

WOMEN'S STUDIES IN FOCUS

Infusing Feminism: A Discussion of Methodology, Pedagogy, and Praxis

Emily van der Meulen, May Friedman, Vicki S. Hallett, Diana Gibaldi and Claire Carter

Abstract

This paper explores the continuum of feminist research to feminist teaching by looking at pedagogy, inquiry, and practice. It presents perspectives on feminist life writing, research and action research, as well as queer positive and experiential classrooms. The authors provoke a critical conversation about feminist methodology, pedagogy and praxis.

Résumé

Cet article explore le cursus de la recherche féministe à l'enseignement féministe en regardant la pédagogie, l'enquête, et la pratique. Il présente des perspectives sur les écrits féministes sur la vie, la recherche et les recherches d'action, ainsi que des classes positives queer et des classes expérimentales. L'auteure provoque une conversation critique sur la méthodologie féministe, la pédagogie et le praxis.

Introduction

The authors of this paper are fourth-year doctoral students in Women's Studies at York University, Toronto. We began the program in 2004 with diverse research interests, theoretical positions, and academic backgrounds. This paper originated as a collaborative panel presentation we mounted while working through our comprehensive examinations. Our conversation at that time focused on how to infuse our research and teaching with feminist methodology, pedagogy and praxis within an interdisciplinary environment. As Women's Studies students we were beginning to better understand the unique set of challenges that we face as feminists both in the classroom and the field. As an ever growing and changing discipline, Women's Studies poses transformative and radical possibilities that are complicated by academic structures and policies.

While this paper does not have an overarching epistemological frame, the sections themselves weave a common thread. The paper speaks to how postmodernism, queer and anti-racist theories and critical methodologies continue to challenge and inform the development of feminist thought and Women's Studies. We begin with Vicki Hallett's questioning of feminist research in the humanities; she asks us to consider what strategies make humanities research feminist. Emily van der Meulen follows with a discussion of action research and its possibilities as a student's methodology, and emphasizes the importance of keeping ties between activist and feminist academic work. Next, May Friedman writes about building

bridges between her role as a student and her role as a teacher. She poses valuable questions about the divide between research and pedagogy in an attempt to find a middle ground of praxis. Diana Gibaldi then provides a grounded discussion of queering the classroom in which she examines some of her struggles and puts forward suggestions for making the classroom a more trans inclusive space. Finally, Claire Carter addresses the changing role and meaning of "experience" in the classroom. She draws on her experience as a graduate student and teaching assistant to consider the value of recognizing and incorporating our own lives as a part of doing feminist pedagogy.

Wherefore Art Thou Feminism?

Vicki S. Hallett's research interests include identity formation through place, and women's life writing.

As a humanities student focussing on women's archival life-writing texts, my major research process is comprised of reading and writing. This presents a double challenge. In a discipline that often privileges social science research I need to consider the ways in which my work is valued as research in and of itself. Likewise, as a feminist scholar, I find myself considering the ways that my research strategies are specifically feminist in orientation.

When I ponder reading strategies, I often think about Donna Haraway. After reading her theory of "situated knowledges" I am left to understand that all of our vision is imperfect and imperfectly mediated by the technologies (organic or inorganic) that we use to see the world. We are all dependent upon our eyes, be they the ones in our heads, the ones in our fingers, or in other techno-gadgetry, to read the world. However, these eyes are already programmed and it is incumbent upon us to recognize and question that. These are but initial steps towards creating a

situation where we might catch a glimpse through other eyes, other instruments of vision which "mediate standpoints" (Haraway 1991, 193). Such processes can help in conceptualizing reading as a feminist project that, as Diana says of teaching (below), will allow a sharing of knowledge and thus work toward common feminist goals.

