

Disrupting the Heteronormative Subjectivities of Christian Pre-Service Teachers: A Deweyan Prolegomenon

John E. Petrovic and Jerry Rosiek

5 In this article, the authors draw on the work of John Dewey and his notions of transactional realism and habits to inform their analysis of the heteronormative subjectivities of pre-service teachers. The authors depict the dynamics of heteronormative attitudes among pre-service teachers and highlight the ways heterosexist beliefs interact with teachers' professional, moral, and religious identity. Through these depictions, the authors uncover certain "hitches" or contradictions in their subjectivities that teachers must negotiate. These hitches should be points of departure for teacher educators in getting teachers to explore and renegotiate their heteronormative positions.

10 **M**uch of the literature bringing attention to the plight of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) youth in society and schools portrays the general experiences and school climates that LGB youth endure and proffers arguments for including LGB content in school curricula (Bickmore, 1999; Petrovic, 1999). This work also has included specific ways to incorporate LGB themes and to expose the hidden curriculum of heteronormativity in subject content (Letts, 1999; Lipkin, 1995; Martino, 1999).

20 In addition to advice for teachers, research focuses on teachers' beliefs about gay and lesbians and on teachers' attitudes towards dealing with gays and lesbians and LGB issues in schools (Casper, Cuffaro, Schultz, Silin, & Wickens, 1996; Dolores & Cain, 1997; Rubin, 1995; Sears, 1992). We wish to expand this literature with a more thorough depiction of the dynamics of heteronormative attitudes among pre-service teachers—the ways heterosexist beliefs interact with teachers' professional, moral, and religious identity, and the way teachers negotiate contradictions in these dynamics. A goal of this essay is to highlight such contradictions as points of departure for the disruption of heteronormativity among teachers. The primary audience for this piece is teacher educators. However, we hope that we might induce readers to reflect on their own subjectivities vis-à-vis non-heterosexuality and that, more specifically, teachers will reflect on the ways that their subjectivities promote or hinder the creation of safer, anti-heterosexist classrooms.

40 Although there are certainly more nuanced and theoretically-driven definitions, for the purposes of this article we employ fairly straightforward definitions of the two fundamental concepts: heterosexism and heteronormativity. Heterosexism, in our working definition, is a form of oppression that both assumes and presumes the superiority of heterosexuality while (and by) casting non-heterosexuality as abnormal, deviant, or immoral. As with all forms of oppression, heterosexism creates and supports certain privileges for those in power. These privileges may range from pervasive institutional arrangements (e.g., marriage and the many benefits that it includes, such as tax breaks) to insidious social arrangements (e.g., the power to demonstrate affection in public). If heterosexism is the form of oppression, then heteronormativity is the tool that perpetuates it. Heteronormativity is the normalization of heterosexuality and those practices that promote and perpetuate that normalization. This involves, often explicitly but more frequently implicitly, the abnormalization of non-heterosexuality. It is the nonquestioning of heterosexuality and heterosexual images and the fear of naming all things non-heterosexual. There is a strong interrelation between these two constructs given that heterosexism makes heteronormativity practicable while heteronormativity serves to perpetuate heterosexism.

55 There are two important and intimately related assumptions that we make in beginning this article: (1) Heterosexism is a form of discursive subjugation, and (2) Teachers' identities can be built around heterosexist norms. In other words, those who cleave to heterosexist worldviews and engage in heteronormative practices

Address correspondence to John E. Petrovic, University of Alabama, College of Education, 206 Wilson Hall, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487. E-mail: jpetrovi@bama.edu

tend to do so uncritically, their subjectivity or identities having become habituated to (or formed by) that particular discourse. Heterosexism as discursive subjugation provides a way to understand how well-meaning teachers can create a classroom climate formed by heterosexist discourses without being aware of it. Teachers often inflict these heterosexist norms on students through implicit (and explicit) aspects of their teaching. It is this habit of thought and pedagogy that we seek to illustrate and whose disruption we hope to promote with this article.

Since teachers can think through only those discourses they have at their disposal, helping pre-service teachers to think differently about non-heterosexuality involves providing them the opportunity to be immersed in alternative discourses. To develop a conception of teacher education practice that intervenes in heteronormative discourses, we look to John Dewey's theory of "transactional realism" (Sleeper, 1986). As San Chee (1997) points out, in transactional realism, "Acts or events are seen as always unfolding in a context. Through dialectical processes involving interaction with the environment, learners wrestle to make stability of meaning prevail over the instability of real-world events" (p. 2).

Further to this idea, Dewey provides an embodied conception of discourse as "habit" (Sullivan, 2001). Where some theorists talk about "discourse," Dewey talks about habits of thought, feeling, and action. By framing heteronormativity in terms of habits broadly conceived, we are able to look for ways of bringing different habits of belief and feeling into conflict with heteronormative habits. Such conflicts may provide openings in which teacher educators can encourage students to genuinely reconstruct their relation to issues of sexuality in ways that support more inclusive teaching practices.

