Editorial: A New Department

William Bruneau

In seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe, when "scientific" journals were young, readers looked forward to reading tales of strange new lands, of creatures unknown to the "old" world, of new devices and methods for the discovery of knowledge. These items appeared in long "récits circonstanciés," what we might now call "contextualized research reports."

In this and later issues of *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation,* we would like to adopt something of this ancient practice. Our new department of "Research Notes and Correspondence/Notes de recherche et correspondence scientifique" provides space for forms of historical argument and discussion that do not fit the rubric of the classic "article." We have in mind to publish discussions about underutilized archives; to invite methodological enquiry and debate; to outline regions of historical investigation new to our community; to spur historiographical argument (and the present issue contains just such an argument); and to provide for constructive questioning of articles previously published in *HSE/RHE.* There may be still other ways this department may serve the interests of our community, and we invite our readers to suggest them.

Lucy Townsend and Elizabeth Johnson have opened up, in this current version of "Research Notes and Correspondence," discussion about developing traditions and practices among journals in the history of education. They pay special attention to three journals, and raise questions from a standpoint just now reaching the attention of many of our readers. The Townsend-Johnson enquiry might have quite different results if carried out in academic communities in Europe, North America, Africa, or Australasia. In Europe we know of regularly published journals in the history of education in France, Belgium, Germany (at least two), Austria, Switzerland, Poland, Sweden, Norway, the Netherlands, Italy (at least three), the United Kingdom (at least two, and probably several more depending on definition of terms), Spain (two at least)—and this European list is, we think, already out of date! One wonders what may be the result of analogous enquiries into European traditions and practices.

On another front, Campbell Ross discusses problems of argument he detected in an article published in fall 1995 in *HSE/RHE.*

Both research notes are, in one or more senses, about developing traditions and approaches in the history of education. We hope these first entries in our new department will encourage others to consider the meanings and future implications of publication practice among us all.

Life-Writing and Journals in the History of Education

Lucy Townsend
Elizabeth Johnson

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

At a recent conference for educational life-writers, there was lively discussion of journals that might welcome the results of research in our field. After all, we thought, a journal is the public voice for a community of scholars. When journal editors, with the assistance of the editorial board and/or peer reviewers, accept an essay for publication, they recognize the quality of the author's work and its relevance to the community's collective interests. Hence, the journal to some degree displays the community's dominant philosophical, aesthetic, and social values.[1] Two of us decided to make an inventory of journals likely to be interested in the life-writings of poststructuralist feminists. The results of our study may be useful to historians interested in historiography, academic discourse, academic societies, educational life-writing, and feminist post-structuralism.

We selected journals published in four different English-speaking nations. We chose *History of Education Quarterly (HEQ),* the organ of the History of Education Society (HES), from the United States, as it is reputed to be the most prestigious history-of-education journal in that country. We decided on *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation (HSE/RHE),* published by the Canadian History of Education Association/Association canadien de l'histoire de l'éducation (CHEA/ACHE), because it is recently established, and because new periodicals may be especially open to novel scholarship in ways older journals may not. We also thought it interesting to compare the work of our close neighbour with that of the United States. Finally, we chose *History of Education Review (HER),* published by the Australian and New Zealand History of Education Society (ANZHES). This journal is particularly valuable for our purpose since it provides evidence for a transcontinental comparison.

We limited our content analysis to a five-year period, 1990–95. During that time, the journals published 180 essays. *HEQ* (U.S.A.) offered the most, sixty-nine; *HER* (Australia/New Zealand) and *HSE/RHE* (Canada) published nearly as many, sixty-one and sixty, respectively.[2] We asked about the place of life-writing in each journal. We wondered, too, how many articles dealt with "non-elites," a collective term for individuals and groups usually considered ordinary, inferior, or powerless (for example, children of all classes, aboriginals, the

© *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* 8, no. 2 (1996): 212–225.

impoverished). Last, we wanted to know how receptive journals are to fresh methodologies and topics, and to a diversity of voices, including those of women, graduate students, and scholars from other nations.

We do not presume to be "objective."[3] With Daniel Lee Kleinman, we agree that scholars are neither omniscient nor omnipresent. "If we look at something from one place," Kleinman writes, "we cannot see it from others. Thus we cannot, by definition, be objective."[4] Although we may use "objective" methods, we reject the notion that asking questions, collecting "facts," analyzing them, and writing about the results can be entirely impartial. Instead, we assert that scholars' personal beliefs, class, gender, nationality, and race colour their work. Scholars whose discourse gives the impression that they are omniscient, omnipresent, impartial observers in one sense mislead the readers.