Such goals make the reading of texts highly politicized, and much more complex. I used to read texts with the humble goal of simply trying to understand the message of the author. However, as a doctoral student there is a need to engage with texts on many different levels. We think about not only the author's theory or message but also the reader's mediated vision of it, and about the very nature of an author. A reader engages in dialogue with texts, while simultaneously putting texts in dialogue with one another. So doing, we can become what Helen Buss calls a "very good reader, one who can hold many possibilities of subjectivity without resorting to narrative closure as a release from the demands of multiplicity" (Buss 2001, 34)

Lorraine Code's philosophical take on the subject of methodology is another important piece of my research strategy. As she says, "...a crucial first step in developing an adequately sensitive feminist methodology is learning to see what is not there and hear what is not being said. [...feminists...] have to understand the power structures that effect these erasures" (Code 1995, 23). This step is particularly crucial, and particularly difficult, in archival research, as the archive is a reflection of the society that creates it. This point is made by Michael Hill in *Archival Strategies and Techniques* (1993), and later echoed throughout Buss and Kadar's collection *Working in Women's Archives* (2001). The power dynamics that are at work in the larger society will determine what is considered valuable enough to warrant protection in an archive. Thus, one must not only read the texts found in the archive, but also read the archive as a

socially mediated text.

As in the case of Claire's ideas of feminist pedagogy, feminist reading strategies require the interrogation of my own experiences and assumptions so that I can recognize the ways I am implicated in the mediation of the text. These include, but are not limited to, assumptions about my role as researcher and writer, about what I will find in the archive, who the women are that I am looking for, what their lives were like, and my relationship to them. It is here that a key connection between reading and writing becomes apparent. As Audrey Kleinsasser states, "Researcher reflexivity creates physical evidence of personal and theoretical tracks through a created text, evidencing the researcher's deep learning and unlearning" (Kleinsasser 2000, 156). What I write will reflect the texts that I read, and how I read them.

Laurel Richardson says that she "write[s] in order to learn something [she] did not know before [she] wrote it" (924). She sees the act of writing as, "a way of 'knowing' - a method of discovery and analysis" (Richardson 2000, 923). Thus, for Richardson, and now for me, the act of writing is no longer a simple matter of recording what I already know, but a process through which I explore potential knowledge. So, a feminist writing practice will also show itself as having an author (with many contested meanings), one who is present in the writing (yet also hiding), and who is interested in not only discovering new things, but finding out that old assumptions were flawed.

Like feminist reading strategies, our writing strategies must be self-reflexive at all times. We must be cognizant of the ways our many selves and subjectivities (and those of the authors) come to influence what, and how, we are reading and writing at any given moment. As Kadar posits, such reading and writing practices encourage the readers to develop "[...their] self-consciousness in order to humanize and make less abstract, [...] the self-in-the-writing" (Kadar

1992, 12). Is this an impossibly quixotic task? Yes, of course! We can never be entirely sure we have examined our research practices from every angle, but the effort is surely worth it. And indeed, if we view knowledge production not as an individual endeavour, which it surely is not, but a communal one - such as the ideas of action research discussed by Emily in the following section - then the task becomes more manageable. If we are able to accept that much academic work is what Trinh T. Minh-Ha terms "intellectual bricolage" (Minh-Ha 1989, 62), then we should also be able to accept the assistance of other feminists in the search for reflexivity and feminist praxis.

Action Research Methodology: The Possibilities and Pitfalls for Students

Emily van der Meulen's dissertation research is on sex work policy, labour rights, and the decriminalization of the industry. She is a board member of Maggie's: The Toronto Prostitutes' Community Service Project.

Drawing from Vicki's thoughts on reading, I am likewise looking for innovative approaches to my own research methods. In particular, I ask how research and knowledge production can become a community project rather than an individual endeavour. In considering participatory action research, I am looking at ways of blending some of the reflexivity discussed by Vicki with a methodology that supports and encourages this reflexivity.

It has been through grassroots and feminist social justice activism that I have come to better understand the importance of researching in egalitarian and participatory ways. I first came across action research (AR) methodology and its possibility as a student's methodology in the months of reading towards my comprehensive exams. It immediately struck a cord with both my politics and my

personality. Action researchers affirm that within their AR projects the people in a particular setting are capable of identifying their research needs, supporting the research process, and implementing their own solutions (Borda and Rahman 1991; Whyte 1991). In an AR study, the participation of the local community begins at the design and implementation stage and follows through to the analysis of the results and releasing of data (Brydon-Miller et al. 2003). As such, it actively promotes and encourages the direct participation of those whom the study involves. Partnerships are formed between the academic researcher and the local researchers so that the community itself participates in carrying out the project.

