



CHARTING GIRLHOOD STUDIES

Claudia Mitchell

Chart/charting:

noun

- a sheet of information in the form of a table, graph, or diagram: *the doctor recorded her blood pressure on a chart*
- (usually **the charts**) a weekly listing of the current bestselling pop records: *she topped the charts for eight weeks*
- a geographical map or plan, especially one used for navigation by sea or air: *a chart of the English coast*
- (also **birth chart** or **natal chart**) *Astrology* a circular map showing the positions of the planets in the twelve houses at the time of someone's birth, from which astrologers are said to be able to deduce their character or potential.

verb

- 1 [*with object*] make a map of (an area): *Cook charted the coasts and waters of New Zealand*
- plot (a course) on a chart: *the pilot found his craft taking a route he had not charted*
- record the progress or development of: *the poems chart his descent into madness a major series charting the history of country music*
- [*no object*] (of a record) sell enough copies to enter the music charts at a particular position: *the record will probably chart at about No. 74*

(OED)

Introduction

Charting, as the definitions above suggest, can be highly technical. But if one takes a more figurative approach that sees that terms such as “geographical map or plan,” and “circular map,” and “route,” and “plot” can be both denotative and connotative, charting may be the perfect term to describe the interdisciplinary area of girlhood studies and the ways in which it involves navigating the terrain of an academic and activist area. Several questions direct this route-clearing, which, from the outside, may seem to be rough and rocky, with few discernible

trails, and no clear sense of where the trails start or where they lead. Is girlhood studies really just part of women's studies or gender studies? Where does it fit in relation to boyhood studies or child studies or youth studies? Is it possible already to do a history of girlhood studies, a field that is still relatively young? How can one *place* girlhood studies in time, in space, or in relation to age?

While it would be a worthy project to try to answer all of the above questions, I navigate through girlhood studies via the auto-ethnographic practices of charting girlhood studies, practices that other scholars and activists in the area of girlhood studies might also employ.¹ The approach I lay out here makes the idiosyncratic the entry point, and makes no apology for this. From these practices we can work back (following various trails) or work forward (following others) with the goal of deepening an understanding of the broader project of girlhood studies. The chapter is divided into two main sections. It begins with an example of charting—my own— that has a starting point, a backing up and working further back process, a circling, then a section that I describe as “expanding the terrain,” and, finally, a section called working forward. The second section makes explicit the various practices that might be used in the process of charting. These practices might include memory-work and the use of visual and other texts, along with auto-ethnographic writing in the service of starting somewhere in the study of girlhood, albeit at different places and at different times.

Subjectively Speaking: My History of Girlhood Studies

Starting Point

Let me start at the beginning, one beginning, a beginning for me at least. ...

It is in the late afternoon of 6 December 1989 in Montreal, and as I write this twenty-five years later I have no difficulty putting myself there in time and place. The 80 bus I am riding is jam-packed as it crawls up Avenue du Parc toward Mille End and beyond. I have one hand on the railing and one hand on my four-year-old daughter, trying to keep us upright, both of us in the crowded bus with our faces pressed into the heavy dark coats of our fellow bus passengers. I have just picked up my daughter from day care and I am heading home from McGill University where I teach. The trip, normally twenty minutes or so from Sherbrooke Street up to Saint Viateur, seems to be taking forever. I have never seen traffic quite like it but with the snow and the late afternoon rush hour perhaps it is just what is to be expected. I am vaguely aware of the sound

of sirens and the flashing red lights in the early winter darknesss, but in a busy city like Montreal and in a snowstorm and at this time of the day, the sirens, too, are not that unusual. By the time we get off the bus at Saint Viateur Street, and Dorian and I make our way through the snow, and get into the house, explanations for the sirens become clearer. I immediately turn the radio on when I get into the house, and as I listen I call out the words to my two teenage daughters who have arrived home a little earlier. “Polytechnique ... Université du Montreal ... gun man on the rampage ... shootings.” As the evening progresses and as we stay glued to the radio, we learn much more. Fourteen young women, most of them engineering students, were shot and killed. Marc Lepine, the killer, calls them “a bunch of feminists.” For days, weeks, and years afterward, media analysts, gun-control lobbyists, and feminists will argue about whether it was an isolated incident, the work of a mad man, something totally misogynistic, or part of a larger “connecting the dots” of patriarchy. The phrase “bunch of feminists” is conveniently left out of much of the discussion, but twenty years later Denis Villeneuve’s film *Polytechnique* (2009) deals directly with Lepine’s murderous violence against the female engineers and the gendered realities of education in Engineering. A female character in the film, a young mechanical engineering student, goes for an interview for a position as an intern on the very day of the shooting and is asked by the male interviewer why she isn’t taking up civil engineering, which is considered an easier option. In real life, when the late Andrea Dworkin, arguably the best known feminist in the world in relation to addressing violence against women, gives the keynote talk at the one-year anniversary of the Massacre, I think I hear her say something to the effect that “if you are going to be killed as a feminist, make sure you deserve to die as one.” Years later I listen to the transcript of her talk: “It is incumbent upon each of us to be the woman that Marc Lepine wanted to kill.”² I am sitting in a huge lecture theater at the Université de Montreal as she utters these words that remain as chilling and haunting today as they did all those years ago.

