students could consider the following quotation from a conservative businessman who identifies what is at stake for the controversy. He decides the issue is whether public schools "have the courage to set fundamental standards of decency" (Schontzler 9). In discussing the values behind this statement, students can begin to identify and understand the ways in which education is a site of contested terrain and is not politically neutral or objective. They can determine how a variety of ideologies struggle to imbue both education and the English curriculum with meaning as social institutions. Becoming more aware of the subtle and not-so-subtle struggles for the power to give meaning and direction to the English curriculum is necessary in a pedagogy of stewardship because it helps teachers and students become aware of the forces that shape education. By increasing awareness, we create the possibility that students can make choices and act on those choices according to their own values and beliefs. Thus, as informed participants, students can take action in their communities and in their own education as the "vehicles of power" that Foucault describes.

However, not only the discourses surrounding texts in the classroom deserve attention. Considering the discourse within the texts we read is also part of this pedagogical theory. As I discussed earlier, literature provides a wonderful opportunity for students to explore how characters are defined and shaped by particular discourses. This
focus is important not only for the way it enriches their reading of texts but also because later they may begin to consider similar questions for themselves.

For example, in order to frame the discussion of discourse within a text, a teacher may choose to incorporate some of Bakhtin's theories of social heteroglossia in the novel as a theoretical framework for student exploration of this topic. As I explained in the previous chapter, Bakhtin posits that social speech in a novel is characterized by diversity, that it cannot escape the dialogism of language, and that unity of language and style is "opposed to the realities of heteroglossia" (270). (Note that in using theory to initiate the practice of discourse analysis, the pedagogical principles of discourse and theory inform one another and overlap, as they ideally should in practice.)

Consider a few examples of how examining discourse through Bakhtin's theoretical lens might work in the play Macbeth. Steven Mullaney writes, "Language behaves strangely and impulsively in the play, as if with a will of its own. At times Macbeth seems to stride the blast of his own tongue, not so much speaking as he is spoken by his words and their insistent associations" (69). His analysis here follows Bakhtin's theory that language is never unitary, and that a novel, or in this case a play, is characterized by the "movement of the theme through different languages and speech types, its dispersion into the rivulets and droplets of social heteroglossia, its dialogization" (263). In drama, dialogism is given an added dimension as audience members interact differently with the meanings of spoken dialogue in the context of the action on the stage than the other characters on stage do. One might consider, for instance, Macbeth's comments following the "discovery" that Duncan has been murdered in Act II:

Had I but died an hour before this chance,
I had lived a blessed time; for from this instant
There's nothing serious in mortality.
All is but toys. Renown and grace is dead.
The wine of life is drawn, and the mere lees
Is left this vault to brag of (2.3.107-112).
The other characters most likely interpret his comments as referring to Duncan; an audience member may also read them as applying to Macbeth himself, especially considering the famous lines he professes later in Act V:

```
Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player
That struts and frets his hour upon the stage
And then is heard no more. It is a tale
Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,
Signifying nothing" (5.2.27-31).
```

Thus, in this specific teaching situation, bringing Bakhtin's theories about discourse to the character's dialogue can lead students to more complex readings of the play.

Students might also study how Macbeth's discourse swings wildly throughout the play, from patriotic duty to paranoid delusions to bragging over-confidence. Exploring these and other discourses coming from Macbeth and other characters and the discourses' impact on the characters and the action of the play develops interpretations that are not reliant on a teacher's "translation" or on footnotes, cliffnotes, summaries, and so on. An additional discourse that pervades the play involves the supernatural. While exemplified primarily through the Weird Sisters, it is evident in other scenes as well (e.g. the appearance of Banquo's ghost and a conversation about the upheaval of the natural world in Act II, Scene 3). Students can trace the appearance of this discourse throughout the play, charting the scenes where it manifests itself both explicitly and implicitly and determining how the supernatural affects the action of the play and the characters themselves. The scenes where the Weird Sisters predict Macbeth's future may also be particularly useful for exploring Bakhtin's ideas of heteroglossia because the conditions of the particular time and place within the action of the play illustrate how context affects the meaning of the utterances of the witches. Tracing a discourse in these ways, then, not only builds reading skills but also can lead to learning to read for the appearance of any number
of discourses as they appear throughout literature and students' own social and historical contexts.

James Welch's *Fools Crow* also presents literature teachers with a text where discourse figures centrally. In fact, one of the aspects of the novel that has received much acclaim is the discourse itself. From the beginning pages of the first chapter through the final scenes, the text performs in such a way as to displace and marginalize a post-colonial reader. As Andrea Opitz remarks, "One is forced to question one's position in the world, the way in which one understands oneself in the world" (126). Both the language and syntax reflect the worldview of the Blackfeet Indians in the 1870s when they were in contact with increasing numbers of white settlers. As a result, the text changes how the reader perceives reality because it immerses the reader into the Blackfeet world, language, and vision of reality. For example, in the first chapter, a reader's sense of place is shaken as he or she attempts to make sense of names that define the world of Fools Crow (here called White Man's Dog):

White Man's Dog raised his eyes to the west and followed the Backbone of the World from south to north until he could pick out Chief Mountain. [. . .] White Man's Dog watched Seven Persons rise into the night sky above Chief Mountain. Above, the Star-that-stands-still waited for the others to gather around him. White Man's Dog felt Cold Maker's breath in his face, but it looked as though he would keep the clouds in Always Winter Land tonight (3-5).