Our points of origin are those of white, middle-class American poststructuralist feminists. Feminists believe women are the equals of men and that women's lives, activities, and ideas are as significant as those of men. We view the human beings we study as subjects rather than objects, by which we mean that they partially create the world in which they live and are not completely dominated by powerful elites or social and political forces.[5] Poststructuralist feminists are interested in the development of human subjectivities, particularly individuals' conceptions of gender.

We see gender—like race, social class, and ethnicity—as "one of the great cleavages" dividing society. People on one side of the cleavage behave differently and have different opportunities from those on the other.[6] We view individual and societal conceptions of gender as neither natural nor static. Rather, in gender construction, individuals learn, establish, maintain, and reconstruct their gender in contrast to the "other." Human beings encounter dominant "storylines" (for example, choices related to schooling, sexual behaviour, employment) that grant males more privileges than females. Some individuals resist dominant storylines, creating new roles for themselves. Others "invest" themselves fully in their "given" roles.[7] Resistance and investment continue throughout a life span as the individual interprets and reinterprets texts, whether in written, oral, visual, or experiential forms.

Gender is not the only category of analysis. We understand self-conception as multiply constituted and shifting, with age, region, religion, race, and class contributing to individuals' social and political positioning. Poststructuralist feminists, concerned with the development and maintenance of subjectivities, base much of our research on people's life stories, including autobiographies, memoirs, letters, journals, and oral and written reminiscences. Our published work is often called educational life-writing, a broad category encompassing such forms as autobiography, individual biography, group biography, and

theoretical discussions "about the nature of human life as lived to bear on educational experience as lived."[8]

In conducting this study, we asked: Is our research likely to be published in history-of-education journals selected for this study? We reasoned that the percentage of life-writings about women in each journal might help to predict the journals' receptivity to our research. We also examined the discursive threads of life-writings in the journals, especially definitions of masculinity and femininity. Such an analysis illustrates the distinctive approach of post-structuralist feminists and at the same time reveals whether recent scholarship on women has influenced the work of the authors and of the editors and peer reviewers who evaluated their essays. This is one way to determine, at least in part, whether the persons representing the society through its journal know of and value recent scholarship on women.

COMPARISON OF JOURNAL CONTENTS

HEQ, established in 1949 by the HES and edited until the end of 1996 by B. Edward McClellan of Indiana University, has the largest circulation (1,800 subscriptions) of the three journals we analyzed. Nine articles (13 percent) of the sixty-nine published in *HEQ* from 1990 to 1995, are life-writings. These essays fall into two broad categories, individual and group biographies, all in similar format. Each begins with an argument explaining the significance of the study in terms of large movements in education, then places the study in historiographical context. Each then moves to a specific analysis of the historical events and concludes with a restatement of the argument, re-emphasizing its significance. Only three (33 percent) of these life-writings focus on non-elites.

As these figures indicate, life-writing is an insignificant feature of *HEQ,* and a majority of these few essays are about elites. In a telephone interview, McClellan stated that *HEQ* does not receive very many life-writings, and suggested that life-writings are out of style. He explained that social historians (who in his view dominate in HES) use a "bottoms-up" approach—that is, they explore large movements rather than individuals. These historians may see biography as elitist history.

However, McClellan stated that *HEQ* will publish life-writings if the authors begin each essay with a clearly stated argument; if they argue persuasively that the study is significant; if they link the lives (or individual life) to a movement and/or show how the lives are linked to a larger context; and if they demonstrate that the study reveals something important which educational historians have previously overlooked.[9]

We agree, as McClellan noted, that one reason many American social historians do not pursue life-writing is that they view life-writing as a celebration of the lives of privileged people. There is some basis for this view. The Library of Congress reported that during the first six months of 1990 American readers chose biographies over all other types of reading matter.[10] Most biographies were about political figures and celebrities. Meanwhile, a number of educational historians, particularly graduate students, are examining the educational experiences of non-elite individuals and groups and are using life-writings not only as major sources but also as forms for expressing their research results.