Perhaps to fully appreciate my starting point, you had to have three daughters, two of whom were on the receiving end of a curriculum in secondary schools in Canada at the time of the Montreal Massacre that was telling girls to go into science and engineering. If I think of Dworkin’s speech, what was I really saying to my daughters and nieces? Go out and get yourself killed? At the risk of overdetermining the significance of one event on 6 December, as an advocate and champion in the 1980s of the getting girls into mathematics and science movement, I do not think I would ever look at this particular “project of girlhood” in quite the same way again. I am especially struck by women in their thirties and forties who trained as engineers and who as feminist scholars remember the commemorative days of 6 December in their schools or communities, years after 1989, as having significance to their own pathways.

Andrea Dworkin clearly saw the Massacre as just one more set of actions along a continuum in relation to violence against women, while Julianne Pidduck (1995) wonders if perhaps we have made too much of the huge and horrific events at the expense of all the everyday acts of violence against women. I do not want to say that 6 December 1989 was “the” birth of girlhood studies as though there was one definitive moment that could be captured for all time and all regions of the world, even for an imagined Wikipedia entry. I do, however, want to make a claim that 6 December 1989 marks the beginning of a particular political project in relation to girls’ lives that resonates from this place and time in Montreal. Maybe you had to be in Montreal, or maybe you had to be on the 80 bus heading north on Avenue du Parc late on the afternoon of 6 December, and maybe it had to be snowing and maybe you had to hear the sirens. And maybe this now seems like a miscasting of the fourteen victims of the shooting. After all, they were young women, ranging in age between twenty and thirty-one, and not girls at all, and not all of them were engineering students. But the interpretation of the event needs to back up, so to speak, and begin even before the beginning. ...

Backing Up

I want us to back up just a little from the events of 6 December 1989. It is earlier in the 1980s and a decade of a broad discourse of getting more girls into science, mathematics, and technology in schools, ostensibly so that there can be more women scientists (and engineers) in the workplace.³ Post-Massacre, I realize that it was not quite the feminist project that many of us thought it was. My own questions in 1989 started with an agenda that was framed by what I now want to call *interrogating naïveté*. Why did I (we) think that getting more girls into science and technology was about numbers and role models? Why did we think that there was only one project, or that the project of “more girls in science and technology” could ever just sit so neatly by itself? It is not that I now want to say that this explains why Marc Lepine killed those fourteen women, but I do want to highlight that the agenda was naïve.

The 1980s in North America were framed by various studies and reports across a wide range of areas, from science and technology through to education and the curriculum of schools that attempted to address the issue of more women scientists. These included the Science Council of Canada’s *Who Turns the Wheel?* (1982), the report of the American Association of University Women (AAUW) (1992) *Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America* Study, and, at the other end of the spectrum, Talk Teen Barbie’s assertion that “math class is tough” (Mitchell and Reid-Walsh 1995: 145). In between, and across the United States, the UK,

Australia, and Canada, there are such studies as Valerie Walkerdine's *Counting Girls Out*, and the Girls into Science and Technology (GIST) projects in Britain. In Canada there were the *A Capella* studies organized by the Canadian Teachers' Federation and the *We're Here, Listen to Us* study carried out by the Status of Women, Canada. Indeed, right around this time, there was also a range of articles such as *Bias against Girls is Found Rife in Schools, with Lasting Damage* (Chira 1992: A1). Rebecca Hains's book *Growing Up with Girl Power* (2012) cites the Chira article, and notes that the American Association of University Women's Executive Director, Anne Bryant, called the study "a wake-up call to the nation's education and policy leaders, parents, administrators and guidance counselors." Bryant argues that "unless we pay attention to girls' needs today, we will find out 15 years from now that there is still a glass ceiling" (quoted in Chira 1992: A1).⁴ While the report has now largely been discredited in relation to its use of selective evidence, its status as a wake-up call was symbolic of a situation of girls-in-crisis heralding the so called rescuing girls literature that included the extensive studies on girls' self-esteem (see for example Kenway and Willis 1990) and the popular *Reviving Ophelia* work of Pipher (1994) and others.

