PART III
Creating Multicultural Classrooms

Reflecting on Meaning: Crafting Visual Metaphors on Whiteness

Colette Gosselin
The College of New Jersey

... home is the birthplace of memory but I’m wondering if it’s too late for us, almost?

How’re we gonna dig out the old memories and replace them with new?

—“Foxfire” by Joyce Carol Oats

Introduction

Teaching a course in multicultural education at a largely white, middle-class, suburban liberal arts college has its challenges. Among those challenges is a prevailing naivety among the student population regarding the role sociocultural structures have in creating the kinds of opportunities that afford social privileges; likewise, the students are “blind” to structures that hinder access to resources essential to academic achievement (Conchas, 2006; Howard, 2008; Lopez, 2002; Valdes, 1996). As a result of this blindness, my students typically attribute their educational success to personal effort and envision that others have had similar chances to succeed. For some, the course serves as an eye opener that engenders a growing awareness of social inequities as they begin to construct a nascent understanding of their privileged social position (Gosselin, 2009). Others cling to their meritocratic beliefs about opportunities, remain steadfast in their deficiency explanations for school failure, or simply remain unconvinced of the role social structures play in achievement.

Since the 1990s, multicultural educators (Cochran–Smith, 1991; Delpit, 1995; Gay, 2002; Ladson–Billings, 1994, 2001; Nieto, 2005) have asserted the importance of understanding the role sociocultural context plays in constructing one’s values and beliefs and how the development of this understanding can enhance teachers’ abilities to be effective among diverse student populations. More recent literature in multicultural education (Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, & Haviland, 2009; Gay 2010; Schussler, Stocksbury, & Bercaw, 2010; Villagas, 2007) has focused on the relationship between teacher candidate dispositions and the adoption of multiple perspectives and strategies that improve teacher effectiveness. For example, Schussler et al. (2010) examined teacher candidates’ attitudes, actions, and worldviews in journal entries in connection to the kinds of pedagogical choices teacher candidates make. Using a heuristic framework that drew on three dispositional domains—intellectual, cultural, and moral—their results indicated that teacher candidates who possessed the greatest capacity to evaluate their own assumptions were more likely to question their own thinking and actions and therefore better able to adopt multiple perspectives.

The multicultural education course I teach is offered to sophomore undergraduates in a secondary-education program. The sophomores have not yet taken methods courses nor have they been placed in a secondary-school classroom in a teaching capacity. In fact, this is their
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first opportunity to discuss life in classrooms from the perspective of future teachers. While theoretical case studies have shown to be useful tools for examining the context of teaching in this course, I have also found that theoretical work tends to yield a different result than reflections on real world practice, i.e., a tense, visceral reaction, especially towards the issue of white privilege. Race talk frequently raises much angst among white teacher candidates as the Buehler et al. (2009) study on race, emotions, and cultural competence reveals. These authors found that despite their candidates’ emergent cultural competence, their beginning teachers needed assistance in normalizing the feelings that surface as they wrestled with deeply embedded beliefs. Consequently, in my course I wanted an alternative and novel approach other than discussion to capture the rich microcosm of my students’ individual realities that would uncover their worldviews on race and white privilege. I decided on visual metaphors as I thought this approach would be a reliable yet less heated medium that would aptly capture their authentic beliefs. Further, as other research has shown, metaphors can lead students to self discovery and subsequent recreation of their paradigmatic explanations of the “goings on” in classrooms (Bullough & Stokes, 1994; Johnson, 2002).

Why Use Metaphors as a Tool?

Metaphors can be powerful tools to draw out internal realities as they are one way that people condense their understandings. They are central to how people construct their narratives and consequently how they organize their behaviors. They are so pervasive in our everyday lives that Lakoff and Johnson (1980) contend that our “conceptual system in terms of which we both think and act is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (p. 3). It is in our conceptual systems that we establish meanings that have been both acquired and confirmed in our daily experiences. Dewey (1933) tells us that we act on these confirmed meanings “with assurance as an instrumentality of understanding” (p. 149) as we draw upon them to explain things that remain perplexing. When new social contexts arise, our concepts also serve as our “standards of reference” from which we generalize from one thing to another. Subsequently, we unconsciously construct new knowledge and reshape our habits of thought within the meanings and discourses that have been already confirmed in our conceptual system (Dewey, 1933).