Whether they write on elites or non-elites, life-writers thus may have difficulty publishing their work in *HEQ*. Jeffrey Mirel, editorial board member and vice-president of HES, stated that some authors seem to assume that if they are interested in a topic, then surely it is important. Such authors, he said, need to convince him that their topic connects to something larger, "such as progressivism in New York or progressivism in general."[11] Significant historical "truth," according to Mirel, resides outside individuals and groups (that is, in large, sweeping movements), rather than in human subjectivities. The latter viewpoint has been pervasive for some time, according to Barbara Finkelstein, who found, in a study of articles published in *HEQ* between 1977 and 1987, only five biographical essays.

> With the exception of those studying women and children, the typical historian of education has been preoccupied with recovering the "hard surfaces of life," or tracing the origin and diffusion of ideas. They have analyzed the social structures and/or the philosophical environments in which people lead their lives, assuming that reformers somehow acted in response to these pressures. That is, historians have implicitly defined human motivation, action, achievement, and sensibility as utterly derivative. . . .[12]

Such historians would probably laugh at William Butler Yeats' well-known statement that "nothing exists but a stream of souls," that "all knowledge is biography."[13]

Life-writings may have only a small place in *HEQ*, but they appear often in *HER*, the journal with the next-largest circulation (350 subscribers). The organ of ANZHES, *HER* was founded in 1972 and titled the *ANZHES Journal*, the name it held until 1983. It is currently edited by Robert C. Petersen and Geoffrey Sherington of the University of Sydney. Between 1990 and spring 1995, *HER* published sixty-one articles, twenty-two (36 percent) of which are life-writings. This is more than twice the number in *HEQ*. Some two-thirds (fourteen, or 64 percent) of these essays feature non-elites. A distinctive feature of *HER* is its interest in children; four of the twenty-two life-writings explore their subjectivities and schooling.

Life-writings are also a prominent feature of the most recently established journal, the Canadian *HSE/RHE.* Founded at a conference hosted by the University of Calgary in 1988, its current editor-in-chief is William Bruneau of the University of British Columbia. The journal is designed to appeal both to English-speaking and Francophone scholars; hence, some articles and announcements are in French, and the journal has a French-language editor, Thérèse Hamel of Université Laval. *HSE/RHE* has around 250 subscribers. Between 1990 and spring 1995, *HSE/RHE* published sixty articles. Of these, twenty-two (37 percent) are life-writings. Most of these, nineteen (86 percent), are about non-elites.

Life-writings in both *HER* and *HSE/RHE* usually take the form of group biographies, although individual biographies, and what we call "identity construction" and "historiographical life-narratives" (to be discussed later), appear occasionally. When the two journals' editors were questioned as to whether they encourage the submission of life-writings, they responded that they do not. Co-editors Petersen and Sherington stated that their board favours articles "with theoretical interest and international significance."[14] Winnifred Millar, a recent co-editor of *HSE/RHE,* was surprised to learn that nearly 40 percent of the journal's articles are life-writings. She stated that the editorial board has formulated no specific criteria for articles. The editors strive to maintain high academic standards, she said, but they also encourage diversity in format, subject matter, and style.[15]

Another group of questions concerned editors' receptivity to a diversity of voices and approaches. It is difficult to determine the race, ethnicity, and social class of a journal's contributors, but gender representation is relatively easy to compute. In addition to comparing the number of male and female authors, we interviewed editors to establish criteria for selection of essays, rejection rates, and practices designed to include the voices of graduate students and foreign scholars. Last, we read essays to determine degree of variation in subject matter, research methods, and form of expression.

All three journals regularly publish the work of women, whose essays between 1990 and 1995 comprise 42 percent of articles published in *HEQ* and around one-third of those in *HER* and *HSE/RHE.*[16] Various strategies have been devised to encourage graduate students to publish. According to a former co-editor of *HSE/RHE,* Rebecca Coulter, the journal's editors guide students to make necessary manuscript revisions before the essays are sent out for blind review. Apparently, such coaching is helpful; many student essays are accepted for publication.[17] Petersen and Sherington, co-editors of *HER,* stated that some of the journal's best articles in recent years have come from graduate students and new scholars.[18] The HES (U.S.A.) annually awards the Henry

Barnard Prize to an outstanding student paper, which is subsequently published in *HEQ*.[19]

We asked to what extent the journals published the work of foreign scholars. We found that all have international editorial boards and all publish articles by scholars from other nations. Robert Gidney, a former co-editor of *HSE/RHE,* stated that those who attend Canadian conferences and serve as visiting professors are more likely to publish in *HSE/RHE* than are those who merely submit an essay.[20] Although an author's involvement in the activities of the Canadian and Australian-New Zealand scholarly communities may play a role in the editors' decisions, such activity in the U.S.A. seems to play no similar role in the decision making of *HEQ* editors.