The re-naming (or the return to the original names) of familiar objects, places, and animals, along with the Native American myths and sacred stories interspersed throughout the novel, force the reader to the margins of the text. Admittedly, at first this makes the novel difficult to read because the audience feels some discomfort and sense of displacement without really understanding why. However, in a literature class the exploration of the displacement and marginalization effected by the discourse of the text
could serve to create an awareness not only of the social and historical contexts of the novel but also of the students' own social and historical time period.

In addition, because the connections between discourse, worldview, and practices are made clear in the novel, it serves well as a text where students might work with the theories of Foucault on discourse and power. The opposing discourses of the Pikunis (the Blackfeet) and the seizers (the white settlers and military) illustrate Foucault's assertion that discourse and practice are intimately connected and that power is established through the circulation of discourse.

For example, students might consider the following two passages describing different reactions to increasing conflicts between the Blackfeet and white settlers. The first passage comes from a scene where some of the Indian chiefs have gone to meet with representatives of the U.S. government who then present to the Pikunis a string of ultimatums:

You must make the other chiefs, especially Mountain Chief, aware that war is imminent. Their people will be killed like so many buffalo. They themselves will be killed or brought to justice. [...] But we are capable, and some more than willing, to punish the Indians who would deliberately thwart that peaceful course. You are warned—and you would do well to warn those other chiefs who saw fit to ignore this chance for peace. (283)

The military officers use language here to express threats and power along with confidence and a sense of justice and mission. The passage may be seen as representing the attitude of many settlers that the land was theirs to settle and that any Native American resistance to their course represented illegal activity punishable by United States law, regardless of the fact the Blackfeet were not citizens of the United States. As we know from history and from the course of events in the novel, including a description of the Marias River Massacre of 1870, the practices of the settlers soon followed their discourse as they consolidated power in the region and attacked the Blackfeet.
In the second passage, Fools Crow's father discusses the fate of the Pikunis and the actions that they should take in light of continuing conflict with the settlers:

Sun Chief favors the Napikwans [settlers]. Perhaps it's because they come from the east where he rises each day to begin his journey. Perhaps they are old friends. Perhaps the Pikunis do not honor him enough, do not sacrifice enough. He no longer takes pity on us. And so we must fend for ourselves, for our survival. That is why we must treat with the Napikwans. You are brave men, and I find myself covered with shame for speaking to you this way. But it must be so. We are up against a force we cannot fight. It is our children and their children we must think of now. (177)

This selection of discourse is illustrative of the Pikunis' spiritual beliefs and the ways in which these beliefs helped them to interpret the situation they were facing as their traditional way of life became harder and harder to follow. While at first glance, the passage may seem to suggest a forced resignation, a discourse of survival is also subtly present. This discourse pervades the entire novel and is additionally seen in the practices of the Blackfeet throughout the story, ending with the final chapter where, despite the massacre that had recently occurred, the ancient Thunder Pipe ceremony continues.

Foucault's theories tie nicely into these two passages, and others like them, because of his interest in examining how power has been and is tied to discourse. The relationship between power and discourse are complex in the example given above because while the settlers did eventually gain control over the land and use the power of the "law" to overcome Native American resistance, readers might also consider the power of the Native American discourse of survival. That is, power does not necessarily have to be institutionally given and can be expressed in discourse that is not related to institutional authority. Indeed, as Lori Burlingame argues, texts like *Fools Crow* "offer empowerment through self-responsibility and cultural awareness and reconnection" (3). Hence, in comparing these two sections of the novel, students will begin to develop readings that take into consideration the role of discourse in the novel and its relation to power.
To be sure, the preceding discussion of the discourses surrounding and within *Macbeth* and *Fools Crow* is limited, and there are many other directions that classroom practice may take with the two texts. However, the goal was to exemplify how the pedagogical theory outlined in the previous chapter might actually be enacted in practice. The same principle applies as I turn to the next pedagogical principle—a dialectical relationship between theory and practice.