As figurative expressions, metaphors can serve as powerful instigators of doubt. By depicting uninterrogated beliefs in more tangible forms, metaphors engender the potential of exposing hidden beliefs, meanings, and the discourses in which they are constructed. In teacher education, this is especially critical as beliefs guide our classroom practices—curricula conceptual frameworks and the resources that inform them, pedagogical choices, assessment design, and most importantly, our interactions with students. By uncovering the hidden patterns of thought that guide our actions in classrooms, we can think more deliberately and become critically reflective about our practices and the implications these have on student learning.

Therefore, course assignments that draw upon metaphors can serve as authentic pedagogical tools that challenge the dilemmas we encounter when we attempt to jar our students’ beliefs. Through metaphoric expressions, students can unconsciously express their implicit beliefs as well as reveal their tendencies to misinterpret information preened from coursework and experiences at field sites that are intended to confront their assumptions and presuppositions about teaching and learning (Kegan, 1992). The three studies below explain how metaphors serve to promote inquiry, self-awareness, and growth in teacher candidates.

By uncovering the hidden patterns of thought that guide our actions in classrooms, we can think more deliberately and become critically reflective about our practices and the implications these have on student learning.

Bullough and Stokes (1994) illustrate how metaphors can be used to conceptualize the work of teachers. In their study, secondary-education students chose metaphors of teaching to capture themes and images that surfaced in their educational autobiographies as they journaled throughout a field-based course. At critical points, students revisited their metaphors, sometimes expressing relief at discovering their subject-knowledge competency. At other times they were discouraged by their inability to enact the idyllic beliefs about teaching that their metaphors represented. As the students continued journaling about events they encountered in their fieldwork, some began to recognize the naïveté of their original metaphors. This realization led to the crafting of more plausible metaphor variations, such as “teacher as artisan” in the journal entries. As a reconstructed image, the new metaphor illustrated not only the cognitive shift that may have occurred in the students’ conceptual system but also served as a means of making that shift concretely visible to the student.
Johnson’s 2002 study offers a novel model for using visual depictions to draw out uninterrogated classroom beliefs that student teachers have themselves showcased. In this research, secondary-school student teachers constructed a picture book comprised of both drawings and narratives about some aspect of their prior practicum experiences in secondary schools. These picture books, which resembled comic book-like caricatures replete with dialogue balloons and backdrops, formed the basis for audio-taped interviews that invited student teachers to critically interrogate their own visuals and narratives which served to interrupt their “taken-for-grantedness” or uninterrogated beliefs about schooling practices as they listened to their voices offer explanations of classroom dynamics.

Last, Weber and Mitchell (1996) describe a course assignment that asks preservice teachers to draw a portrait of “teacher” with the purpose of revealing how childhood memories form social stereotypes about teachers and how these images have shaped their emergent teacher identities. While free to draw on any image of teacher they wanted to depict, many of the students chose to represent themselves in an ideal projection within traditional classrooms, replete with signifiers such as blackboards, erasers, books, and apples, as well as conventional representations of shapeless teachers in skirts and hair buns. Asked to reflect on these images, the preservice teachers could identify the influence past and present experiences had on their images as well as how social stereotypes reified those images. Reporting feeling “jolted” by the depictions they drew, the preservice teachers began to express the ambivalent feelings that subsequently surfaced as they encountered and faced the dominant discourses embedded in their portraits.

Encouraged by the possibility that my students own work might serve to “jolt” their reasoning about white privilege, I created the following assignment for two sophomore classes:

*Think* about what whiteness means to you. What images or mental pictures emerge as you consider the ramifications of whiteness with respect to your own social position? *Draw* a visual metaphor that represents this understanding. Then *write* a short narrative that fully articulates the meaning of the metaphor to the reader.

Initially my intention in this assignment was to uncover how our discussions on racism, specifically those on white privilege, were influencing my students’ conceptual understanding of a topic that fueled so much discomfort. Their representations proved to be creative, exciting, and unusual in breadth and led me to interview a few selected students. Below I recount the results of the interviews with two female teacher candidates whose metaphors and voices raise new questions about self-awareness and its possible impact on beginning teacher effectiveness in diverse settings.¹

**Jenn: The Jigsaw Puzzle**

The first time I was conscious of it (race) was in our class, because we were talking about it.