In keeping with Dewey's (1925) notion of "empirical philosophy," responses taken from a student assignment in a course taught by one of the authors were used to stimulate our thought about the issue this article addresses. These data illustrate the ways in which (1) personal identity issues are linked to student rationalizations of their heteronormative practices, and (2) habits of belief about issues of sexuality actually come into conflict. The article concludes with suggestions for deepening the way we think about anti-heterosexist teacher education curriculum as per Dewey's transactional realism.

DEWEY, HABITS, AND TRANSACTIONAL REALISM

Here it is important to elaborate somewhat on Dewey's (1922) notion of "habit" that goes well beyond a typical, everyday definition of habit as mere repetition. Dewey views habit as "an acquired predisposition

to ways or modes of response, not to particular acts except as, under special conditions, these express a way of behaving" (p. 42). To illuminate this conception, Dewey is worth citing at some length:

[A] predisposition formed by a number of specific acts is an immensely more intimate and fundamental part of ourselves than are vague, general, conscious choices. All habits are demands for certain kinds of activity; and they constitute the self. In any intelligible sense of the word will, they are will. They form our effective desires and they furnish us with our working capacities. They rule our thoughts, determining which shall appear and be strong and which shall pass from light into obscurity. We may think of habits as means, waiting, like tools in a box, to be used by conscious resolve. But they are something more than that. They are active means, means that project themselves, energetic and dominating ways of acting (p. 25).

Notice that habits for Dewey are socially acquired. It is within the subject's particular context that habits are formed and begin to shape the subject. Just as we described discourses above, habits shape who we are and how we feel; indeed, they constitute the reality of the self. Further, Dewey is careful to stress that these habits "project themselves" in order to dispel the "myth" that it is "a mind or consciousness or soul in general which performs these operations" (p. 176). For Dewey, habits project themselves prior to reflection. "Habit incorporates, enacts or overrides objects, but it doesn't know them" (p. 177).

Dewey (1922), however, did not conceive of the social context in which human selves are constituted as hermetically sealed from external influences. Although the subject is certainly shaped by habits and often led mechanically by them, this need not be the case. According to Dewey, moments occur when those habits are raised to the conscious attention of the one possessing them. In those moments reflection can occur, even reflection upon one's most deeply socialized habits.

Reflection upon one's habits is provoked when there is "a hitch in its workings [which] occasions emotion and provokes thought" (Dewey, 1922, p. 178). These "hitches" can be defined as "incompatible factors within the empirical situation Then opposed responses are provoked which cannot be taken simultaneously in overt action" (Dewey, as cited in Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 1998, p. 2). The subject is then forced to reflect on the tension that such hitches create and devise a way to cope with it. This coping requires the modification of both the subject and object of study. In this transaction the object acquires new meaning for the subject and any time a subject reconstructs the object of her inquiry she also is changed. For she now "knows" in an altered way, and this new knowing must be made consistent with the other habits that constitute the self.

180 This is, in brief, the view of experience that stems from Dewey's transactional realism. On the one hand, habits of being and feeling that constitute subjectivity can be non-reflective and thus can "become negative limits" on inquiry and prevent the acquisition of new knowledge.
 185 On the other hand, some kinds of habits are the necessary pre-reflective prerequisites of inquiry. Without them there is no problematic tension between habits in conflict to prompt the inquiry. The difference here is whether the habits lend themselves to the deliberate engagement
 190 in inquiry. For example, in *Essays in Experimental Logic*, Dewey (1916) illustrates the easily recognizable difference between quenching one's thirst where the water is merely incidental to the action and the study of what water is, or between the enjoyment of social conversation and a study of the character of the participants in the conversation.

Applied to the issue of "knowing" other people, Dewey (1902) eloquently argued that

200 bigotry, intolerance, or even unswerving faith in the superiority of one's own religious and political creed are much shaken when individuals are brought face to face with each other, or have the ideas of others continuously and forcibly placed before them (p. 376).

205 In short, knowing, especially knowing that some other is X, is a social process and this is brought into high relief when in close proximity to the other. In this process, the interaction with a person whose subjectivity is constituted by a different discourse (or constituted differently by a shared discourse by virtue of occupying a different
 210 position in that discourse) need pose no threat to the possibility of mutual understanding. As Vanderstraeten and Biesta (1998) argue about Dewey's view of subjectivity:

215 It is precisely as a result of the process in which agreement in action is aimed at that individual realities are transformed in such a way that objects get the same value for both with respect to carrying on a common pursuit. It is important to note, that although agreement in action requires a sufficient coordination of individual perspectives, it does in no way require that these perspectives
 220 become identical. People remain to "live" in their own reality, although this reality has now been sufficiently transformed to make agreement in action possible (p. 2).