But Before That ... Working Further Back

Although I have started with 1989, for me and for Montreal as a site of collective memory, it is, of course, far from the beginning, and some of the most generative and ground-breaking work in the study of girls' lives was already well underway. McRobbie and Garber ([1981]1991), for example, responded to Paul Willis's notion of lads on the street corner in *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs* (1977), by putting on the map the idea of adolescent girls and bedroom culture, and the commoditized world of romance as consumed in magazines like *Jackie* and *Just Seventeen*. So it was a world about spatiality; long before people were talking about girls' geographies, McRobbie and Garber's work also put girls' agency on the map in a practical way. Parallel work can be found on the reading and viewing practices of girls and women, from Janice Radway's *Reading the Romance* ([1984]1991) to Gemma Moss's *Un/Popular Fictions* (1989). These works led to Linda Christian-Smith's *Becoming a Woman through Romance* (1990) as well as her edited book *Texts of Desire* (1993), and Pamela Gilbert and Sandra Taylor's *Fashioning the Feminine: Girls, Popular Culture and Schooling* (1991). The study of reading and viewing practices was not necessarily about the invisibility of girls so much as a devaluing of girls' culture. Radway's work, for example, was key to drawing attention to the pos-

sibility of agency and choice in how girls and women read romance fiction and how they were far from simply being unthinking and indiscriminate consumers. In a study I published in 1982, “I Only Read Novels and that Sort of Thing” I draw on the status of the reading habits of girls and women in Jane Austen’s world of the eighteenth century to frame the comments that women made in my study centuries later. They were still apologizing for reading fiction. In essence, when girls and women were visible, the worth of their practices was invisible.

The scholarship that examined how girls were being shortchanged in the educational system complemented the body of work within media studies about the (mis)representations of girls and the frequent overrepresentation of boys in television programming. As Hains (2012) observes, journalist Bill Carter (1991) in “Children’s TV, Where Boys Are King,” exposed, in *The New York Times*, the matter-of-fact, cavalier way in which industry executives privileged boys’ viewing interests as they vied for top ratings. Carter’s article spelled out the connections between this form of media industry sexism and the various studies carried out on girls and their academic achievement. ABC television had just announced their fall lineup for 1991, deciding to cut the shows that most appealed to girl audiences. Their rationale was that boys constituted a 53 percent majority in the Saturday morning viewing audience—a difference that, slight as it was, ABC executives feared could make or break their odds of success in the so-called ratings war.

Circling

But there are other ways in which girls are absent. To circle back to the early 1980s, for example, Carol Gilligan published what became a highly controversial but significant work, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development* (1982; reprinted in 1993). The book, based on interviews with over 100 girls, argued that psychology had long misunderstood women. Gilligan used *In a Different Voice* to critique the work of Kohlberg (1971), the developmental theorist with whom she herself had studied. In his work on the stages of moral development he had found that women’s moral development was weaker than men’s. Gilligan argued that the issue was with his definition: he viewed moral reasoning as being about following the rules, but the girls and women she studied often viewed morality as making decisions in people’s best interest—caring, not rule-following. She argued that society had been privileging the thinking and moral approaches of men when it needed to value both men’s and women’s perspectives as having equal validity.

Then in 1992, Lyn Mikel Brown and Carol Gilligan published *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girls' Development*, which interrogated the silence of girls in adolescence and their fear of damaging their relationships with others. The study highlighted what the researchers named as the "I don't know" phenomenon. Looking back at this work now, Lyn Mikel Brown offers:

Our goal then was to interrupt the prevailing academic and public conventions that placed boyhood at the center of child and adolescent development, and provide the means for girls to give voice to their thoughts and feelings. We did so in the mid-80s when "girl" was synonymous with unimportant, and, except for those few private girls' schools which funded our early work, listening to girls was considered a waste of time and money. We did so through the early- and mid-nineties when popular books misconstrued our findings and took up the "girls in crisis" call; and grant money was more available, both for research and for empowerment programs designed to "save" girls from a tsunami of all things bad (2008: 2).

As Hains highlights in her work, this *saving girls* discourse was indeed a tsunami in terms of the overproduction of books on the topic.⁵

However, I want to make sure that this history is not bound by the borders of North America. Australian authors Jane Kenway and Sue Willis's edited book *Hearts and Minds: Self-Esteem and the Schooling of Girls* (1990) offered critiques on the potential holes in this *save the girls* work. And one would need only to look at Valerie Walkerdine's *School-girl Fictions* (1990), which analyzed a complex set of issues around patriarchy and power, to see why self-esteem might have been limiting.

Expanding the Terrain

The exclusion of girls in so much scholarship and in popular culture was (and still is) not just about the absence of girls in relation to the Global North, of course. In 1988 The Zimbabwean (then Rhodesian) novelist and filmmaker Tsitsi Dangarembga published *Nervous Conditions*, a novel that has come to be a feminist classic in postcolonial literature on presence and absence in relation to girls' lives and especially girls' education. Taking on the issue, common throughout Africa, of the privileging of sending boys to school and keeping girls home to work, this novel is regarded by many feminist scholars as making a definitive statement about girls' education in the Global South. The opening paragraph of the novel, written in the voice of Tambu, looking back on her girlhood, says it all: "I was not sorry when my brother died. Nor am I apologizing for my callousness, as you may define it, my lack of