Jenn’s visual metaphor depicts an identity negotiated between Chinese and American influences. Her representation is complex as it includes a white background (signifying white culture) of puzzle pieces, which dominates her identity, with black and red letters that spell whiteness and Chinese, respectively. Some red letters are overlaid onto black ones, while other red ones are discarded as they cannot wedge in. Empty spaces in the word whiteness and in the white background are characterized as black spaces.

**Jenn’s Narrative**

“The jigsaw puzzle represents my world, each piece symbolizing the different aspects of life, society, and culture. The pattern of the puzzle itself has been carved according to the rules of the dominant, white society, but the pieces are my own. Many of the puzzle pieces have been put into place and fit perfectly within the puzzle. This illustrates how some aspects, I would say even the majority, of my worldview align with white culture. However, there are some aspects of my life, particularly my Chinese culture, that do not fit into the white mold. Some pieces are a forced fit, depicted by the letters that correspond in both words “whiteness” and “Chinese.” Their shapes resemble each other, but there is not complete harmony between the space and the pieces. These letters are placed in the mold, but they feel the pressure of the white culture because they do not exactly fit. However, the longer they are fitted into the shape, the less pressure they feel because it has become their new conformation . . . There are other pieces of my life that will not fit in at all, like the extra-large letters that have no place in the puzzle. They are distinctly different from white culture and there is no place for them to fit in. I am not sure if these pieces will be eventually discarded or continue to sit off at the side or if a space will open up where they could fit. There are also several aspects of whiteness that I do not have, as indicated by the missing pieces, [as] there are some aspects of white culture that I will never be able to assimilate, for example, my appearance.”
Biographical Discussion

Born, raised, and married in Malaysia, Jenn’s parents immigrated after college and began their own family in the United States. Isolated from extended family and the greater Chinese community, Jenn, her three siblings, and her stay-at-home mom formed a close family framed by traditional Chinese values. While her siblings served as playmates and companions prior to school, Jenn formed only one close friendship with a neighborhood girl with whom she had attended kindergarten. In the interview, Jenn attributed her “lack” of friendships outside the family to her shy and introverted personality. Despite our weekly class discussions of case studies and ethnographies that revealed tensions between dominant and minority culture, Jenn did not consider cultural difference to be a mitigating factor in her ability to make friends as a child nor did she consider that middle-class, white families in her community might have viewed neighborhood and playground friendships as preparation for schooling where their children would be expected to make friends quickly and easily. In retrospect, Jenn also did not question her shyness as a label constructed by others or by social expectations of neighborhood peers who seemed more easily engaged in play (Valdes, 1996). However, in elementary school, Jenn said she did become aware of cultural differences; specifically, she mentioned common values and interests. Focused more on learning than many of her peers, Jenn met the “model minority” expectations of her teachers and as a well-behaved girl was frequently labeled as a teacher’s pet. She explained that this aggravated her ability to make new friends. As a result, Jenn found herself developing friendships primarily with the few minority “outcast” students. However, despite Jenn’s acknowledgement that cultural differences did in fact impact friendship formation, Jenn continued to assert throughout the interview that she never felt she experienced discrimination. Rather, as the interview progressed, she continued to attribute her ongoing struggle with friendships to the absence of common interests, especially in pop culture. Jenn describes her
experience in middle school, writing, “[I] found [myself] trying to become interested in pop culture. I remember trying to watch the music videos but it never really appealed to me so I thought this was silly; by high school I didn’t care.” Choosing a different social end, Jenn added that some of her friends were drawn to pop culture and were desirous of climbing the social ladder, an interest she simply didn’t share. She described her high school attitudes toward schoolwork as “enjoying learning and acquiring new knowledge for its own sake.” This disposition describes not only her current attitude as a biology major but also her theory of friendship building. To her, friendship building is a natural outgrowth of common interests and goals:

The older we get the more you see people as they are; your in-crowd gets smaller and smaller. It’s natural; as you get older and know yourself; there will be fewer people who will share [your] values . . . it’s not right or wrong. The same thing happens at college I gravitated to a pool of friends who are members of a Christian campus group . . . again [we] share the same set of values.

Emphasizing that she identifies with her Christian values more strongly than with her Chinese culture or science interests, she also explained that:

A lot of who I am is my faith background. I have a small core of close friends . . . you can’t invest a lot of yourself in a large group; my closest group of friends are not Chinese or in the sciences but are friends made largely in Intervarsity Christian Fellowship at the college.