In relation to my dissertation, engaging with action research principles means that I would act more as a facilitator or collaborator who uses my particular skills to work with a community on a project that is in part their creation. In effect, AR is not only a research methodology but also a pedagogical tool with emancipatory potential. It is on the one hand a research process with its own disciplinary history, and on the other, an activist commitment that promotes social justice and social change. The AR process recognizes the unique and important contributions of all participants and encourages collective action, evaluation, and knowledge production. Communities and individuals are brought together to produce knowledge together.

My doctoral work focuses on the experiences and expert knowledge of sex workers, a stigmatized and often-marginalized community of workers. As I strive to be cognizant of the complicated dynamics within research projects, especially those imbued with racial, class, and gender power dynamics, I am aware that many communities are rightfully distrustful of outsider and/or academic researchers. Indeed, a history of exploitative methods and ulterior motives has directly contributed to many strained and sometimes

antagonistic relationships within research settings (Borda and Rahman 1991). Relationships between sex workers and feminist researchers tend to be particularly complicated as a good deal of feminist literature has simplistically, and problematically, positioned sex workers as victims who lack the ability to make informed decisions. A history of being studied by various sociologists, psychologists, historians, anthropologists, and feminists has led some sex workers to avoid participation in any research projects. But while some relationships between feminists and sex workers are fraught with tension, it is important to note that these two categories are certainly not always mutually exclusive. There are many sex workers who identify as feminist and many feminists have been or will be sex workers.

One of the main attractions of action research methodology is that the practitioner actively examines issues of power and privilege in the research setting. Action researchers recognize that it is their own responsibility to be self-reflexive and to acknowledge the position of privilege that comes with being an institutionally supported or sponsored researcher. While it is never possible to equalize power relations within research settings (particularly between academic researchers and local stakeholders), action research strives to constantly check, challenge, and critique the complicated and often problematic dynamics involved.

As I progress through my doctoral program I have been grappling with whether or not AR methods are feasible in a student's research project. With action research comes a unique set of challenges and complications. The relative flexibility of its principles and methods, for some, creates a positive and inclusive environment where spontaneous decisions can be made and where issues of race and gender are open for analysis. For others, the lack of rigid framework denotes a blurring and confusion of methodological stances. Indeed, some have argued that action research

is "long on ideology and short on methodology" (Chiu 2003, 174). Students are required to produce a thorough and original dissertation proposal that is capable of passing rigorous ethics standards. If the research questions and/or methods identified by the community group are incongruent with the institutional ethics standards and requirements the student researcher might not be allowed to participate in the project for their doctoral work. Additionally, institutional time constraints on producing a high quality dissertation could make it difficult to work collaboratively with a community group or organization when the original research project comes under serious challenge or revision. Issues of intellectual property and copyright can also pose specific challenges. Questions of authority and ownership over the results of the project, and therefore who can publish and when, are particularly troubling. To publish or perish is especially relevant in this context. As I think about action research as a possible methodology that links my student life with my activist life, I wonder what challenges lie ahead. In the following section, May asks similar questions in her attempts to find a feminist praxis that connects her life as both student and teacher.

Edging Toward the Middle: Finding Praxis Within the Feminist Academy

May Friedman lives in Toronto with her partner and two small children. She currently is working on a dissertation about mothering and blogging.

Emily asks us to consider the challenges of legitimacy with respect to a research method that challenges traditional positions of subject, observer and knowledge. Here, I do the same with respect to introducing more radical modes of teaching in the classroom and in the field.

Research and teaching are often viewed as

disparate (although interrelated) aspects of academic work. We grapple with the ethical demands and practical considerations of our work as feminist academics undertaking research and teaching but do not always pause to consider the two as mutually constituting. Specifically, the value granted to our research knowledge implicates our credibility as feminist educators, while our research methods (and the ethical considerations therein) enter our classrooms in both subtle and explicit ways.

Research is central to academic knowledge and it can be carried out in a wide variety of ways and has, effectively, always been the basis of academic knowledge. A working definition of research could include the notion that it is about examining some aspect of lived experience ("data") and attempting to measure it and record it. Research, by its definition, assumes that there is empirical knowledge out there to be found and documented. A more flexible approach to knowledge, however, would include discussions about who owns that knowledge and the position of the researcher.