225 The challenge for this transactional view of subjectivity is to overcome the exclusionary practices—the avoidance, the dismissal, and the dehumanizing rhetoric directed towards those who are different—through which coherent subject positions are assumed. In other words, heterosexual subjectivity is often constituted through the repudiation of homosexuality (and vice versa). Thus, it is crucial
 230 that educational transactions "force a reworking of that logic of non-contradiction by which one identification is always and only purchased at the expense of another" (Butler, 1993, p. 118) for this is part of how we might "find

a way both to occupy such sites and to subject them to a democratizing contestation in which the exclusionary conditions of their production are perpetually reworked" (p. 115). 235

STUDENT RESPONSES TO A CLASS ACTIVITY

240 To illustrate what we mean by these theoretical concepts and to highlight how they can help us think through our teacher education practice, we will share some examples of student work that initially prompted this paper. The bulk of the material we examined came from students' formal writing assignments from a class
 245 taught by Petrovic. Notes on class discussions and individual conversations with students were kept by Petrovic. On-line communications (a website to which students could post messages had been built for the class) also were retained. This material was collected over
 250 a two-semester period from two different participant cohorts.

Students in the classes completed a two-part assignment. For the first part, they were asked to write a one or two page discussion of their initial reaction to the idea
 255 of including the issue of sexual orientation in the K-12 curriculum. It is important to note that for this initial assignment "including" was not defined in any way. Also, this assignment took place prior to any class discussion or readings (identified below) on the topic. 260

For the second part of the assignment, students were asked to read Petrovic's article (see Petrovic, 1999) defending the inclusion of LGB issues in the K-12 curriculum and to write a reflective response to it addressing the following questions: Did the article address any of the concerns you raised in your first paper? Did it make
 265 you rethink your original position or did it reinforce your position? In what ways? What arguments/points made the most impact on you? Why? Beyond the article, students also could bring other class activities and assignments to bear in their reflections. For example, they
 270 also read Elze (1992) and O'Connor (1994) and watched the documentary "It's Elementary" (Chasnoff & Cohen, 1996).

275 Our initial examination of this material focused on the following questions: How do students conceptualize "inclusion of LGB issues in the K-12 curriculum?" How does this conceptualization reflect their attitudes toward gay and lesbian students? How does it enhance or detract from their willingness to be proactive in their dealings with LGB youth in schools? On one hand, how do
 280 pre-service teachers tend to justify their heteronormative or heterosexist positions? On the other hand, how do they justify challenging such positions or what arguments seem to move them to less heterosexist positions? 285
 In answering these questions, we focused on the original positionalities of the pre-service teachers and the ways

in which the transaction of inquiry led them (or not) to resituate their own subjectivities.

290 To address these questions, 80 formal writing assignments were read, coded, and subjected to domain analyses (Spradley, 1979). Of the 80, we chose 15 assignments in which the particular pre-service teacher explicitly positioned herself within a Christian religious discourse.¹
 295 This is not to say that the other students, those who did not use religious discourse as a reference point to grapple with this subject, did not employ the same or similar heterosexist arguments. We place our focus on these particular participants, the most religiously-identified students, because it was in their responses that the conflicts
 300 in the discourses that formed their attitudes about LGB issues emerged in highest relief and, thus, we believe that they provide a good starting point in identifying primary domains of discourse.

305 **Looking for Hitches and Transactions: The Overall Picture**

Primarily through their immediate association of non-heterosexual identities with "sex" or "sex education," to our minds all 15 of the pre-service teachers represented
 310 in this sample initially provided a heterosexist conceptualization of what "inclusion of LGB issues in the K-12 curriculum" might mean. Heterosexism was most apparent in the justifications that participants used to support the denial of inclusion. It was also quite apparent in the manner
 315 in which those who indicated support for inclusion justified it. Before reviewing these justifications, it will be useful to consider at some length a typical response in order, first, to demonstrate the extent of the tension this issue causes among pre-service teachers and, second, to
 320 demonstrate the resultant difficulty in coding/analyzing responses.

Jenny,² for example, began by stating immediately, "Personally I do not think that gay issues should be taught in with [sic] the Sexual Orientation classes." Notice that this question is so foreign to Jenny that she has
 325 to invent a space for it—sexual orientation class—even before she is able to begin an argument for or against the whole notion. Jenny goes on to argue, "This is an issue that needs to be addressed, but I don't think it should be taught until later middle school or even high school."
 330 Just a sentence later Jenny asserted, "I'm not sure I would want a teacher teaching my children about this topic. I think this is a topic that needs to be addressed at home first." In response to the question "Should LGB issues be included in the K-12 curriculum, Jenny has, in a single paragraph, answered "No," then "Yes, in high school," and then "Maybe, after the parents have discussed it with their children." Later, Jenny's "Yes, in high school" vanished when she asserted:

340 When you are teaching sexual orientation in schools, I think you are teaching mostly about the reproduction

system of both females and males and how babies are made. You are teaching about the bodies of males and females. I don't think there is any reason to teach about gays when teaching about sexual orientation. 345