feeling. For it is not that at all. I feel many things these days, much more than I was able to feel in the days when I was young and my brother died, and there are reasons for this more than the mere consequence of age. Therefore I shall not apologize but begin by recalling the facts as I remember them that led up to my brother's death, the events that put me in a position [to be educated] to write this account" (Dangarembga 1988: 1). Tambu's brother had been sent to a mission school, run by their uncle, Babamakuru, where high quality secondary education was provided, while his sister Tambu had to stay behind to attend the village school because there was not enough money to send her away to the mission school, too. Education in the novel is not simply about schooling, although it is Tambu's opportunity to go to school that starts the story in the first place and that then also allows us to compare the schooling of Tambu as a village girl with the education she receives at the mission school where, as mentioned earlier, her well-educated uncle is the headmaster. Tambu's cousin, Nyasha, Babamakuru's daughter, caught up in the conflict between wanting to succeed academically, on the one hand, and resisting the results of the colonial (British) education of her father and mother, on the other, develops a severe eating disorder, one of the nervous conditions apparent in the novel.

Interestingly, the development world caught up with the literary several years later with the convening of the first World Conference on Education for All (EFA) held in Jomtien in 1990. It was at that conference that official recognition was given to the need for a girl-focus in education. As UNESCO put it: "More than 100 million children, including at least 60 million girls, have no access to primary schooling."⁶ I cannot help but recall here my own introduction to the discourse of the 60 million out-of-school girls in 1994 when I worked on a girls' education project in Zambia. More than anything it highlighted the need to see the experiences of girls in a global context.

Working Forward—Girls into Doing

But to take up one of the definitions of charting offered at the beginning of this chapter, "record the progress or development of..." I want to highlight what I regard as important movements away from the crisis of girlhood and into girls' engagement and participation—from the DIY movement of digital media through to the use of video making, photography, and digital storytelling as seen in Gerry Bloustien's *Girl-making* (2003) or Mary Celeste Kearney's *Girls Make Media* (2013). There is also a connection between seeing girls as doers and as cultural producers, which other scholars have examined historically in Girl Scouting

movements, the feisty characters in series like Nancy Drew and Anne of Green Gables, or, as we see in this volume, the work of Jacqueline Reid-Walsh, who has been looking at seventeenth- and eighteenth-century girls as DIY producers of flap books.

Indeed, building on participatory culture, we can track or chart the project of girlhood studies as seen through the eyes of girls themselves. While there are many examples of participatory and DIY projects from which to choose, I want to highlight a participatory video project in rural KwaZulu-Natal in South Africa, in which a small group of adolescent girls produced a short video called *Vikea Abantwana* (or *Protect the Children: A Story about Incest*). It was produced in a one-day workshop using an approach to video making that does not require editing (NER-No Editing Required) (Mitchell and De Lange 2011). Their three-minute video highlights a number of critical issues about sexual abuse in their rural setting. Through the video, the filmmakers tell the story of Philendelini, who is found crying in the classroom by her best friend. As she recounts the story, we learn that Philendelini has been raped by her father. She tries to tell various women around her but no one will pass the information on to her mother. Eventually, she is taken to a doctor who confirms that the girl has been raped and also that she is pregnant. The mother, learning this, bursts into tears. The story ends with Philendelini's father behind bars in jail.

While I have written about this video in several other contexts (see for example Moletsane, Mitchell, Smith, and Chisholm 2008; Mitchell 2011), the particular relevance of the film to this chapter is in the way in which it offers an analysis of the feminist dilemma in the relationship between girls and women in that it highlights the ways in which adult women can be part of the problem in the lives of girls and young women. In 1992, Brown and Gilligan noted that the adolescent girls in their study identified the ways in which the adult women teachers and mothers in their lives betrayed them by encouraging girls to speak up and then not speaking up themselves. Similarly, *Vikea Abantwana* shows how the adult women in the lives of girls can be part of the problem. Philendelini, for example, confides in the housekeeper, who in turns feels that she cannot directly confront her boss (Philendelini's mother), and so she passes the information on to a neighbor who, she hopes, will be the one to tell Philendelini's mother. When the mother does finally hear about the rape, she immediately denies that it could have happened. But there is also something alarming about the ways in which the various women in Philendelini's life wonder who else she has told, implying that should have kept it to herself. The father, too, even though he really has no right to an opinion on this, also comments that

it should be kept in the family. But in addition to hoping that she keeps this to herself, there is also the idea that Philendelini is just making this up (or that others are). The truth, it seems, is unbelievable, and one of the clear messages of the story the young filmmakers tell through their video is that adult women do not listen to girls when they report rape and sexual abuse.

Charting Girlhood Studies as Practice

It seems to me that any of the definitions of charting found at the beginning of this chapter could be applied to the work I am describing here: a sheet of information in the form of a table, graph, or diagram; a geographic map or plan; a birth chart (at least figuratively); to make a map of an area, to plot a course, or to record progress or development. At first glance the definition referring to current best sellers in music may not work quite so well, but then I think of all the competing agendas within girlhood studies—girls, science, and technology; girls and self-esteem; girl power; girls as victims; girls as agents; mean girls—and think that perhaps this meaning, too, could work in terms of what is most salable in the field.