On the most basic level, we teach what we know. And we know what we know because we - or someone we read - researched it. Our approach to research has a profound impact on the way we teach and what we teach. Thus, any suspicion held toward the methods of feminist scholars could result in a resistance to the discipline of Women's Studies in its pedagogical forum. Furthermore, there is clearly a relationship between research, pedagogy and legitimacy. It is very difficult to stand up and teach our students about standpoint and contextualized knowledge if the research we use to guide our teaching is decontextualized or if it fails to take multiple points of view into account. We must be consistent in both our research and pedagogy. An approach to research that welcomes ambiguity and intersectionality, however, makes it quite difficult to function pragmatically within the academy, to graduate, to get hired, to get tenure,

to get the resources we require in order to continue to do our research. In turn, this reflects poorly on our departments and eventually on the entire discipline of Women's Studies. It also has implications beyond our self-esteem: if alternate research paradigms are viewed as "cheating" somehow, feminist researchers will struggle to get funding, to gain support from (often empirically-trained) supervisors and struggle, finally, to graduate. This struggle does not just pit feminists against all other researchers: as Women's Studies scholars, we must remain aware of the history of the women's movement itself and the ways that power imbalances and oppressive practices have dogged this social movement. A feminist researcher, then, must somehow address the dual burden of history with respect to both feminism and research.

How do we embody Donna Haraway's "situated knowledges" while mired in the context of empiricism? (Haraway 1991). Can we realistically take up Elizabeth Ellsworth's challenge that "Knowledge, once it is defined, taught and used as a 'thing made,' is dead" (Ellsworth 2005, 1) while working within an academic setting that prizes static knowledge as a laudable and achievable goal?

Sometimes the challenge is to do research that allows for a degree of legitimacy in order to debunk or at least add nuance to that same research in our transgressive teaching. Unfortunately, however, the mutual dependence of teaching and research around the axis of knowledge makes it enormously difficult to change this system without proposing a radical revisioning of our approach to education. As long as we demand that our students are evaluated based on their retention of certain facts over others, for example, we continue to uphold a system that may resist our attempts to incorporate difference or otherwise resist a narrowing of potential identities or possibilities. As we attempt to explore this apparent contradiction with our students, the very system within which we teach seriously restricts our abilities to make

substantive change. Indeed, to discuss the power dynamics of research and teaching while teaching is potentially alienating and disingenuous, while ignoring those dynamics maintains the oppressive scenarios that we ought to be striving to change.

How do we usefully navigate the system, stay true to our dewy-eyed ideals and yet teach our students with a (relatively) clear conscience? Often, we take recourse to subversive methods that are causing contemporary Women's Studies to be, at its best, an exciting, dynamic discipline. We don't just teach about intersectionality, we embody it (see below). We don't just pick a range of communities to study, we struggle with our uneasy placement within those communities. These may not be explicitly feminist methods. We cannot say that non-feminist researchers have never conducted research or taught from intersectional spaces, or that oppressive research practices have never been undertaken in the name of feminism. We might also argue that contemporary feminism (blending threads of postmodernism with third-wave hybrid identities) shows an almost paralytic self-consciousness, yet this self-consciousness may endow a peculiar sense of responsibility to the researcher, resulting in a reflexivity that is both unique and exciting. Furthermore, this reflexivity is specifically located at the intersection between pedagogy and researcher. Knowledge rests at the juncture between these two activities, in a way that has the potential to change how we view all three - teaching, research and knowledge itself. By acknowledging the deep ambivalence we may feel about the knowledge we create and document, we stand to become more versatile researchers, to create more varied educational opportunities, and ultimately to effect a potentially more flexible and varied face of feminism itself.

Pride in the Classroom: Sexuality and Gender Identity Politics

Diana Gibaldi's research interests include trans theory, queer theory, feminist pedagogy, postmodern and poststructuralist feminist theory and feminist cultural studies.

Drawing on May's thoughts with respect to feminism and integrity in the classroom, I think about the ways in which my various identities impact my position as an educator. I consider the ways in which I use myself as my most important teaching tool in the queer positive and trans positive space that I try to create for my students.