From a transactional view, Jenny's exposure to this new issue, this object, is the first step. Her admirable willingness to struggle with it is the second. However, her arguments and heterosexist assumptions (e.g., correlation of sexual orientation to sex education and even within that the recognition of heterosexuality as the only sexual orientation) are typical of these students. Thus, the question remains: In what ways are students' subjective positions changed? In other words, is a Deweyan transaction truly taking place? 350 355

In/Habiting Religious Discourse and the Golden Rule Hitch

All identities are constituted by a number of habits shaped by the discourses in which a person lives. Religious identities are no exception. For the Christian religious identity of the students whose responses are being considered here, the exclusionary subjectivity of heteronormativity is clearly one of these habits. From within this subject position, these participants raised arguments based in their religious habits against the inclusion of LGB issues in the curriculum. As Beth pointed out, "My view of homosexuality is that it is a sin. Homosexuality is apparent throughout the entire Bible. The most well known illustration may be Sodom and Gomorrah." Chris continued this line of thinking, asserting: 360 365 370

My first reaction or idea of sexual orientation is that God made woman for man and man for woman. Therefore, I am a heterosexual and believe that everybody is born this way based on my Christian belief. Also, in my Christian belief, if God intended on having same sex partners then it would be possible for them to reproduce. 375

Certainly, these sorts of attitudes are neither new nor surprising. However, it is interesting to note that many of the students who bring their Christian identities to bear on this issue create contradictions for themselves. Specifically, a tension between a heterosexist interpretation of Christian scripture and the golden rule emerged in many of the students' remarks. Sarah, for example, wrote: 380

I am a Christian and I believe what the Bible says about homosexuality. However, I also believe what the Bible says about the way we treat other people. We should treat others better than ourselves. This includes homosexuals. I think that being gay or lesbian is wrong. There is no doubt about that . . . In writing this page about the way I feel about gays and lesbians being taught in schools [sic, read: about teaching about gays and lesbians in schools], I feel like I am not promoting the concept of homosexuality, but that I am for teaching children how to be more accepting of them. 385 390

395 Christina took a similar tack pointing out that she
feels homosexuality is wrong and that she would not
"encourage it in [her] classroom." "Schools," she contin-
ued, "should not be responsible for teaching such a topic
400 to students. I feel that it is the parents' responsibility." In
the same vein, Christina argued, "Schools should teach
students to be tolerant of different lifestyles even if they
disagree with that lifestyle."

Here we see what could amount to a Deweyan "hitch"
in their religious habits. However, this contradiction does
405 not run deep enough to constitute a tension that would
require serious interrogation of their views on the matter
of heterosexism. In the above examples, both Sarah and
Christina say they want to teach children to be tolerant
of different lifestyles and accepting of "them;" however,
410 they are loath to mention who "they" are. Other students
made similar rhetorical moves. Although they seemed
to be struggling to make their personal religious beliefs
about homosexuality consistent with some (thin) notion
of fairness, they minimized this struggle by withdrawing
415 into the silence that heteronormative discourses build
around non-heterosexual experience.

Since heteronormative discourse functions in part by
enforcing silence and invisibility on those who fall out-
side heterosexist norms, this silence it seems would need
420 to be brought into tension with students' Christian
religious identity if a genuine Deweyan "hitch" in their
heteronormative subjectivities were to be located. In retro-
spect it would seem that the subject of silence itself would
need to be sins of omission as well of sins of commission.

425 **Construction of Normality and the
Essentialist Hitch**

Another issue that surfaced in class discussions was
the essentialist/constructionist dualism. Jagose (1996)
observes, "It is often assumed that essentialist under-
430 standings of homosexuality are conservative, if not re-
actionary in their consequences, whereas construction-
ist understandings of homosexuality lend themselves to
progressive or even radical strategies" (p. 9). Jagose's as-
sumption is that the constructionist position allows us
435 to abandon a strict homo-hetero dualism and to enable
people to see that sexuality lies on a continuum, and
that one's place on that continuum is being constructed
within and by the individual's sociocultural place in time.
We are not convinced that the image of a linear contin-
uum is the best metaphor for describing human sexu-
440 ality, nonetheless we are sympathetic with Jagose's ef-
fort to provide an alternative to the binary categories of
hetero/homo sexuality provided by much mainstream
discourse. The point here, however, is that our data indi-
445 cate that those pre-service teachers holding heterosexist
views are unwilling to place themselves on such a con-
tinuum, let alone within any more complex explanations

of human variations in sexuality. And, so, the radical
"strategy" fails. But, given that these pre-service teach-
ers are unwilling to place their heterosexual selves on 450
this continuum (holding an essentialist view of their own
sexual orientation), this study supports Jagose's other
observation that "combinations of the two positions are
often held simultaneously by both homophobic and anti-
homophobic groups" (p. 9).³ Herein lies the potential to 455
identify another place where a Deweyan "hitch" in the
heteronormative subjectivities of Christian teacher edu-
cation students might be achieved.