We reasoned that most academics are likely to study their homelands, so we asked how frequently the journals published articles about foreign countries. Between 1990 and 1995, *HEQ* published the largest number: twenty-two (32 percent). *HER* produced slightly fewer, seventeen (28 percent); and *HSE/RHE* still fewer, twelve (20 percent). Forty-seven (92 percent) of the entire group of international essays dealt with the major industrialized nations, *HEQ* ranging widely over Western Europe,[21] *HER* and *HSE/RHE* emphasizing Anglo-Saxon nations.[22] Three recent *HEQ* articles explored education in Japan and China, and an occasional *HEQ* and *HER* essay was on an underdeveloped nation. None of the journals published an essay on Latin America, the Middle East, or India. International essays in *HER* and *HSE/RHE* explored less of the world than those in *HEQ* but relied more heavily on international scholarship, often citing in a single essay the work of academics in the U.K., U.S.A., Canada, and Australia-New Zealand. These essays were also more likely to be the fruits of international collaborations.

Of the three journals, *HEQ* has the most stringent editorial practices. Its circulation is five and seven times larger than those of *HSE/RHE* and *HER,* respectively, but it annually publishes only about two more essays. *HEQ* has a very low acceptance rate: only 14 percent of submissions. More than 90 percent of articles actually published have gone through one set of revisions and often as many as three or four.[23] The Canadian and Australian-New Zealand journals have significantly higher acceptance rates (60 percent of submissions). Petersen, co-editor of *HER,* explained that the board favours the contributions of society members, but the journal also accepts articles by non-members. According to Peterson, about 10 percent of submissions are rejected and about 10 percent are accepted without revisions; the other 80 percent being returned to their authors for revisions. Only one-third of these manuscripts are returned to the editors for another review.[24] Nearly all submissions to *HSE/RHE* usually require at least one revision and some need more, according to Millar.[25] These practices indicate that subscribers of *HER* and

HSE/RHE are more likely to find a public voice in their journals than those who subscribe to *HEQ,* but the latter journal has more prestige indicators (larger circulation, higher rejection rate).

FEMINIST POSTSTRUCTURALIST ANALYSIS OF SELECTED ESSAYS

Finally, we asked if journals were likely to welcome the life-writings of poststructuralist feminists. We began by counting the number of life-writings about women in each journal.[26] We reasoned that the more such articles appeared, the greater the likelihood that the journals were and would be interested in feminist poststructuralist life-writings. Around half of the life-writings in the journals are on women, the Canadians having the greatest propensity to publish such essays. Of published life-writings in *HSE/RHE,* fourteen of twenty-two (or 64 percent) were on women; in *HER,* twelve of twenty-two (54 percent); and *HEQ,* the fewest, five of nine (or 56 percent). During this period, two of the journals, *HEQ* and *HER,* published a special issue on women, a practice indicative of women's marginal status. Linda Kerber argues persuasively that assigning women a space in a publication signals their lack of representation in the journal's mainstream discourse.[27]

Next, we categorized the types of life-writings in each journal. We then selected representative essays using the following criteria: the article had surface appeal (for instance, a provocative subject, interesting photographs); and its topic, structure, and style were typical of the journal's contents. We selected two essays, one in *HEQ* and another in a joint issue of *HSE/RHE* and *HER.* Using the lens of poststructuralist feminism, we examined the essays' discursive threads to determine the authors' treatment of gender and their use of recent scholarship on women.

Of the four types of life-writings in the journals, *HEQ* contains only two: group biographies (for instance, of Mount Holyoke College chemistry professors and their students, Japanese Americans in Hawaii) and individual biographies (for instance, a leading art educator or philosopher of education). Ernest Freeberg's "'More Important Than a Rabble of Common Kings': Dr. Howe's Education of Laura Bridgman"[28] falls into the latter category. Its title contains a creative oxymoron. What makes the education of Laura Bridgman so much more important than the unruly struggles of "common" kings? The opening paragraphs of the twenty-two page article argue for the significance of the topic by informing readers that Bridgman was the quintessential product of American society, the "perfect symbol of her society's commitment to educate *all* of its members, no matter how humble their station" (p. 306). In fact, Bridgman was "one of the most famous women in the world" (p. 306).