**Theory**

In the last chapter I described the relationship between theory and practice as dialectical instead of a dichotomous. Thus, this chapter in and of itself illustrates that definition as it focuses on the *practice* of the theoretical principles of a pedagogy of stewardship in relation to two specific texts that might be taught in a classroom. Furthermore, the section just previous to this one on discourse in *Fools Crow* and *Macbeth* also exemplifies the theory-practice relationship because theories about discourse inform the practice of examining the discourses of texts and the discourses surrounding texts in the classroom. For the following section to most fully uphold the theory-practice dialectic as I described it, I would need to have a discussion of how my pedagogical theory and resulting practice had been challenged, modified, supported, and so on by its actual practice in the classroom; I would re-theorize my practice and pedagogy based on interactions with students. Unfortunately, as I mentioned previously, the structural limitations associated with my own specific contexts have not allowed me the opportunity to enact in full this pedagogical theory. Therefore, at this point, I can only reiterate and emphasize the importance of developing a theory-practice dialectic in order to enrich both, to foster reflective thinking, and to begin facing the complexities of classrooms, texts, identities, theories, and practices. To be clear, continually reflecting on theory in light of practice and practice in light of theory is essential for a pedagogy of stewardship because
constant reflection and analysis will serve to keep educators accountable as stewards to the various communities that we touch through our teaching.

The aspect of the theory-practice dialectic that I can develop in this section concerns integrating theory with practice for our students. In order to do this effectively in the classroom, I would be explicit about the theoretical approach the class would take in exploring a text. That is, I would "let the students in on it." I do firmly believe and have experienced myself that undergraduates can read theory and can use it directly themselves to ask questions of texts. Therefore, students should read pertinent excerpts of theoretical texts (not only summaries of theory, although these also may be helpful) with the understanding that the theoretical approach selected is just one of many critical approaches to a text, is not the only way to read the text, nor is it the way the "teacher" is prescribing to read all texts. Rather, as students evaluate and interpret the texts in light of theory—and preferably they will have the chance to work with a variety of critical and theoretical approaches—they can make decisions for themselves regarding the merits and/or flaws within any particular theoretical approach. Creating a space in the classroom where students have an opportunity to read theory first-hand and to come to their own conclusions about it fulfills the emphases on helping students become "vehicles of power" and to answer for themselves "what can we [teachers] do for them." Student initiative, participation, and ownership of this type are central concerns of a pedagogy of stewardship.

To be more specific, let's consider a particular theoretical question for *Macbeth* and *Fools Crow*—questions about authorship. This is a theoretical issue that may be worthwhile exploring for both texts in light of their differing canonical status and is also relevant for students because it challenges readings many of them practice that constantly search for the meaning of the text in terms of authorial intent. Furthermore, the debate about authorship encompasses theoretical questions that stem from post-structuralism,
feminism, new historicism, New Criticism (to name only a few). Thus it provides a context for introducing students to a theoretical issue from any number of angles. Again, my aim is not to articulate necessarily the one theoretical position or question that I hold as the only way into a text, but rather to discuss a theoretical position that asks particularly interesting questions of these two texts. To argue vehemently for one theoretical position constructs a static practice, a construction a pedagogy of stewardship seeks to avoid because it limits ownership and availability of choice.

The theoretical issues surrounding the "Author" generally center on questions that stem from a postmodern understanding of "Author" as a construct rather than as an "original genius" that more traditional views may explicitly or implicitly uphold. Two texts in particular can provide the theoretical foundation necessary for students to begin exploring this question in relation to Macbeth and Fools Crow: "The Death of the Author" by Roland Barthes and "What is an Author?" by Michel Foucault. While not taking the same position, both texts shift focus from "Author" to the text, the reader, or the discourse surrounding the author. For example, Barthes writes, "Once the Author is removed, the claim to decipher a text becomes quite futile. To give a text an Author is to impose a limit on that text, to furnish it with a final signified, to close the writing" ("Death" 256). And, of course, Barthes' famous last line of the essay reads: "we know that to give writing its future, it is necessary to overthrow the myth: the birth of the reader must be at the cost of the death of the Author" (257). Foucault, writing in response to Barthes' text, proposes that seeking the author in relation to the actual writer is "false" and that "the 'author function' arises out of their scission--in the division and distance of the two [author and writer]" (129). Students, then, in considering "the death of the author" and the "author-function" can formulate a number of questions for their readings of Macbeth and Fools Crow.
In terms of *Macbeth*, both texts by Barthes and Foucault present a challenge to the more traditional ways we talk about and think about Shakespeare's plays. That is, we see them as "Shakespeare's plays" (note the possessive). Perhaps of all the great authors that make up the traditional canon, Shakespeare himself is equally a part of the canon as are his texts, and often great amounts of class time spent studying Shakespearean drama or poetry involve biographical information. (How many models of the Globe theater have been constructed out of popsicle sticks since Shakespeare first became a standard in the curriculum?) Conceivably, the theoretical issues brought out by Barthes and Foucault might offer students the tools to begin examining how their own readings are constructed by the need to find the "hidden meaning," a need tied to the idea of Shakespeare as original genius. For instance, students may consider questions such as these: How does Shakespeare as Author dominate the readings of his texts? How might considering the death of Shakespeare give birth to readers? Or even, how is understanding Shakespeare as a biological, living author important in reading his texts? These theory-based questions open possibilities for students to validate their own readings and interactions with texts.