One case in point is Stephanie, who took a construc-
tionist position, claiming, "Christians like myself believe 460
that homosexuality is not hereditary." This position al-
lowed this student to conclude, "If one chooses a gay sex-
ual orientation, they should understand that the world
may be cruel." Marina similarly argued, "People choose
their sex partners by the way they are raised, society, and 465
by peers, not because they are made that way." She goes
on to conclude:

As for the question, should sexual orientation be in-
cluded in the school's curriculum, I would have to an-
swer the question no. I base my answer on the fact that 470
your sexual orientation is your own personal decision
and on my Christian background.

Under the assumption that one's sexuality is a choice,
the fear for these students may be that schoolchildren
could be led to sin. All of the students in this sample, 475
however, seemed to be of the opinion that they per-
sonally could not just "choose" to be attracted to a sex
other than the one they were attracted to. The construc-
tionist view that they applied to others was not part of
their natural attitude towards their own sexuality. This
contradiction could be ignored in most of their experi-
ence, however, because their own sexuality was labeled
as "normal" and therefore was in need of no explanation.
It was only "abnormal" homosexuality that needed ex-
planation, and the explanations that most often emerged 485
were the ones that permitted the designation of "abnor-
mality" to be preserved.

Interestingly an essentialist view of sexuality was key
for one of the very few students in this sample to accept
the idea of including LGB issues in the K-12 curriculum in 490
the first phase of the assignment. Nonetheless, it was still
an inclusion that preserved the status of homosexuality
as transgressive and pathological. Natalie wrote:

I guess it just seems odd to do something like this [discuss
homosexuality at school with a five-year-old] because 495
young minds are so impressionable and we don't want to
feel as though we are promoting homosexuality or trying
to increase their chances of becoming homosexual . . . So,
assuming that homosexuality cannot be learned, I think
it would be safe and extremely practical to include sexual 500
orientation in the K-12 curriculum.

Class discussions of this topic focused mainly on students' views about the normality or abnormality of homosexuality. Upon reflection it now seems that looking for contradictions in students' essentialist or constructionist conceptions of homosexuality as a way of challenging their heteronormativity will not suffice to achieve the "hitch" in their heteronormative habits. Instead, their essentialist or constructionist views of their own sexuality needs to be discussed and brought into juxtaposition with their views of non-heterosexuality.

Sex, Silence, and the Relationship "Hitch"

The example of Jenny captures many of the arguments against including LGB issues in the K-12 curriculum. She raised the question of the proper context for discussion of LGB issues indicating, as other students did, that this is more appropriately a parental issue, not one to be dealt with by teachers in schools. Another issue of context Jenny raised, and other students echoed, was the appropriate grade to introduce the topic. For example, in Jenny's and others' opinions, if LGB issues were to be discussed, it is inappropriate to do so in the context of elementary school. As Mark pointed out:

My first reaction to including gay and lesbian issues in the curriculum in elementary schools is a definite no-no. [At] this age children have a hard enough time trying to understand other social related issues such as a fatherless-home and kissing. At the elementary level it is too early to load another issue onto the children.

What is particularly interesting here is that Mark goes on to state that he does "not even think sex education should be taught in elementary school." The interpretation of "inclusion of LGB issues in the curriculum" as providing "sex education" or in Jenny's wording, "sexual orientation class" was a recurring theme and many students were cautious with their endorsement even at the high school level. Again, Mark's comment is most illustrative of this position:

As far as high school is concerned, I think that gay and lesbian issues should be addressed in the sex education classes. I do not think, however, that the issue should be a big to-do. There are more negative effects of implementing such a program than there are positive.

Even those who supported inclusion with less doubt and in somewhat more progressive terms did so by invoking sex education. As Susan, one who came the closest to explicitly favoring inclusion of LGB issues in the mainstream curriculum, argued:

Sex education, including the topic of sexuality should be included in the school curriculum. . . . I was in college before I knew that some of our most important intellectuals, artists, and advocates were homosexual. It has become

important to include the topic of sexual orientation in the curriculum now more than ever.

In sum, it seems that there are two discursive forces at work here. First, these pre-service teachers' religious habits build a silence around sex and sexuality. Second, the normalization of heterosexuality is structurally dependent upon the abnormalization of other sexual identities. One way that the "abnormality" of homosexuality is reinforced is through its connection to sex. Through this association the silence around sex reinscribes the invisibility of non-heterosexual people. In schools, this becomes a particularly powerful exclusionary tool since few of us are willing to argue that children, at least elementary school-aged children, need to talk about sex. Teacher educators must find more powerful "hitches" to overcome the discursive connections being made here. Turning the table and interrogating sex as the defining characteristic of heterosexual relationships may be one way.