Jenn’s understanding that friendships arise out of the natural condition of common interests is a recurring theme she draws from to explain outcomes of social relationships. She does not question schooling practices that sort students academically, nor does she question how the school sorting process may have impacted the values and interests she has forged and the subsequent friendships she gravitated toward or was excluded from. She illustrates friendship formation not in terms of sociocultural interaction structures but rather in terms of personal shared interest and value priorities. Yet, she contradicts her theory of friendship when she refers to her ability to fit in:

Because of what being Asian is, it does not mesh a lot of time with what [they] would choose in their friends, you don’t hang out with people that you don’t understand or don’t enjoy company with. Being who they are doesn’t fit that description.

Jenn’s firm acceptance of friendship building as a natural outcome prevents her from considering the implications race has played as a social structure despite her keen observation that race has definitely played a role in forming friends at her high school. More importantly, she clings to her belief that despite her metaphor and the stories she has recounted she does not feel different from white America and cannot name any deliberate effort to exclude her based on race.

In e-mail exchanges months after the interview, Jenn maintained her position that race has not played a significant role in friendship formation. She says:

I’m not sure I would say ‘despite my experiences’ because I think that my experiences are what led me to this conclusion. I believe that friendships have formed more out of common interests. While of course race has been an influence, it’s more a secondary influence. I have not had an experience where I think that my race has been a primary influencing factor in affecting my relationships. I think that I can still have a strong sense of my cultural identity without it becoming a primary influence on the decisions and choices I make regarding the relationships that I make.

At this point in time, Jenn referred back to her theory of personal common interests and downplayed the role race as a social structure may have played in friendship formation in schools. She neither questioned the relationship between race and ethnicity nor did she define this as a socially constructed problem. Instead, she situated her explanation within a personal and family paradigm.

Given that family membership is central to identity construction in Chinese cultures, this aspect of Jenn’s identity is best represented in her metaphor as one of those red letters cast outside of her puzzle. Emphasizing the role family played in constructing her identity prior to and during schooling, Jenn said that:

Personality-wise, when you are the minority, you are most culturally a minority before you enter school because you are with your family . . . so that is the only culture you know . . . we didn’t know much about pop culture . . . because we were a racial minority, but also because of our Christian heritage. I believe my parents chose not to expose us to secular pop culture.

In the interview, I commented to Jenn that her identity illustrated to me “ethnic identity as a negotiated border crossing.” In response to my comment, she did not consider that possibility and again turned away from examining the implications of racism by replying: “I’ve never seen it as border crossing . . . I’ve just seen it as being me.” In asserting herself as a successfully assimilated Chinese American, she returned to feeling . . . assimilated into American culture . . . there’s such a huge picture of what you can do . . . America is a blending of all of these cultures . . . I do take a lot of pride in being Asian, my parents’ mindset is that of being Asian, their
mindset is this knowing of being Chinese. But my father wants us to remember that we are Chinese and be proud of that. I am proud of being Chinese.

As the interview ended, I tried to return to the impact that Jenn’s field experience in a school that boasted a 30% Asian-American population may have had in reshaping her metaphor. She hesitated, mulled over it briefly and replied that its meaning “has become more generalized.” She didn’t expand on what she meant by generalized. We had run out of time. But I wondered if she meant that her metaphor had simply been affirmed or if she thought it applied to the other Asian-American cultures—Korean, Indian, Pakistani—she had encountered in her field placement.

**Denise: The Glass Ceiling**

I was brought up in an education of questioning things and being more critical of my background.

Denise’s mental tape of racism is represented by a glass ceiling that denotes the constant struggle experienced by people of color and members of the working class who live in a society that perceives itself to be a meritocracy.