Another interesting and useful direction for *Macbeth* prompted by issues of authorship concerns 16th and 17th century collaborative dramatic practices. As Jeffrey Masten, who explores collaboration in early modern drama, notes, "Emphasizing collaboration in this period demonstrates at the level of material practice the claim of much recent critical theory: the production of texts is a social process" (371). *Macbeth* in particular illustrates the social nature of the drama of the early modern period because scholars now speculate that, for example, the scenes involving the witches in Acts III and IV may have been written by another dramatist such as Middleton. This fact might prompt questions like the following: How does considering Shakespeare's texts as social collaboration change our expectations and/or readings of the text? How does it change our understanding of Shakespeare himself? If early modern drama can be considered as...
collaborative texts, would we also consider texts written today as collaborative? Why or why not? As students explore the text through these and other questions, their interaction with the text and its historical and cultural context is more meaningful than a lecture on the same topic. In addition, using theoretical questions to explore texts and the historical and social contexts of those texts models the dialectical relationship between theory and practice that a pedagogy of stewardship aims to achieve.

Furthermore, critical questions about authorship in relationship to Shakespeare might also stimulate discussion on the views of authorship at the time of Shakespeare and also conceptions of authorship in our own historical contexts. These questions might include: Who was and who wasn't authorized to author in the early modern period? What was the discourse of the period in regard to women writing? (The recent scholarship on women writing in the early modern period speaks to this question.) Have these conditions changed today? How and why?

Hence, by bringing theory to a canonical work, students develop questions that open interpretation of the text and prompt other explorations. As a result, the depth of meaning moves beyond "getting" what Shakespeare meant. Creating possibilities for interpretations and developing questions like those mentioned contribute to pedagogical practices that encourage students to be critically conscious of their own reading practices, of how those practices are shaped culturally, and of how our understandings of authors and texts can be subject to our social and historical contexts. By using theory and practice for this purpose, we foster the reflection and critical consciousness essential for stewardly action.

For Fools Crow, similar questions are at stake. Just as the presence of Shakespeare as Author can dominate the text of Macbeth, the presence of James Welch as Author, particularly as a Native-American author, can dominate his text. Barthes suggests that "the very identity of the body writing" is lost in the writing space (253). Yet, our students
might ask, in what ways is knowing and understanding the identity of the author important for reading marginalized texts? For instance, does knowing that James Welch's great-grandmother herself, Red Paint Woman, was wounded in the leg at the Baker Massacre make a difference in how we as readers understand and respond to the text? (In the novel, the main character, Fools Crow, comes upon the site of the massacre and interacts with some of its survivors.) Questions like these may center on the benefits and/or liabilities that can result from reading "autobiographically" into a text.

At the same time, the fact that *Fools Crow* is a text generally classified as Native American Literature brings forth another series of questions relating to the "death of the Author." Traditional Native American literature does not uphold the same understandings of Author that Western, white culture does. Texts that have been passed down orally across time and generation have a sense of being given and received rather than being "owned" by a singular author as originating genius. Although his grandmother died before he was born, Welch notes that she had told his father many stories which in time were passed down to Welch (Schontzler 3). The characters in the novel also reflect this pattern, especially as Fools Crow learns the myths and stories that provide the framework for his tribe's spiritual life. The stories from the origin of the Beaver Medicine to the sad tale of Feather Woman reflect the social nature of Native American authorship. Thus, questions concerning authorship in this context may bring insight into how "Authors" are constructed socially, culturally, and historically.

In the end, if "theory is a set of questions you ask about a text" (Steen, Interview), then by bringing exposure to theory into the undergraduate and high school classroom we create possibilities for our students in opening up a whole range of new questions that involve more than comprehension, uncovering the "meaning," and personal response (not to say that these questions also might not be necessary and beneficial at times). Especially if we define texts broadly to include literature, the classroom, popular
culture, the academy, and so forth, theoretical questions can become powerful pedagogical tools for our students as well as for ourselves. I have used as an example just one of the innumerable theoretical issues and texts that can be applicable for the reading practices of students in our classrooms. As teacher-stewards consider the texts and the students who are a part of their teaching, they can decide on other theoretical issues and positions that may best inform their practices.

As a teacher, one would hope that students could ground their differing readings of texts in the theory with which they engage. If they do this, the emphasis in learning shifts from repeating the instructor's interpretation to developing their own. By doing so, students develop as (stronger) vehicles of power who begin to invest their own discourses with authority. One would also hope that the reading of the text in this manner transfers to other texts, and in this way theory and practice are brought into accord not only for the teacher but also for our students.