Why had we, historians specializing in the education of nineteenth-century women, never heard of her?

Despite the title of the essay, Freeberg deals mainly with persons from elites, Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe and Horace Mann. These "kings" of educational reform viewed Bridgman primarily as a scientific experiment to disprove the Calvinist doctrine of human depravity. Freeberg reveals the distortions of their rhetoric by contrasting the sanitized versions of Bridgman's academic achievements with her development as revealed in the copious notes kept by her teachers.

Freeberg's essay is well researched, well organized, and elegantly written. But he virtually ignores Bridgman's race and gender. Nineteenth-century Americans did not simply educate regardless of these latter categories; rather, they debated endlessly about the proper education of women, whom they generally assumed to be white. How ironical that one of the most celebrated women in the world, the symbol of American democracy, was deaf, blind, and dependent. Even with an education, Bridgman had no apparent prospect of autonomy, and she posed no threat to the existing gender hierarchy. If anything, her academic achievements strengthened male hegemony by demonstrating the benevolence of male educational leadership.

The qualities Horace Mann admired in Bridgman show popular nineteenth-century beliefs about gender. Mann wrote that Bridgman's education deprived her of much in the external world, but she retained something of far greater value—her innocence and purity. This argument was used to prevent white women from voting or entering the professions. Women, if they were to retain their femininity, were, whatever their educational attainments or maturity, to remain innocent, pure, passive, and dependent on men.[29] The article also reveals much about white masculinity. White middle-class men viewed themselves as powerful and autonomous; women were seen as passive objects who, if they achieved any public recognition, were symbols of male aspirations. Apparently Freeberg is oblivious to the inequality of this gender arrangement. That he views Laura's female teachers as unimportant is revealed by his lack of interest in them. He names only one and reveals little else about her. In a photograph she stands with downcast eyes, a pose usually associated with docility. Bridgman, too, is more an object than a fully realized human being. We learn nothing about her opinions or her experiences after graduation. Did she earn the respectable position in society that Howe envisioned for her? If so, what was it? Perhaps Freeberg had no relevant sources, but neither the text nor the footnotes mention a search for such documents.

This analysis illustrates poststructuralist feminists' use of deconstruction, which is "simultaneously a critique of the categories proffered by a text, and an exposé of the text's unacknowledged challenges to its own premises."[30]

One might be tempted to conclude, based on the analysis, that *HEQ* excludes scholarship on women; yet a perusal of the journal's contents belies this notion. Linda Kerber may provide insight. She argues convincingly that historians often relegate scholarship on women to a subcategory ("women's history") and fail to integrate it fully into the main body of historical work.[31] One cannot safely generalize from a single essay. Still, the analysis raises worthwhile questions about peer reviewers' and editors' criteria of judgment.

Life-writings in *HER* and *HSE/RHE* are more varied, on our criteria, than those in *HEQ*. Group biographies predominate, although individual biographies appear as well. The subjects of these studies are usually non-elite individuals, such as students (for example, the first women to enter Canadian universities, Methodist women missionaries) or teachers (for instance, women secondary school teachers in Toronto, or teachers in Quebec Protestant academies). Many group biographies explore issues of gender and power.

Two other types of life-writings in these journals are what we call "identity constructions" and "historiographical life-narratives." "Identity constructions" are studies of group identities, for example, soldiers, statesmen, wives, or mothers, in a specified period, such as the 1920s. Some studies analyze a stereotype (for example, the black female slave) or a prescriptive identity (for instance, the ideal mother) and are derived primarily from published sources. Others contrast a societal stereotype with a group portrait of actual people, the latter usually drawn from private sources. A fourth type of life-writing, the "historiographical life-narrative," is distinctive in that a lengthy historiographical discussion is attached to a life-narrative. We can only speculate why this form has developed. Given the tendency of some historians to discount life-writings as lacking objectivity, authors and editors may believe a substantial historiographical defense is warranted. Some life-writers do not relate their subjects' lives to a large educational movement; hence, they may use the historiographical discussion to further justify the importance of the study. Or the form may show the influence of quantitative studies, which devote a well-defined space to methodological discussions.