**Denise’s Narrative**

“When this project was assigned I knew that my drawing would have to be glass between “me” and “they.” “They” represents anyone who is not white or middle class like I am . . . I made the ceiling glass to represent the constant struggle of people of color and the lower class to get ahead in a society that is suppose[d] to be a meritocracy. They can see where they want to be but most will never get there. At first, I thought on making the glass just a wall separating me from those who are different, because I feel so separated from them, literally and figuratively. But I chose to make a glass ceiling because it represents the advantage I have because I am
white and middle class. The reflection that you see in the glass represents my own self-reflection that has been spurred in this course. I have been forced to look at myself and why I make judgments and generalizations about people based on race or social standing . . . they” have no faces because I have not, as yet, been able to see people as individual without immediately passing judgment. It reflects my difficulty seeing people as individuals instead of stock representative of their race or social class. If there is a race problem [I tend to see it as] “their problem instead of looking at causes of unemployment; “they” need to get a job; instead of accepting new culture, “they” need to speak English . . . Although I want to change, I find it difficult to reach out into other cultures for fear of saying something offensive without knowing it, so I am at a stalemate, represented by my hands behind my back . . .”

**Biographical Discussion**

Raised by second generation Italian parents, Denise described race as a “hot topic” that surfaced during holiday meals. Referencing one specific conversation about the time her sister was dating an African American boy, she explains how her family’s racism became etched in her thinking:

[M]y sister was dating a black kid and that didn’t fly . . . he was a fantastic guy and then she dated this other kid who was not good for her . . . but my parents were more accepting of him than this really fantastic person. My grandparents wouldn’t tolerate interracial dating.

Struggling with a mental tape etched from home experiences and media messages, Denise’s interview focused not on her white racial identity but rather on self-development, an endeavor she surmises to be a generational undertaking—each generation becoming more tolerant with new knowledge and experiences. To Denise, knowledge and experience are the basis of change. For her, knowledge is not accepted as given and inevitable or as a natural result of interactions, but rather out of deliberation.

Despite her close family ties, Denise states that she is determined to “correct” her upbringing. Offering more insight into family dynamics, she explained: “When I talk to my mother she’s uncomfortable about questioning things . . . whether its religion or other things; I see this as a fault that I want to correct in myself.”

In tracing her quest for self-improvement, Denise started musing about college courses that exposed her to new perspectives. But as the conversation continued, she began to recollect a series of memories: conversations with liberal teachers with whom she felt safe verbalizing her beliefs, and a family priest whose racism alerted her to the contradictions she identified in her faith. As her memory unfolded, she recalled pivotal friendships, an insightful boyfriend, rebellious friends who dated outside their race, and her friends’ parents who seemed to share her beliefs in equality.

As the interview shifted to the metaphor, Denise first referenced a recent conversation with a female classmate who planned to pursue medicine. She emphasized the additional hurdles women face in the marketplace, the need to be “extra professional, less emotional, a standard we have to live up to so that we can become equals.”

To her, the glass ceiling in her metaphor must now encompass a series of ceilings that acknowledge barriers to race and gender. She states, “If I were breaking it down it would have black women on the bottom . . . I’m not the top of the food chain . . . we all take advantage of things that we can benefit from . . . women benefit from affirmative action.” Struggling with competing “–isms,” she continues, “It’s hard to say what’s right, about who should receive affirmative action. Should you sacrifice yourself as a woman to give up affirmative action for a person of color?”

While her metaphor has now extended to include gender, Denise still described her hands tied behind her back. She confessed “that’s still going on . . . how do you conquer that problem?” She described feeling fake whenever she attempted some kind of affirmative action, “wanting to feel more natural” about her choices, and raised an essential question:

How do you make something more natural when it’s not something you normally do? A lot of times I feel that when something is uncomfortable then it must be fake. So, I tell myself, I’m being fake, when it’s really about not wanting to go out of your comfort zone.

From her junior practicum, Denise discovered that she needs to:

stop assuming that there is so much difference between myself and the students that I teach . . . that there’s more cultural differences that needs to be negotiated. There is a cultural difference and we saw some of the differences about what they don’t know . . . about prior knowledge . . . there was a reference to Eden . . . some of the Middle Eastern students who don’t have that frame of reference . . . oh, some people don’t know about that . . . it was eye-opening that there are some cultural or religious differences but that doesn’t mean we couldn’t have conversations or understand each other. I don’t know why I build up this whole thing that there’s got to be these differences . . .

Looking back to her own spiraling development and the role questioning has played in that development,
Denise envisions the pivotal role she can play in her students’ lives:

I want to introduce literature; you have very easy access to these issues and get the ball rolling. I can start the questioning process . . . knowing why you believe the things that you do, think about the ways you think about things, having a classroom of questioning, of critical thought.