Emotion

After recently presenting a section of the previous chapter dealing with emotion in pedagogy, a number of members of the audience, while supportive of the basic premise, wondered how creating a space for emotion in the classroom might work out in practice. In fact, one respondent remarked on the energy and ambition of this project in light of all the other tasks and issues that teachers are already dealing with in their classrooms, including student resistance to texts and pedagogy. I do not deny that educators face an overwhelming number of responsibilities and issues on a daily basis and that conscientious and stewardly educators who work to fulfill those tasks to the best of their abilities do find themselves exhausted both mentally and physically on any number of occasions. However, I also contend that engaging with emotion in relation to many of the issues that
most exhaust and frustrate us may provide us with a means of dealing with many of the barriers, like student resistance, that impede us from meeting our pedagogical goals.

For example, when students resist our efforts to make them aware of the ways in which class, race, and privilege shape subjectivities and values, we may find with a little probing that negative emotions underlie their resistance. As I outlined in the previous chapter, Boler suggests that emotional experience can be a "window into ideology" (123). Thus, if we begin asking students why they are resistant to certain ideas or theories, we may find emotions like fear, guilt, distrust, and insecurity at the root of that resistance, and thereby we shed light on the ideologies at stake for them and of which they may not even be consciously aware. In the end, the "trick" is creating a space where students feel free enough to be honest and open about expressing those emotions and, more importantly, are willing to examine them in the social context of the classroom. In practice, then, in order to create a such a space, I suggest that we need to first spend time exploring with students how their emotions have been traditionally controlled in education through the series of myths outlined in the previous chapter, and second to spend time naming and identifying the emotions that they have been taught to ignore in the context of learning. I have found that after students name an emotion, such as frustration, we can make remarkable progress in overcoming resistance and exploring new ideas and theories.

Frustration is possibly one of the most common emotions students experience with a text like Macbeth, and one they are most willing to admit. This frustration can also lead to resistance. Especially for students reading a text from the early modern era for the first time, comprehending the language and syntax of the period can be both overwhelming and exhausting. However, for teachers who include emotion in their pedagogical theory, frustration can be a starting place, at least once it is out in the open and acknowledged as a legitimate response rather than one that students should smother because it is "irrational." First, when frustration is named and identified we can begin to address the
issues giving rise to it, such as lack of comprehension. In this context, students ask for and take ownership of the ways in which a teacher might assist them in their reading practices. Often when I face a silent and non-responsive classroom, I ask students to identify the reasons behind their silence; when frustration with the text is one of them, we can begin together to work with their readings of the text and arrive at a place where they feel less overwhelmed by the material and ready to engage with it.

In addition, Macbeth is a text filled with characters who are emotionally complex. For example, at different times in the play Macbeth demonstrates pride, self-pity, despair, jealousy, fear, guilt, cowardice, shame, confidence, irrationality, and anger. Consider these lines from the final act of the play, where Macbeth exudes despair, tired of life and all that he has gained:

\[
\text{I have lived long enough. My way of life}
\text{Is fall'n into the sere, the yellow leaf,}
\text{And that which should accompany old age,}
\text{As honor, love, obedience, troops of friends,}
\text{I must not look to have (5.3.26-30)}
\]

Tracing the emotions and actions that lead up to this point may aid students in understanding both the plot of the play and the complex motivations of the characters within it. Furthermore, because students can identify with the emotions of the characters, more than, for example, the historical context of the play, they are important for helping students become less detached from the text.

In addition, explicitly working with students to identify a character's emotions at certain points in the play is important if we also want to acknowledge and identify students' own emotions in our classrooms. Through determining what a character's emotions reveal about him or her and how those emotions are a part of that character's identity, we create the structure for a dialogue that we can later apply more broadly as students begin to develop their own emotional responses to the plot and characters of Macbeth. Many teachers do, in fact, use students' emotional responses as a means of
engaging them with the texts. However, what is important for this pedagogy of stewardship, once again, is that students move beyond expressing emotion in the context of unreflective and self-contained sharing to questions that consider emotions in social contexts with implications for how we live in relationship to others.

For example, Lady Macbeth's vivid "motivational" speech in the Act I could provoke emotional responses in students that could move outward from individual experience to a discussion of cultural expectations, values, and ideologies. In this scene Lady Macbeth, seeking to encourage Macbeth to murder Duncan, tells Macbeth:

I have given suck, and know
how tender 'tis to love the babe that milks me.
I would, while it was smiling in my face,
Have plucked my nipple from his boneless gums
And dashed the brains out, had I so sworn as you
Have done this" (1.7.62-67).

Her horrifying image probably gives rise to emotions of shock, outrage, and horror which could then be explored in terms of cultural expectations and values of motherhood and femininity, not only for the period of the play but also in our own historical moment.