Transactions for Some, the Hidden Curriculum, and the Two Mommies "Hitch"

In the previous sections, we sketched out a relation between some pre-service teachers' Christian identities, the heteronormative discourses that are a part of these identities, and the subjectivities that these discourses produce. These descriptions focused on how their subjectivities affect their interpretation of and interaction with notions around the issue of sexual orientation. The hitches to which we pointed in these examples were not recognized by or did not stand out as problematic for the pre-service teachers. Nevertheless, hitches became apparent to some upon further engagement with the topic by way of readings, a video, and class discussions. As Dewey pointed out, "Reflection arises because of the appearance of incompatible factors within the empirical situation. . . . Then opposed responses are provoked which cannot be taken simultaneously in overt action" (cited in Vanderstraeten & Biesta, 1998, p. 2).

The transactions that took place in these pre-service teachers' inquiries into sexual orientation were often quite subtle, not revealing much about potential future actions as a teacher. For example, Laura wrote:

From this assignment and from class and reading, I feel I have become more aware and open-minded about the issue of homosexuality in the classroom. I am planning to find ways to better educate myself on this topic, so that when I become a teacher my classroom will be a safe and happy environment for all my students.

Other students were somewhat more concrete in their responses. Part of the inquiry that they had not foreseen and that later seemed especially to move them was the fact that they may come across in their teaching a student

605 who happens to have gay or lesbian parents. This situation forced them to reexamine a number of issues, including the heterosexist connection of homosexuality to sex and heterosexuality to relationship and family and the justice (or lack thereof) in disallowing such a student to see her family represented in her school curriculum. As Maria observed:

615 I think students (children) do have the right to see their family reflected in their curriculum. Young children have enough problems to deal with at school, besides worrying about if they are going to be accepted by other students because they have gay or lesbian parents.

620 Even several of the students who took extremely conservative positions initially responded to the scenario of a child with gay or lesbian parents. Recall Sarah who stated that she believes "what the Bible says about homosexuality." While reaffirming this belief in her second paper, Sarah also pointed out:

625 [E]ven though I disagree with homosexuality, I still believe in equal rights and privileges for all people. This includes equal representation in schools. I think students should be exposed to all types of people. They should be able to see their family structure represented in the curriculum, whatever that family structure may be.

630 Thus, this particular scenario seemed to move pre-service teachers towards "inclusion" in a more progressive sense than sex education.

635 This is not to say, however, that this scenario moved all students to the same degree. Some were not moved at all and simply restated a nebulous position to treat all students equally. This usually meant providing them with "the same education as everyone else." It also tended to mean that they were not inclined to include LGB issues in the curriculum (outside of sex education—if even there).

640 Other students took more or less middle positions, trying to demonstrate tolerance (despite their heterosexism) while simultaneously trying to keep homosexuality (as a classroom issue) at bay. Beth, for example, was adamant that in her elementary classroom she would "not plan a lesson about homosexuality." However, she continued, "If a student says they have two mommies or daddies, that is no problem and I will act as if there is nothing wrong with that and encourage the child to be proud that she has two adults to love her so much." But then, she needed to insist, "My classroom will not have text dealing with the subject."

Not too differently, Stephen remarked:

655 I feel that if you have a child with homosexual parents, then you should have material made available to that child, so that they can find books (or other materials) that they can relate to. I do feel that those children do need something that they can relate to and that it may be

my job to provide that for them. However, overall, I do not feel that I should openly display LGB books because then I am assumed to agree with homosexuality.

660

In sum, the scenario of a child with two mommies or daddies seemed to change the nature of the "object" of their inquiry, sexual orientation. The "object" was instead a child, a "real" reason to have to consider how and why one might have to include (confront?) LGB themes in the curriculum. Given the heterosexist position that sexuality has nothing to do with elementary age students' lives anyway, many of the pre-service teachers were unable to justify doing so in the elementary curriculum otherwise.

665

Another valuable lesson of this scenario was that it shed some light on the hidden curriculum of heteronormativity and made glaring the impact it could have on a child of same-sex parents. As Tammy pointed out, "It is seen in every classroom that you walk into. [T]here are posters and things hanging up all around the room that portray families that include a mom, dad, and child. That would be unfair for children who have different families." Linda continued this line of thought:

670

675

[H]eterosexuality as well as homosexuality is taught in our schools. It is part of the hidden curriculum. Generally, children learn that heterosexuality is normal (or moral) and that homosexuality is abnormal (or immoral). Teachers must take a moral democratic stand . . . on these issues . . . If these issues are going to be covertly taught anyway, why not do it on the up-and-up?

680

685

While these students became quite aware of the hidden curriculum, a few others still could not find it. Lisa, for example, did not change her position at all, remarking:

I think that a teacher should stay out of those topics [LGB-related ones] because it is such a moral issue and teachers do not need to impart their morals on their students . . . I also think that teachers should keep their own sexual preference to themselves because by telling students what their preference is, they are indirectly influencing the students.

690

695

Lisa also raised this position in a class discussion and when asked by another student if any of her teachers had every talked about their husbands or wives and what they did on the weekend. Lisa, completely unaware of where her classmate was leading her, responded "Yeah."