She believes this approach to be especially critical in homogeneous classrooms where:

... there is no one to complicate issues and make it productive.” [It’s hard to imagine] what can I learn from someone who is the same as me; we benefit more from hearing other points of view. If you’re not actively questioning then you feel guilty (about privilege) and you don’t know why; it might not even been guilt, but just the discomfort of knowing that you might have been able to do something but didn’t.

Unlike Jenn who considers change as naturally occurring and downplays the direct impact racism has had on her life, Denise engages questioning, is cognizant of the racism in her family and its place in her own mental tape, and is actively engaged in confronting the powerful images that she acknowledges need “correcting.” In addition, Denise has begun to expand her awareness of dominance from race to gender. She positions herself inside a complex hierarchy of power in which she is neither at the bottom nor at “the top of the food chain.” Furthermore, she views her role as a teacher to be that of facilitator of inquiry and recognizes this as pivotal for future generations.

Summary

What implications do Jenn’s and Denise’s very different theories about how we interact with experience have on their future effectiveness as teachers? How will their personal conceptual lenses shape the way they query about puzzling classroom situations, student failure, and disruptive interactions that occur in the classrooms in which they will teach? Will each be able to effectively evaluate the nature of a classroom problem before determining their course of action? I have confidence in Denise’s preparedness to look beyond surface explanations but possess concerns about Jenn who, despite her commitment to becoming a good teacher, seems to turn a blind eye to the social exigencies within her own life. I fear that she may attribute her students’ academic failure to lack of effort, desire, or intellectual capacity; that she will overlook the social exigencies they may face in their own lives, in her classroom, in public schools, and that she may eventually succumb to prevailing teacher workroom talk which dismisses students’ social circumstances. I wonder if there will come a time when she will reconsider the role sociocultural context has played in her own life and, as a result, come to think differently about her students’ lives, as she comes face to face with their own personal stories—stories that might compel her to grapple with assumptions and cause her to question the taken-for-granted practices that turn a blind-eye to the realities of the students she encounters.

For me, this small study has brought deeper insight into my own practice as a teacher educator. First, I recognize on a deeper level that my teacher candidates are on their own developmental paths and this may pose frustrating obstacles as I attempt to nudge them along from more naïve perspectives to complex and dynamic social theories. As the interviews with Denise and Jenn reveal, Denise’s questioning of racism began in high school, if not earlier, while Jenn notes that this was the first time she became conscious of race because we were discussing it in class. So, while our course built on Denise’s preexisting inclination of questioning, this was the first time Jenn became conscious of race and privilege. Our class discussions may have nudged her or raised some unexpressed doubt, but students like Jenn will require a series of experiences if they are to reconstruct their conceptual lenses.

First, I recognize on a deeper level that my teacher candidates are on their own developmental paths and this may pose frustrating obstacles as I attempt to nudge them along from more naïve perspectives to complex and dynamic social theories.

Secondly, this work revealed to me that methods of instruction and assignments do not always reveal our students’ conceptual systems. Jenn’s metaphor is complex and conveys a sophisticated understanding of how she has created a blended yet tense identity constructed from forced cultural appropriations that sometimes left her feeling excluded. Yet it was only in the interviews that I was able to capture the degree to which she dismissed the role racism played in the construction of her identity. This has caused me to rethink how my approaches to sensitive issues need to be multilayered, complex, and ongoing if I
am to gain insight into how teacher candidates interpret their experiences.

Last, I turn to the degree of emotional labor this work entails, which can be both discouraging and draining. Progress is slow and at times I experience a sense of "failure" when my students resist delving deeper into their own belief systems. Yet this emotional burden must be shouldered if I desire to raise teacher candidates' critical awareness of the taken-for-granted realities in current school practices. Faced with an increasingly white teacher population who will teach in increasingly diverse classrooms, I don’t think we can afford to ignore this task if our commitment is to educate teacher candidates who are effective in diverse settings. Therefore, for my inspiration, I listen to Denise’s advice regarding the birthplace of memory and the role teacher educators have in its reconstruction. She nailed this need exactly when she turned to me in our conversation and offered these words of advice, “[i]f there is no one to complicate issues and make it productive” it’s hard to imagine “what [we can] learn . . .”

Notes

The metaphors, brief narratives, and biographical discussions were reviewed by both students for accuracy. Their responses and corrections were integrated into the final text of this manuscript.
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