As I have sought to demonstrate in my auto-ethnographic writing about 6 December 1989, charting requires us to start somewhere, to place ourselves in a field and then to work back and work forward. Ideally suited to groups of feminist scholars working together, it is a strategy or approach for getting at the complexity of the study of girlhood, and especially its interdisciplinarity. At one and the same time it is also a strategy for getting at imagined pasts and imagined futures. The Massacre itself set an agenda for political education for so many young women in universities, but it also set an agenda for female academics and activists more broadly. In this way it is a touchstone event, not unlike the shooting of JFK or of John Lennon, or 9/11 and then, “Where were you when...?”

But which charting methods or tools can best be used to do this work most effectively? Starting somewhere may not be so straightforward for everyone, and one might look to some of the feminist tools that have been written about elsewhere as useful approaches to starting somewhere. For example, those working in the area of feminist memory-work such as Frigga Haug (1987) offer systematic approaches to retrieving the past through the use of common prompts for collective or individual remembering, and these might be adapted to charting in a protocol such as the following: “*Think of the first time [or a time] you be-*

came moved about something that you read/heard/saw/experienced either as a girl/ young woman or about a girl/young woman.” While it may be premature to prejudge which events will be significant for a new generation of girls and girlhood scholars, it is hard to imagine that the shooting by the Taliban of Malala Yousafzai on 9 October 2012 will not be one of those *starting somewhere* events or touchstones, although such catalysts do not have to be public events, and could even be organized around objects and things (see also Mitchell and Reid-Walsh 1998; Reid-Walsh and Mitchell 2000; Mitchell 2010).

There are other types of generative prompts. For example, one might work with a set of one’s own photographs of a particular time of girlhood (see Kuhn 1995) or curate a small album (Smith 2012) or digital production.⁷ Hallam and Marchment (1995) write about a method of collective viewing, using the feminist TV series *Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit* (1989) as a starting somewhere point. Inspired by this methodology, Mathabo Khau (Motalingoane-Khau 2007; Khau 2009) organized a film-viewing pajama party in her study of women science teachers in Lesotho and their recollections of their own adolescent sexuality in relation to their current work with young people. As she writes: “My aim was for us to reconfirm our bonds of friendship and have fun together. I hired some video films such as *Coming to America*, *Lambada: The Forbidden Dance*, and *Dirty Dancing*, which were some of our favourites as we grew up.” Viewing the films together also served as memory prompts. As Khau writes: “We discussed the film *Dirty Dancing* afterwards and how Baby had shocked her father and everybody by admitting that she had spent a night with a man who was being accused of theft. How would your father have reacted? Would you have done it? What did you do that shocked your parents? These are some of the questions that we discussed which led to us thinking back to those days when we were adolescent girls” (2007: 34).⁸ Where the techniques of feminist memory-work might then call on a deeper analysis (either collectively or individually) of the written memory texts, the process of charting extends into the inclusion of further work with artifacts and other forms of material culture and relevant critical literatures. As noted earlier, in the case of the Montreal Massacre, I finally took the opportunity to view Denis Villeneuve’s 2009 film *Polytechnique*. I also accessed an audio archive of all of Andrea Dworkin’s speeches, including her forty-three-minute keynote address on the occasion of the first anniversary of the shootings so that I could check what she had really said against what I remembered she had said. Then I went back to the literature on the 1980s and early 1990s on girls, science, and technology (see for example Acker and Oatley 1993).

Representing the charting process, however, is a different matter, and in this chapter I have produced a text that is a straightforward written piece, drawing on auto-ethnographic narrative. But this is where visual arts-based methods and performance could be useful, taking into consideration the various definitions of charting that include maps, graphs, diagrams, and other visual representations. Performance, along with the use of social media and other innovative approaches, could also be part of charting and could engage audiences (and provoke further charting).⁹ For example, an activist-artist scholar from the U.K., Rosy Martin, used what she called phototherapy, as the title of the article, “Phototherapy: Transforming the School Photo. (Happy Days Are Here Again)” indicates, as a re-enactment to contest the validity of the normative schoolgirl body. In their work they produce photographic images of themselves as adult women but dressed in their school uniforms, and in resistant schoolgirl poses (for example, posing themselves as schoolgirls smoking) (Martin 1987).

Conclusion

When I first started to work on the subject of charting girlhood and girlhood studies, I had the idea that I would either be able to compress the history into one chapter (impossible), or that I would be able to lay out a grand scheme for studying the field, something that would build on the mapping girlhood project that my colleagues and I began in the late 1990s.¹⁰ Maybe I would even be able to come up with the definitive timeline for girlhood studies. Somewhat ironically, I had occasion to revisit a piece of writing that Jacqui Reid-Walsh and I did in 2008 in our Introduction to a two-volume encyclopedia on *Girl Culture*, and discovered that we had actually offered a timeline of key moments in the field. But our timeline had many limitations, ranging from our decision to include only some disciplines and not others, as well as other decisions to exclude by region and social identity and our own idiosyncratic interests and investments. I am reminded of the work of Douglas and Carless on their attempt to write a history of auto-ethnographic research, where they also arrived at a similar conclusion.