Gillian Weiss's "Three Generations of Women: Learning and Schooling Amongst the Adnyamathanha"[32] is an historiographical life-narrative appearing in a special issue published collaboratively by *HSE/RHE* and *HER* in 1994. This provocative essay illustrates the interest of both journals in non-elites, internationalism, and unexplored historical territory. Weiss's twenty-nine-page transgenerational oral history explores the lives of three Adnyamathanha women of the Flinders Ranges in South Australia. It is part of a larger study of aboriginal groups in South Australia, in British Columbia, and on Manitoulin Island in Ontario, conducted by scholars from the University of South Australia and the University of British Columbia.

Weiss begins by providing an historical overview of the Adnyamathanha people from their first contact with white settlers in the 1840s until 1930, when the nomadic tribe settled permanently in Nepabunna, a haven from whites. Weiss justifies the study by stating that the women's stories are "intimately connected with the broader history of the Adnyamathanha as a people and less directly, but still importantly, with Australian Aboriginal history generally" (p. 172), both of which, until recently, were ignored by white academics. She emphasizes how the women acquired knowledge of Adnyamathanha and Udynu (white) cultures in their childhoods and how they "strive to use, retain and preserve" both kinds of knowledge today and in their "perceived futures" (p. 171).

Pearl Wilton was born in a creek bed and spent her childhood among her people. Her family migrated from station to station within traditional tribal lands, living for long periods in Nepabunna, where she met and later married John McKenzie. Much of her oral history relates how she acquired tribal customs. Pearl Wilson's daughter and granddaughter grew up in a white community. With each generation, the amount of Udynu schooling increased, including high school and then post-high school training. The three women share a common concern to preserve their tribal history, but each views her role in its preservation differently.

The final third of Weiss's essay concerns the preservation and interpretation of oral history. Weiss states that historians must reassess their traditional methods if they are to use aboriginal oral sources responsibly. She discusses two important academic questions, the reliability and generalizability of oral histories. She further argues against using traditional methods of interpretation. Scholars should avoid the conceptual categories typically used to analyze the cultures of working-class whites or of African-Americans, she writes. What concepts to use instead Weiss does not know. She states that a "sophisticated theoretic structure" (p. 197) may emerge as more study is done, or it may be unnecessary.

Weiss's essay is well researched but lacks the elegance and tight structure of Freeberg's essay. Like Freeberg, Weiss reveals gender differences but fails to examine them systematically. For instance, she writes that girls and boys had separate tribal activities, that boys (not girls) had initiation rites, and that uncles (not aunts) were disciplinarians. Yet there is no indication that Pearl Wilson saw these differences as signs of female subjection. Was she taught to view women as the equals of men? Also, Pearl Wilson and her offspring appear to occupy shifting status positions. For example, Weiss states that Pearl Wilson's father and father-in-law were the last traditional leaders of the tribe, but Weiss does not reveal whether Wilson was considered an elite by her people. Did the tribe grant status or privileges to leaders' families? If so, did

she have any privileges usually granted only to males? What effect, if any, did her tribal status have on Pearl Wilson's view of herself? On her daughter's and granddaughter's self-conceptions? How did their status change after they moved to a white community? Identities are "multiply consisted," Leslie Hill argues persuasively, reflecting "the fluid interconnections of racism, classicism, and sexism."[33] Weiss has not yet determined how to sort out these interconnections.

An essay provides not only a description of a scholar's work but also evidence of her or his self-construction. Here Weiss presents herself as a collaborating member of an international academic community that is experimenting with fresh topics and approaches. Rather than playing the role of transcendent purveyor of "truth," she positions herself alongside the three Adnyamathanha women and strives to present their worlds from their perspectives. Her findings are complex, unfixed, and open to further analysis. Freeberg, on the other hand, constructs himself more as an Olympic contender striving to out-perform past gold medalists. He follows carefully the rules of historical scholarship mastered by a succession of scholars whose work appears in *HEQ*. His elegant style, carefully constructed argument, and meticulous documentation contribute to the impression that his historical questions are fully answered, his topic closed to further discussion. How different are the scholarly dispositions of Weiss and Freeberg.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This analysis shows that all three journals publish at least some life-writings, all publish studies of other nations, and all publish the work of women and graduate students. Which journal would be most likely to accept our scholarship?