700

"Well," continued Lisa's classmate, "You just said she shouldn't have done that."

"No . . . Well, yeah I guess."

"Well, so, should she also have to take family pictures off her desk or remove her wedding ring? I mean that's the whole thing about the hidden curriculum that Dr. Petrovic was explaining."

705

"I just don't think they should tell students directly."

710 "Well, you can't..." [At this point, Lisa's classmate shook her hand in the air dismissively and gave up on the conversation.]

715 Perhaps with a little more work Lisa could have come to recognize her subjective position and the way it leads her to take as unproblematic the workings of the hidden curriculum. Unlike with some other students, however, we doubt simple exposure to such hitches will ever be more powerful than the heteronormative discourses and habits that so thoroughly constitute the subjectivity of students like Lisa. What will be needed in addition to this is sustained exposure to alternative discourses.

SUMMARY AND THE "HITCHING" QUESTIONS IN AN ALTERNATIVE DISCOURSE

725 Overall the responses of the pre-service teachers to the questions asked by Petrovic suggest that they will be likely to promote heteronormativity in their classrooms. Their justifications for these practices stem from religious habits of thinking and feeling that dictate engagement in heteronormative practices. It is important to understand these habits and practices. It is also important to respect them as having their own socio-cultural value to these subjects. However, as teacher educators we need, as Dewey encourages us, to "forcibly place before" pre-service teachers the [mandatory] opportunity to reflect on notions that challenge their own positionality, especially when it is exclusionary, as with the case of heteronormativity.

735 We need to provide pre-service teachers the opportunities to rework their habits of subjectivity in ways that are consistent with their most inclusive impulses. Only then can they begin to make their classrooms hospitable to LGB youth and their families. We must try to move students, especially those with religious convictions anathematic to LGB youth, to positions that allow them to remain true to their own convictions while doing no harm to and serving the needs of LGB youth.

740 As the one thing that all of these pre-service teachers agreed on, regardless of their adherence otherwise to heteronormative positions, the necessity to stop student harassment, including both verbal and physical violence, may provide the best starting point from which to challenge heteronormative subjectivities and habits. We must not allow teachers to end at violence prevention. As teacher educators, we must provide future teachers opportunities to analyze the discursive practices that give license to the violence they seem to disdain. A mere but important starting point, violence prevention does not provide a hitch to help students analyze heterosexism.

750 We have tried to identify such hitches; for Dewey was surely right when he asserted that reflection upon one's habits is provoked when there is a hitch in its workings.

Many of these pre-service teachers saw a problem with taking religious positions in schools in front of their students. On the one hand, despite what their religious subjectivities might dictate, they felt a need to not speak out against homosexuality. For another part of their subjectivity has been constituted by some sense of "live and let live" justice or the golden rule. On the other hand, very few would speak up for non-heterosexual identities as just other (acceptable) ways of being. Teacher educators might ask their students what role silence plays in the golden rule. Is silence consistent with the golden rule in its richest sense? Is silence around the lives and experiences of an entire group of our fellow citizens really "doing unto others?" Might silence be implicit endorsement of violence? And even if it is not seen as "endorsement" of violence per se, does silence help to attenuate violence?

Of course, as we saw, the silence was in some cases not complete. Discussing LGB issues in sex education was somewhat defensible to our participants. But recall that for many this occurred through the equating of homosexuality with sex. Thus, these pre-service teachers could rid themselves of the entire issue by dumping it into sex education. Thus, they found what, from their subjective positions, is a compromise. One side of the "compromise" is the exclusion of LGB themes from the mainstream curriculum. The other side of the compromise is the inclusion of LGB themes in sex education classes. Indeed, in sex education classes they could (albeit half-heartedly for many) defend neutral discussion of LGB issues. This compromise is, however, built from the same habitual subjectivity of heteronormativity, the discursive space that these pre-service teachers occupy. As such, the two sides of this compromise are sides of the same coin. The "compromise" perpetuates the status quo by marginalizing LGB issues (and thus LGB youth). It does so by keeping LGB issues in the sex education closet and by perpetuating the hidden curriculum of connecting gay and lesbian people to sex. Is having a bed partner the defining characteristic of heterosexual relationships? If so, why do we talk about or illustrate heterosexuality in terms of family, stability, love, and commitment? Might it not be possible that non-heterosexual relationships share the same characteristics? Further, if we are to follow the golden rule, should the source of one's sexual identity (i.e., if one takes an essentialist or constructionist position) even matter?

Only by engaging pre-service teachers in dialogue about LGB issues that addresses the malignant silences, as well as the explicitly espoused bigotry in their thinking about the issues, will we have teachers who can provide spaces for LGB youth and their families to flourish in schools. This will mean addressing heterosexism among pre-service teachers as deeply inscribed habits of feeling and thinking shaped by broad discourse habits. It will mean challenging those discourses by providing alternative discourses, perhaps through engagement with the

820 questions we have raised, and enlisting student teachers
in that challenge as well.