So what we have here is a history of autoethnography. In fact – and we may as well be clear about it from the outset – it is our history of autoethnography. To do otherwise would be to write against some of the core premises that autoethnography is built upon. In particular, it would risk working against the realization that knowledge about the social and human world cannot exist independent of the knower; that we cannot

know or tell anything without (in some way) being involved in the knowing and the telling. In addition, it would fail to capitalize on one of the unique opportunities that autoethnography provides to learn about the general – the social, cultural and political – through an exploration of the personal” (2013: 84–85).

In my brief history of starting somewhere, I have made no attempt to be comprehensive and all-inclusive in either going back or going forward. Rather, I have highlighted some of the debates taking place around the time of my “starting somewhere,” which are now necessarily dated. I also aimed to draw attention to a critical shift in contemporary ethnographic work *with* girls that can be participatory as we saw in the example of the video produced by girls described in the previous section, or as part of a DIY initiative with girls engaged in their own media-making. This does not, however, mean that we should therefore exclude textual readings or historical analysis, but only that we have much a wider range of approaches from which to draw, both in relation to who we are as adult researchers of girlhood and how we might want to also engage girls.

Finally, I want to remind us that we do all have to start somewhere. The tools and approaches to charting girlhood studies that I map out here are meant to be invitational to others to embark also upon charting. It is in this way that we start anew the placing of girlhood studies.

Claudia Mitchell is a James McGill Professor in the Department of Integrated Studies in Education in the Faculty of Education at McGill University. Her research interests span work in schools with teachers and young people (particularly in the context of gender and HIV and AIDS) to work in higher education in the study of mainstreaming issues of gender and HIV and AIDS, to girlhood studies. Some of her books include *Girl Culture: An Encyclopedia* (2 vols., 2008) co-edited with Jacqueline Reid-Walsh, *Girlhood: Redefining the Limits* (2006) with Candis Steenberg and Yasmin Jiwani, and *Seven Going on Seventeen: Tween Studies in the Culture of Girlhood* (2005), co-edited with Jacqueline Reid-Walsh. She co-founded and is editor-in-chief of the award-winning *Girlhood Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*.

Notes

1. See also Moletsane et al. (2008).
2. For the complete transcript of Andrea Dworkin’s talk on 7 December 1990, one year after the Montreal massacre, see <http://radfem.org/dworkin/>.

3. For an excellent analysis of the girls-into-science-and-technology movement see Sandra Acker and Keith Oatley's *Gender in Education for Science and Technology: Current Situation and Prospects for Change* (1993).
4. The report was also cited in other articles related to girls' issues and follow-up stories about schools' attempts to close the gender gap (e.g., Van Tassel 1992; Lombardi 1993).
5. The tsunami includes such works as *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the Selves of Adolescent Girls*, by Mary Pipher (1994); Peggy Orenstein's *Schoolgirls: Young Women, Self Esteem, and the Confidence Gap* (1994); Myra and David Sadker's *Failing at Fairness: How America's Schools Cheat Girls* (2010); and Judy Mann's *The Difference: Discovering the Hidden Ways We Silence Girls* (1994).
6. <http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/50y/brochure/tle/116.htm>
7. In Mitchell (2013) I apply a variety of auto-ethnographic approaches to a personal history of growing up in the land of oil in southwestern Manitoba.
8. For an elaborated description of the methodology of memory-work prompts, curated albums, and collective viewing, see Mitchell and Pithouse (2014).
9. See for example the range of auto-ethnographic exemplars in Stacy Holman Jones, Tony Adams, and Carolyn Ellis (2013).
10. Jacqui Reid-Walsh and I came up with a list of questions that we thought would contribute to feminist mapping (see Mitchell, Reid-Walsh, Blaeser, and Smith 1998; Kirk, Mitchell, and Reid-Walsh 2008). It was an ambitious project and at the time we imagined that we might be able to map all that was going on in girlhood across all disciplines and across many regions of the world. Notwithstanding the impossibility of the task, the questions remain useful: How is girlhood defined and why? Who is a girl? What are the geopolitical spaces in which the research takes place? Who is engaging in this kind of research? Who isn't? What is the critical reception of this research? Who funds girlhood? Who are beneficiaries of the research on girlhood? What are the kinds of questions that are being taken up? What is the history of this field? How has the focus of the work changed over time? How does the research link the lives of girls and women? To what extent does the research draw on gender relations? What is the main agenda of the work? To what extent is it regulatory and protective? Advocacy and action-oriented? Policy-oriented? What methodologies are being employed? How do girls and women participate? To what extent is the work girl-centered?