Of the three journals, *HSE/RHE* has the largest percentage of life-writings, and most of these are about women and non-elite groups. Even when women are not the subject of the research, the authors explore issues of gender and power. We like the journal's diversity and admire Gillian Weiss's work.

We'll maintain our memberships in HES to keep abreast of research published in its journal. We are unlikely, however, to submit work to *HEQ*. As our analysis has shown, *HEQ* publishes few life-writings, and its articles fit a prescribed format. One of the things we most enjoy about feminist poststructuralist research is that it encourages us to experiment with various research methods and forms of expression. We think *HSE/RHE* and *HER* are more likely to accept such work. But, of course, Australia is far away, and the editors of *HER* favour the work of contributors who are actively involved in the society. So we expect to submit our work to the Canadian journal.

Our study raises unanswered questions. First, the higher percentage of life-writings in *HER* and *HSE/RHE* suggests that educational historians in these countries have a higher regard for life-writing than those in the United States. Is this indeed the case? And if so, what contributes to the difference? Second, most life-writings in *HSE/RHE* and *HER* are about non-elite groups, so apparently their authors do not view life-writing as elitist. Is this view widespread among educational historians in Canada and Australia-New Zealand? If so, why are American historians different? Given the small number of essays *HEQ* publishes and the large size of its circulation, we wonder how many members never publish in the journal and how many of these "silent" voices are life-writers. Third, *HEQ*'s stringent editorial policies contribute to the journal's prestige whereas *HSE/RHE* and *HER* have fewer prestige indicators (lower circulations, lower rejection rates). On the other hand, these latter journals provide "space" for more of their members' scholarship. The quality of writing is a bit uneven, but articles are more varied. Have CHEA/ACHE and ANZHES made a conscious commitment to provide space for diverse approaches and "voices" even though that decision may jeopardize the journals' prestige? Or do they wish to emulate the more stringent policies of *HEQ*?

But all of these questions remain for future students of the field and its journals.

NOTES

1 This sort of analysis is not entirely neglected. See Patrick J. Harrigan's "Une Revue à Lire?/Would You Read This Journal?" *Historical Studies in Education/Revue d'histoire de l'éducation* 3, no. 2 (1991): 269–73.

2 Only half of the 1995 issues of each journal had been published when we conducted this study. These numbers add up to a larger number than 180 because the editors of *HSE/RHE* and *HER* published a joint special issue (*HSE/RHE* 6, no. 3 and *HER* 23, no. 3 [1994]), containing ten essays.

3 Objectivity is a disputed concept, the history of which Peter Novak traces in *That Noble Dream: The "Objectivity Question" and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1988). We particularly like Novak's definition of historical objectivity: "the key term in defining progress in historical scholarship: moving ever closer to the objective truth about the past." He argues that a belief in objectivity is based on several assumptions: for example, "a commitment to the reality of the past, and to truth as correspondence to that reality; a sharp separation between knower and known, between fact and value, and above all, between history and ficiton. . . . Truth is one, not perspectival" (pp. 1–2).

4 Daniel Lee Kleinman, "Why Science and Scientists Are Under Fire—And How the Profession Needs to Respond," *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 42, no. 5 (1995): B2.

[5] Subjectivities refer to individuals' values, thoughts, ideals, feelings, attitudes, and dispositions. Although "identity" is sometimes used as a synonym, it is a narrower term having mainly to do with individual self-conceptions and collective constructions (for example, the ideal mother, the teacher, the professor). On subjectivity, see Richard A. Quantz, "Interpretive Method in Historical Research: Ethnohistory Reconsidered," in *The Teacher's Voice: A Social History of Teaching in Twentieth Century America,* ed. Richard J. Altenbaugh (Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press, 1992), 179ff.

[6] We do not presume to speak for all poststructuralist feminists. For an excellent short essay on poststructuralism, see Jane Caplan, "Postmodernism, Poststructuralism, and Deconstruction: Notes for Historians," *Central European History* 3, no. 4 (1989): 260–78; on feminist poststructuralism, see Bronwyn Davies, *Shards of Glass: Children Reading and Writing Beyond Gendered Identities* (Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 1993); quotation from E. Anthony Rotundo, *American Manhood: Transformations in Masculinity from the Revolution to the Modern Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1993), x.