825 We have argued that all identities are constituted by
a number of habits that are shaped by the discourses in
which a person lives. This article, we hope, has provided
initial insight into the habits that define the subjective po-
830 sitions of some pre-service teachers. Only by thoroughly
understanding the discursive practices that shape the
heterosexual identities of these subjects can we begin to
identify genuine hitches that result in transactions that
contest the exclusionary conditions of their heteronorm-
835 ative subjectivities. In this vein, we have tried to begin
a discussion, through the questions we have raised about
ways to shape an anti-heterosexist discourse. The over-
all effectiveness of providing an alternative discourse,
the effectiveness of the specific questions we raised to
shape that discourse, and the minimum depth or length
of such engagement are all topics for future research.

NOTES

1. We should make clear here that we intend no implication that all Christian religious discourse is heterosexist.
2. All names used are pseudonyms.
3. Note that while "homophobia" is a somewhat different notion, Jagose's claim applies to heterosexism equally well.

840 REFERENCES

Bickmore, K. (1999). Why discuss sexuality in elementary school? In W. Letts & J. Sears (Eds.), *Queering elementary education: Advancing the dialogue about sexualities and schooling* (pp. 15-25). New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

845 Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. New York: Routledge.

Casper, V., Cuffaro, H. K., Schultz, S., Silin, J. G., & Wickens, E. (1996). Toward a most thorough understanding of the world: Sexual orientation and early childhood education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(2), 271-293.

850 Chasnoff, D., & Cohen, H. (Producers). (1996). It's elementary: Talking about gay issues in schools [motion picture]. San Francisco: Women's Educational Media.

855 Dewey, J. (1902). The school as a social center. *Addresses and Proceedings of the National Education Association of the United States* (pp. 373-383). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Essays in experimental logic*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

860 Dewey, J. (1922). *Human nature and conduct: An introduction to social psychology*. New York: Henry Holt.

Dewey, J. (1925). *Experience and nature*. Chicago: Open Court.

Dolores, M., & Cain, R. E. (1997). Preservice elementary teachers' attitudes toward gay and lesbian parenting. *Journal of School Health*, 67(6), 236-242.

865 Elze, D. (1992). It has nothing to do with me. In W. J. Blumenfeld (Ed.), *Homophobia: How we all pay the price* (pp. 95-113). Boston: Beacon.

Jagose, A. (1996). *Queer theory: An introduction*. New York: New York University Press. 870

Letts, W. (1999). How to make "boys" and "girls" in the classroom: The heteronormative nature of elementary-school science. In W. Letts & J. Sears (Eds.), *Queering elementary education: Advancing the dialogue about sexualities and schooling* (pp. 97-110). New York: Rowman & Littlefield. 875

Lipkin, A. (1995). The case for a gay and lesbian curriculum. In G. Unks (Ed.), *The gay teen* (pp. 31-52). New York: Routledge. 880

Martino, W. (1999). It's okay to be gay: Interrupting straight thinking in the English classroom. In W. Letts & J. Sears (Eds.), *Queering elementary education: Advancing the dialogue about sexualities and schooling* (pp. 137-150). New York: Rowman & Littlefield. 885

O'Connor, A. (1994). Who gets called queer in school? Lesbian, gay, and bisexual teenagers, homophobia and high school. *The High School Journal*, 77(1&2), 7-12.

Petrovic, J. E. (1999). Moral democratic education and homosexuality: Censoring morality. *Journal of Moral Education*, 28(2), 43-56. 890

Rubin, S. A. (1995). *Children who grow up with gay and lesbian parents: How are today's schools meeting this "invisible" group's needs?* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison. 895

San Chee, Y. (1997). Toward social constructivism: Changing the culture of learning in schools. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Computers in Education [On-line]*. Charlottesville, VA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education. Available: <http://www.comp.nus.edu.sg/~cheeys/Publications/1997/ICCE1997Chee.pdf> 900

Sears, J. T. (1992). Personal feelings and professional attitudes of prospective teachers toward homosexuality and homosexual students: Research findings and curriculum recommendations. In K. M. Harbeck (Ed.), *Coming out of the classroom closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers, and curricula* (pp. 29-79). New York: Haworth Press. 905

Sleeper, R. W. (1986). *The necessity of pragmatism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. 910

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, & Winston.

Sullivan, S. (2001). *Living in and through skins: Transactional bodies, pragmatism, and feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. 915

Vanderstraeten, R., & Biesta, G. (1998). Constructivism, educational research, and John Dewey [On-line]. Available: <http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Amer/AmerVand.html>

John Petrovic is an assistant professor in the Social, Historical, and Philosophical Foundations of Education at The University of Alabama. His current work involves radical applications of the liberal democratic tradition to educational policy, especially around language minority and gay/lesbian issues.

Jerry Rosiek is an assistant professor of educational research at The University of Alabama. His current interests include the semiotics of teachers' practical knowledge and the use of narrative modes of representation in teacher education scholarship.