_Fools Crow_ can also illustrate how addressing emotions creates possibilities for teachers and students in the classroom. As the debate over making _Fools Crow_ required reading in several Montana high schools reveals, this novel has provoked both strong emotional responses and resistance. Examining both provides an example of how emotions can be incorporated into a pedagogy, not only in theory but also in practice. In the section on discourse in this chapter, I suggested that a class might look at the discourse surrounding the novel in order to identify what is at stake in the debate and the values and ideologies at play within it. Along the same lines, the comments characterizing the debate also reflect deep emotions. These also can be taken into consideration as a "window into ideology."
Furthermore, emotions in this conflict can be "practically" utilized in another way. One of the teachers who teaches *Fools Crow* explicitly addresses emotion and also uses it as a powerful tool for engaging students both with the text and with some of the issues and themes that the text suggests. As students became aware of the controversy surrounding the novel, their curiosity is naturally aroused concerning the "racy" passages that one side of the debate considers too "adult" for the sophomore readers. After handing out the novels to the students for the first time, the teacher immediately tells them to turn to page seventy-five, one of the more explicit scenes in the novel where Yellow Kidney, a Blackfeet warrior, rapes a young Crow woman struck with white-scabs disease, or small pox. Next, he has students turn to page eighty-one, where the same warrior, Yellow Kidney, tells his fellow tribe members about his suffering and shame that came about as a result of his immoral act (Schontzler 1). Yellow Kidney comments: "I had broken one of the simplest decencies by which people live. In fornicating with the dying girl, I had taken her honor, her opportunity to die virtuously. [...] And so Old Man, as he created me, took away my life many times and left me like this, worse than dead, to think of my transgression every day" (Welch 81).

By introducing students to the controversial novel in this way, their teacher has dealt up front with some of the emotions that students would bring to the text instead of ignoring them. If he had ignored their curiosity and perhaps also the adolescents' sexual desires for reading passages such as the rape scene as erotic, these emotions could have limited the power of those explicit and controversial passages as well as the students' ability to read the book in a way that does justice to the complex moral dilemmas of the characters. Instead, by including and addressing the emotional responses, this instructor sets the stage for engagement with the text in a way that brings emotions into the classroom with honesty, openness, and integrity. Emotions become a tool for exploring the text and for exploring students own interpretations of the text.
Another emotional response that students may have to *Fools Crow* could be resistance to the language of the text as well as the way in which it re-historicizes the settlement of the West from a Native American perspective, specifically the history dealing with the settlement of Montana and the history of the Blackfeet tribes. Arguably, as students become attentive to the story they will question their understanding of the history of Western expansion and begin to experience emotions like doubt, anger, and guilt (especially from students whose ancestors settled the West). In the stereo-typical, schoolbook version, western expansion is often taught as a celebration of the American Spirit. Brave pioneers risked everything to travel by covered wagon to the wild, perilous, and untamed West. These men and women courageously settled a new land and helped build and strengthen the Nation. Terms like "Manifest Destiny," as explained in textbooks, imply a religious motivation and even imperative for Western settlement. Although many pioneers met tragic ends, by their sheer courage, determination, and ingenuity they eventually overcame all obstacles, including savage attacks by the Natives, and tamed the frontier, making it the safe and productive place it is today. Thus, the general understanding of the history of the West for a student evokes images and emotions tied closely to the core values of American character--independence, opportunity, and determination. Part of the power of *Fools Crow*, then, can come through exploring the conflicting emotions that readers may experience as the modified version of Western settlement challenges the values espoused in the concept of "American character."

The text stresses the importance of tribal interdependence for survival, instead of independence. Rather than seeing the opening of the West as creating opportunity, the reader experiences how the settlement of the West limited the lifestyles of Native cultures. Finally, instead of a narrative of pioneering determination in subduing the land, the reader can listen to the determination of a people to survive, physically, spiritually, and culturally. As students begin to define and name the emotions that may underlie their resistance to, or
even acceptance of, the version of Western settlement proposed in *Fools Crow*, they begin to problematize the construction of the history of Western settlement and ask certain questions: Who wrote this history? With what motives? Whose story does it tell? By doing so, they begin to question the definition of terms such as "independence," "opportunity," and "determination" (the list is not exhaustive). Asking questions such as these leads students to move beyond personal emotional responses to social questions and concerns. They also construct knowledge in a way that focuses on how individuals, including characters and the students themselves, view their communities, the past and the future, and their roles in them— all questions and concerns central to a pedagogy of stewardship.

In conclusion, as with the other sections in this chapter, I have developed illustrations that put the pedagogical theory of stewardship into practice. The examples given above that describe bringing emotions into the classroom are limited but do serve to suggest concrete ways in which our theories can inform our pedagogical practices. In this case, by foregrounding emotions we can hope to counter student resistance, build connections with the text, and foster critical consciousness in relation to both our own social, cultural and historical contexts as well as those of the texts we are reading. It is an energetic and ambitious project, but it is also one that hold promise for a pedagogy of stewardship and its goals.
CHAPTER 4

CONCLUSION

From the very first pages of this project and continuing throughout it, I have labored not only to argue that the English discipline could benefit from more scholarly attention to pedagogy but also, through my own theory, to contribute to this scholarship. George Levine describes the importance of research and writing of this type by stating: "The profession badly needs a whole new orientation toward the question of the relation between teaching and scholarship, and a whole new genre that would make it possible to see discussions of teaching as integral to the development of knowledge" (12). His words emphasize the fact that discussions about teaching help to develop knowledge; thus, they reflect the manner in which I have defined pedagogy, as a process of knowledge production. This emphasis is important because when we begin to focus scholarship on the process of teaching, we develop knowledge not only about the texts we teach but also about our classrooms, our curriculum, our students, our theories, our communities, and ourselves. Furthermore, understanding pedagogy as process implies fluidity and change rather than stagnation and rigidity. Making pedagogical theory a priority requires constant consideration of the social, historical, and cultural contexts within which we are teaching. As we survey these contexts and come to understand them better, we re-theorize our practice; hence, our knowledge is constantly in the process of being revisited and revised.