[7] Davies, *Shards of Glass,* x.

[8] F. M. Connelly and D. J. Clandinin, "Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry," *Educational Researcher* 19, no. 5 (1990): 2.

[9] Telephone interview with B. Edward McClellan, 11 October 1995, as taken and annotated by Lucy Townsend.

[10] Edward Beauchamp, "Education and Biography in the Contemporary United States: An Introduction," *Biography* 13, no. 1 (1990): 2.

[11] Telephone interview with Jeffrey Mirel, 2 June 1991, as taken and annotated by Elizabeth Johnson.

[12] Barbara Finkelstein, "Perfecting Childhood: Horace Mann and the Origins of Public Education in the United States," *Biography* 13, no. 1 (1990): 6.

[13] Quoted in Leon Edel, "Biography: A Manifesto," *Biography* 1, no. 1 (1978): 1.

[14] Robert Petersen and Geoffrey Sherington to Elizabeth K. Johnson, 23 October 1995.

[15] Telephone interviews with Winnifred Millar, 14 October 1991 and10 October 1995, as taken and annotated by Elizabeth Johnson (1991) and Lucy Townsend (1995).

[16] Women were authors or co-authors of twenty-nine of sixty-nine *HEQ* articles, twenty of sixty-one *HER* essays, and nineteen of sixty *HSE/RHE* articles.

[17] Telephone interviews with Rebecca Coulter, 15 October 1991 and 10 October 1995, as taken and annotated by Elizabeth Johnson (1991) and Lucy Townsend (1995).

[18] Robert Petersen and Geoffrey Sherington to Elizabeth K. Johnson, 23 October 1995.

[19] The committee awards this prize only if submissions meet its scholarly standards. See, for example, the call for student essays in *HEQ* 33, no. 1 (1993): 145.

[20] Telephone interview with Robert Gidney, 14 October 1991, as taken and annotated by Elizabeth Johnson.

[21] *HEQ*'s international articles: Australia, 1; Canada, 3; United Kingdom, 4; other Western European nations (Germany, Spain, Russia/former U.S.S.R., France, Netherlands, Austria, multiple nations), 10; Asia (Japan, China), 3; British West Indies, 1.

[22] *HER*'s international articles: Canada, 5; U.S.A., 2; United Kingdom, 5; other Western European nations (Greece, Germany, multiple nations), 3; Zimbabwe, 1; and

Papua New Guinea, 1. *HSE/RHE's* international essays: Australia-New Zealand, 6; U.S.A. (also with Australia), 3; United Kingdom, 1; other Western European nations (Sweden, multiple nations), 2.

[23] B. Edward McClellan to Elizabeth K. Johnson, 11 October 1995.

[24] Robert Petersen and Geoffrey Sherington to Elizabeth K. Johnson, 23 October 1995.

[25] Telephone interviews with Winnifred Millar, 14 October 1991 and 10 October 1995, as taken and annotated by Elizabeth Johnson (1991) and Lucy Townsend (1995).

[26] Given the tendency of most researchers to study men, poststructuralist feminists generally focus on girls and women, or compare male and female subjectivities.

[27] Lecture on women's history, University of Chicago, November 1991.

[28] Ernest Freeberg, "'More Important Than a Rabble of Common Kings': Dr. Howe's Education of Laura Bridgman," *HEQ* 34, no. 3 (1994): 305–27. All quotations are taken from this essay and are followed by page numbers.

[29] The ideal nineteenth-century white woman has been the subject of much historical research. The seminal article on this topic is still Barbara Welter, "The Cult of True Womanhood," *American Quarterly* 18, no. 2 (1966): 151–73.

[30] Caplan, "Postmodernism, Poststructuralism, and Deconstruction," 267.

[31] Lecture on women's history, University of Chicago, November 1991.

[32] Gillian Weiss, "Three Generations of Women: Learning and Schooling Amongst the Adnyamathanha," *HSE/RHE* 6, no. 3/*HER* 23, no. 3 (1994): 171–99. All quotations are taken from this essay and followed by page numbers.

[33] Leslie Hill, "Transition in Curriculum Transformation: Some Trends and Challenges," in *Women of Color and the Multicultural Curriculum: Transforming the College Classroom*, ed. Liza Fiol-Matta and Mariam K. Chamberlain (New York: The Feminist Press, 1994), 17.