References

- Acker, Sandra, and Keith Oatley. 1993. *Gender in Education for Science and Technology: Current Situation and Prospects for Change*. *Canadian Journal of Education* 18, no. 3: 255–272.
- American Association of University Women. 1992. *Shortchanging Girls, Shortchanging America Study*. Washington: AAUW.
- Bloustien, Gerry. 2003. *Girl-making*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.

- Brown, Lyn Mikel. 2008. "The 'Girls' in Girls' Studies." *Girlhood Studies* 1, no. 1: 1–12.
- Brown, Lyn Mikel, and Carol Gilligan. 1992. *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girls' Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Carter, Bill. 1991. "Children's TV, Where Boys Are King," *The New York Times*, 1 May, C18.
- Chira, Susan. 1992. "Bias against Girls Found Rife in Schools, with Lasting Damage." *The New York Times*, 12 February, A1.
- Christian-Smith, Linda K. 1990. *Becoming a Woman through Romance*. New York: Routledge.
- Christian-Smith, Linda K., ed. 1993. *Texts of Desire: Essays on Fiction, Femininity, and Schooling*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Dangarembga, Tsitsi. 1988. *Nervous Conditions*. London: Women's Press.
- Douglas, Kitrina, and David Carless. 2013. "A History of Autoethnographic Inquiry." In *Handbook of Autoethnography*, ed. Stacy Holman Jones, Tony Adams and Carolyn Ellis. 84–106. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Gilbert, Pamela, and Sandra Taylor. 1991. *Fashioning the Feminine: Girls, Popular Culture and Schooling*. Sydney: Unwin
- Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hallam Julia, and Margaret Marchment. 1995. "Questioning the Ordinary Woman: *Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit*, Text and Viewer," in *Feminist Production and Process*, ed. Beverly Skeggs, 169–189. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Hains, Rebecca. C. 2012. *Growing Up with Girl Power: Girlhood on Screen and in Everyday Life*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Haug Frigga. 1987. *Female Sexualization: A Collective Work of Memory*, trans. E. Carter. London: Verso.
- Holman Jones, Stacy, Tony Adams, and Carolyn Ellis. 2013. *Handbook of Autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Kearney, Mary Celeste. 2013. *Girls Make Media*. London: Routledge.
- Kenway, Jane, and Sue Willis. 1990. *Hearts and Minds: Self-Esteem and the Schooling of Girls*.
- Khau, Mathabo. 2009. "Journeys into the Hidden Self: Reflections on a Collaborative Inquiry into Women Teachers' Memories of Adolescent Sexuality." In *Making Connections: Self-study & Social Action*, ed. Kathleen Pit-house, Claudia Mitchell and Relebohile Moletsane, 59–75. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kirk, Jacqueline, Claudia Mitchell, and Jacqueline Reid-Walsh. 2010. Toward Political Agency for Girls: Mapping the Discourses of Girlhood Globally. In *Girlhood: A Global History*, ed. J. Helgren and C. Vascolles, 14–29. Rutgers: Rutgers University Press.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. 1971. *From Is to Ought: How to Commit the Naturalistic Fallacy and Get Away with It in the Study of Moral Development*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kuhn, Annette. 1995. *Family Secrets: Acts of Memory and Imagination*. London and New York: Verso.