In the previous pages, I have developed knowledge about literature, discourse, theory, emotion, educational values and myths, teachers, students, and the classroom. In order to accomplish this process, I not only had to develop the pedagogy in theory but I also had to bring those pedagogical practices into practice with specific texts. Only though a dialectical relationship between theory and practice is pedagogy most fully
embodied as a process of knowledge production. Admittedly, this process is often characterized by ambiguity and complex questions; yet, perhaps this is a worthwhile aim for teachers who wish to avoid Freire's "banking" style of education. As teachers of literature, we can use our pedagogies to develop critical reading practices that make students aware of how reading and teaching involve tension, contradiction, and ambivalence, and, importantly, that these characteristics are not necessarily negative. Indeed, they can become part of the pleasure of reading, learning, and knowing one another.

In addition, the three pedagogical principles that I developed—attention to discourse, a dialectic between theory and practice, and a re-valuing of emotions in the classroom—lend themselves to questions and discussions that foreground the myths, tensions, complications, and contradictions that fill not only the texts we read but also that characterize our experiences as subjects relating to one another and to our communities. By framing these discussions under the concept of stewardship, I created a space where these ambiguities need not be feared and need not separate us from one another. Instead, stewardship, because it emphasizes building up, caring, restoring, serving, and acting, encourages us to consider contradictions and complications in the context of our relationships to our communities and to each other. Boler, although not speaking directly about stewardship, articulates well why discussions along these lines are important for a pedagogy of stewardship:

"We can explore how our identities are precariously constructed in relation to one another, so that to suggest change might not feel like a threat to our survival. At minimum, one might offer a responsible accountability for how these emotional investments shape one's actions, and evaluate how one's actions affect others. Learning to live with ambiguity, discomfort, uncertainty is a worthy educational ideal." (Boler 198)
While at first glance, "ambiguity, discomfort, and uncertainty" may not seem to be the best means of helping our students meet the goal of a pedagogy of stewardship to become "vehicles of power," I contend that through this process they will in fact come to a better understanding of the fact that, as Foucault says, "power is 'already always there,' and that one is never 'outside' it" (Power 141). In exploring the complexities and unknowns in texts and in situations outside of texts through the examination of discourse, the use of theory, and the exploration of subjective knowledge students may come to understand for themselves that individuals are "simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power" (Power 98).

In the end, this pedagogical approach avoids some of the pitfalls of recent critical pedagogical theories that tend to dictate to students why they need to be empowered and the steps they need to take to reach that empowerment. It also may provide an alternative to rationalistic and objectivist discourses that have the tendency to silence students. Indeed, a pedagogy of stewardship aims to create a space where students describe in their own terms how teachers can best assist students in becoming active and participatory members in the classroom and in their own communities. Moreover, the pedagogical principles focusing on discourse, theory, and emotion aim to create possibilities in the classroom where students are not shut down by educational myths concerning the ideal rational student. Instead, by bringing our subjectivities into the discussion, our own partiality and interests, we can begin to identify what enables and constrains our participation in and responsibility to our communities.

While I have been using stewardship specifically to frame a discussion about how and why we teach, the Business Executives for Economic Justice discuss it in much broader terms. They write:

[Stewardship] comes with membership in the human community. It is not a mantle we don when we reach a certain level of success and can give something back. It defines our relationship to each other and to the whole
creation. It confers on us the responsibility to oversee the ongoing unfolding of creations. It influences how we utilize the whole range of resources at our disposal—money, time, power, prestige, authority and influence. Every human action has a steward dimension (qtd. in Smith 199).

As I consider their quote, I find myself agreeing with them and realizing that my own efforts to articulate a pedagogy using the framework of stewardship stem from deeply rooted values of stewardship that flow throughout my life. As a member of a human community, an academic community, a family community, an ecological community, and so on, I willingly accept the responsibilities that come with the memberships in these communities and embrace the relationships that define them.