- Lombardi, Kate Stone. 1993. "Easing Bias against Girls in the Classroom," *The New York Times*, 14 March, n.p. <http://www.nytimes.com/1993/03/14/nyregion/easing-bias-against-girls-in-the-classroom.html>.
- Mann, Judy. 1994. *The Difference: Discovering the Hidden Ways We Silence Girls: Finding Alternatives That Can Give Them a Voice*. New York: Warner Books.
- Martin, Rosy. 1987. "Phototherapy: Transforming the School Photo. (Happy Days Are Here Again)." In *Photography/Politics, Two*, ed. Patricia Holland, Jo Spence and Simon Watney, 40–42. London: Comedia/Photography Workshop.
- McRobbie, Angela, and Garber, Janet. [1981] 1991. "Girls and Subcultures." In *Feminism and Youth Culture: From Jackie to Just Seventeen*, ed. Angela McRobbie, 209–222. Cambridge, MA: Unwin Hyman. Originally printed in S. Hall and T. Jefferson, eds. (1978) *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post War Britain*. London: Hutchison.
- Mitchell, Claudia. 1982. "'I Only Read Novels and that Sort of Thing': Exploring the Aesthetic Response." *English Quarterly* Summer: 67–77.
- . 2010. "Things, Objects and Gendered Consumption in Childhood Studies." In *Childhood and Consumer Culture*, ed. David Buckingham and Vejbjerg Tingstad, 94–112. London: Palgrave.
- . 2011. "What's Participation Got to Do with It? Visual Methodologies in 'Girl-Method' to Address Gender Based Violence in the Time of AIDS." *Global Studies of Childhood* 1, no. 1: 51–59. doi.org/10.2304/gsch.2011.1.1.51.
- . 2013. "Oil Rights/Rites." In *Productive Remembering and Social Agency*, ed. Teresa Strong-Wilson, Claudia Mitchell, Susann Allnutt and Katheleen Pithouse-Morgan. 123–137. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Mitchell, Claudia, and Naydene de Lange. 2011. "Community Based Video and Social Action in Rural South Africa." In *Handbook on Visual Methods*, ed. Luc Pauwels and Eric Margolis, 171–185. London: SAGE.
- Mitchell, Claudia, and Jacqueline Reid-Walsh. 1995. "And I Want to Thank You Barbie: Barbie as a Site of Cultural Interrogation." *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies* 17, no. 2: 143–156.
- Mitchell, Claudia, and Jacqueline Reid-Walsh. 1998. "Mail-order Memory-work: Towards a Methodology of Uncovering the Experiences of Covering Over." *Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies* 20, no. 1: 57–75.
- Mitchell, Claudia, and Jacqueline Reid-Walsh. 2008a. "Introduction to the Girl Culture Encyclopedia." In *Girl Culture: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Claudia Mitchell and Jacqueline Reid-Walsh, xxiii–xxxii. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Mitchell, Claudia, and Jacqueline Reid-Walsh. 2008b. "A Reader's Guide to Studying Girl Culture." In *Girl Culture: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Claudia Mitchell and Jacqueline Reid-Walsh, 1–2. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Mitchell, Claudia, and Jacqueline Reid-Walsh. 2008c. "Girl Method: Placing Girl-Centred Research Methodologies on the Map of Girlhood Studies." In *Roadblocks to Equality: Women Challenging Boundaries*, ed. Jeffery Klaehn, 214–233. Montreal: Black Rose Books.
- Mitchell, Claudia, Jacqueline Reid-Walsh, Marilyn Blaeser, and Ann Smith. 1998. "Who Cares about Girls?" In *Centering on ... the Margins: The Evaded Curriculum, Proceedings of the Second Bi-annual Canadian Association for the Study of Women and Education (CASWE) International Institute*, 169–176. Ottawa: CASWE.

- Mitchell, Claudia, and Kathleen Pithouse-Morgan. 2014. "Expanding the Memory Catalogue: Southern African Women's Contributions to Memory-work Writing as a Feminist Research Methodology." *Agenda* 28, no. 1: 92–103.
- Moletsane, Relebohile, Claudia Mitchell, Ann Smith, and Linda Chisholm. 2008. *Methodologies for Mapping a Southern African Girlhood in the Age of AIDS*. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Motalingoane-Khau, Mathabo. 2007. "Understanding Adolescent Sexuality in the Memories of Four Female Basotho Teachers: An Auto/biographical Study." M.Ed. diss., University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban. http://research.space.ukzn.ac.za/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10413/1368/Motalingoane-Khau_MSC_2007.pdf?sequence=1.
- Moss, Gemma. 1989. *Un/popular Fictions*. London: Virago.
- Orenstein, Peggy. 1994. *Schoolgirls: Young Women, Self Esteem, and the Confidence Gap*. New York: Doubleday.
- Pipher, Mary. 1994. *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the Selves of Adolescent Girls*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Pidduck, Julianne. 1995. "Feminist Rhetoric of Violence against Women and the Production of Everyday Fear." *Problematique* 4: 137–154.
- Radway, Janice A. [1984]1991. *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Reid-Walsh, Jacqueline, and Claudia Mitchell. 2000. "'Just a Doll'? 'Liberating' accounts of Barbie-play." *Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies* 22, no. 2, 175–190.
- Sadker, Myra, and David Sadker. 2010. *Failing at Fairness: How America's Schools Cheat Girls*. Simon and Schuster.
- Science Council of Canada. 1982. *Who Turns the Wheel?* Ottawa: Science Council of Canada.
- Smith, Ann. 2012. "Take a Picture: Photographs, Dress, Gender and Self-study," in *Was It Something I Wore? Dress, Identity, Materiality*, ed. Relebohile Moletsane, Claudia Mitchell and Ann Smith, 57–71. Cape Town: HSRC Press.
- Van Tassel, Pricilla. 1992. "New Move to Combat Sex Bias in Classroom," 5 April, n.p. <http://www.nytimes.com/1993/03/14/nyregion/easing-bias-again-st-girls-in-the-classroom.html>.
- Willis Paul. 1977. *Learning to Labour: How Working Class Kids get Working Class Jobs*. Farnborough, UK: Saxon House.
- Walkerdine, Valerie. 1990. *Schoolgirl Fictions*. London: Verso.
- . 1988. *Counting Girls Out*. London: Verso.

Filmography

- Kidron, Beeban. 1989. *Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit*. UK.
- Villeneuve, Denis. 2009. *Polytechnique*. Canada.