Since the pedagogy outlined in the previous pages emphasizes teachers and students naming what is at stake for them in the readings of texts and in their actions, I too, here in this conclusion, identify what is at stake for me in this pedagogy. In short, it embodies one of the foundational values of my life: to imbue all my actions with stewardship. Yes, I both began and completed this project in order to address a need I saw within the English discipline for scholarly work focused on pedagogical theory and practice. However, I also wrote these pages to begin a process of knowledge production for my own teaching; a process that will, as time passes, include revision and reconsideration. Because education and teaching are two of the primary focuses of my life, I can not help but see it through the lens of stewardship—one of the lenses that comprises my worldview.

Almost a year ago, when I first considered what my thesis project would involve, I started with the work of Paulo Freire. In light of the pedagogical emphases that I have outlined, I see now that his work exemplifies the ideals of stewardship because of his stress on action, on participation, on dialogue, and on love and hope. Freire writes, "But human activity consists of action and reflection: it is praxis; it is transformation of the world. And as praxis, it requires theory to illuminate it. Human activity is theory and
practice; it is reflection and action" (125). Teaching literature is but one of many human activities, and Freire's assertion applies to it as well as any other. With action, reflection, and theory, we can transform the world. We start in our classrooms teaching the literature that we love.
Chapter 1

1 I chose Giroux here as an example because of his prolific work in this area. However, I should note that Giroux does address using "border writing" as a teaching method in a cultural studies classroom in "Disturbing the Peace: Writing in the Cultural Studies Classroom."

Chapter 2

2 I use the term "de-mythicize" here instead of de-mythologize in order to distinguish between the myths of mythology, such as narrative stories, that are not necessarily detrimental, and those myths, like the ones mentioned, that are typically unspoken, under the surface, and that can be harmful.

3 Valerie Walkerdine's essay "Developmental Psychology and the Child-Centered Pedagogy: The Insertion of Piaget into Early Education" deconstructs the ways in which developmental psychology and its embedded discourses have not functioned to liberate the child but rather to normalize and produce the child and also to produce the practices of educators. Walkerdine's work deals not only with how students were subjected to the discourses stemming from Piagetian developmental psychology but also with the ways in which educators and educational constructs were subjected to the same discourses because the discourses became the "gaze" through which students, curriculum, learning, and teachers were viewed.

4 Dialogism, according to Bakhtin, characterizes the world dominated by heteroglossia. In dialogism "there is a constant interaction between meanings, all of which have the potential of conditioning others." The conditioning is determined at the moment of utterance (Bakhtin 426).

5 Lev Vygotsky's work, for example, refutes the myth of the autonomous individual's development occurring largely independent of socio-cultural contexts and support social-constructionist discourses. His emphasis on the social nature of learning, seeing learning and development in a social and historical context, also provides further framework for examining discourse, discursive practices and power relationships since these all occur in social settings. Vygotsky's theories legitimatize and prioritize the examination of language and social practices since they, as he describes them, mediate learning and individual development.
6 George Kamberelis describes a possibility for incorporating alternative student discourses into the classroom in his theories about hybrid discourse practice as a means to produce heteroglossic classroom (micro)cultures. Hybrid discourse practice occurs when teachers and students juxtapose "forms of talk, social interaction, and material practices from many different social and cultural worlds" (86).

7 See Deborah Britzman, Practice Makes Practice: A Critical Study of Learning to Teach; Barbara Christian, "The Race for Theory"; Beth Daniell, "Theory, Theory Talk, and Composition"; Jennifer Gore, "What We Can Do for You! What Can 'We' Do For 'You'?: Struggling over Empowerment in Critical and Feminist Pedagogy"; bell hooks, Teaching to Transgress; Jane Roland Martin, Coming of Age in Academe; and Donald Morton and Mas'ud Zavarzadeh, "(Post)modern Critical Theory and the Articulations of Critical Pedagogies."

8 Deborah Anne Dooley, for example, in Plain and Ordinary Things: Reading Women in the Writing Classroom writes that women's writing "has a narrative affinity with an oral tradition influenced both by women's relations to their mothers and their mothers' songs and by their multifaceted position(s) as Other in many cultures and societies" (xv).

9 The field of cultural studies as it makes concerted efforts to study popular culture has shown how bringing the theories and practices of the academy to popular culture is pedagogically powerful. For more on cultural studies pedagogical aims see Stuart Hall "The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities" and "Theoretical Legacies."

10 In these two pieces Barthes argues that the death of the Author will lead to the birth of the reader, and Foucault considers the author as function.

11 The Erotics of Instruction edited by Regina Barreca and Deborah Denenholz Morse is a useful collection of essays that explores the complexities, and often the darker side, of erotics in the classroom.

Chapter 3

12 Sara Jayne Steen in "I've Never Been This Serious: Necrophilia and the Teacher of Early Modern Literature" (forthcoming) describes how this issue impacts her teaching of women's early modern literature and also how her classroom practice and conversations with students interact with the theoretical position that views the author as construct. This text provides an example of the types of questions considering authorship might raise in a classroom. It is also an example of a scholar bringing theory and practice together dialectically because Steen discusses how her practices as a teacher have influenced her theoretical stances and how her theoretical stance has influenced her teaching practices.
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