"How to implement a queer and trans friendly space in one's classroom" sounds like something written on a pamphlet for a Teaching Assistant training workshop. I am not convinced, however, that as teachers we have the queer and trans friendly classrooms we profess to have. I raise questions about what a trans positive style of teaching and learning might actually look like. In addressing these concerns, I hope to find ways of bridging my theoretical framework with my pedagogical practice in my own Women's Studies classroom.

When I became a doctoral student I began to think more critically about how to modify my teaching practices to reflect a different kind of thinking and knowing. As I started to teach I began to realize how difficult a task this was. Not only did I find the institutional barriers of the university challenging, but, more shockingly, I found that I was completely overwhelmed by my own assumptions about my students and worried about falling into the traps of twenty years of standardized teaching methods. Here I am, feminist, queer, and working towards a graduate degree in Women's Studies, attempting to teach my students about homophobia, compulsory heterosexuality, transgender rights and the intersex movement, while simultaneously wondering if my students were trying to figure out whether I am

queer. Or conversely, do they think I'm straight? Do I show them the hair on my legs or do I take the rainbows off my bag so that I don't scare them away on the first day? This seeming contradiction reflects the reality of being and living my politics in a world that wants me to assimilate or cease to exist. In thinking about how this reality works, I see contradictions in what I am teaching and how I am teaching it.

Previous work on feminist pedagogy has examined the relationships, power dynamics and issues that educators have encountered when attempting to implement a feminist or radical praxis in their classrooms (Freire 1970; hooks 1994). Similarly, feminist and queer theorists have addressed the ways in which sexuality shapes the dynamic of one's pedagogy and classroom (Britzman, 1995). Parallel to these ideas, I want to look specifically at the ways that gender identity mediates one's pedagogy and look at the possibility that trans pedagogy holds for feminist teaching and learning.

In my classroom I try to examine the relationship I have with my students as a subject who embodies a series of non-normative categories which they learn about in the course. Indeed, the power dynamics present within university classrooms and the overlapping of heterosexism, white privilege, sexism, and teacher/student dynamics shape the method and style of my pedagogical choices and options. I try to raise questions and ideas from within my feminist teaching that create queer and trans positive, friendly and safe spaces. I also try to think about the ways we can challenge ourselves and our students to break out of old patterns of thinking and knowing that force me to wear pants on my first day of class.

I strongly reject the "add and stir" model for achieving an inclusive curriculum. This idea doesn't work when we are attempting to do feminist work and I contend that it doesn't work with sexuality studies either. Can a class be called feminist if there is a day on women or even a week? How much of the content

needs to be about women for a class to be feminist? I argue that a day on women, feminism, lesbians, or transgendered people only reinforces the topic's lack of significance in the course content..

As May outlined, there are often conflicts between what we do and what we teach, and even further, how we teach. In feminist classrooms we are attempting to teach our students material that challenges binary and biological conceptions of sex and gender. We teach the work of Anne Fausto-Sterling, Leslie Feinberg, and Judith Butler in an effort to convey that there are more than two sexes and more than two genders. Indeed, the rules that govern these categories are suspect at best. And yet how do we reflect this type of thinking in our teaching? Can we change our use of pronouns and encourage our students to do so as well? For example, instead of saying "he or she," we can say "he and she and ze," or his, her and hir? We can eliminate phrases like "the opposite sex" and incorporate a broader perspective of genders and sexes.

To foster this queer and trans positive Women's Studies space, we as feminists need to incorporate the perspectives and issues of transgender communities into all of our lessons and research. We need to recognize trans mothering when we discuss childbirth and motherhood. In discussion of the health care system we can include new legislations on hormones or access to surgery for trans people. Our philosophical inquiries about body schemata and body image can incorporate transgender women and how they experience their bodies in a patriarchal culture. We can ask questions about the effects of transitioning body schemas. We need to investigate how trans men experience male culture and incorporate their voices and ideas in feminist discussions of how to create a masculinity that resists supremacy.

I make these suggestions with the hopes that we conceive of the transgender community as a

group that is not separate or that exists outside of the daily work that we do or the very lives that we live. These suggestions remain part of an ideological shift towards an alignment between our feminist pedagogy and our feminist politics.

Experience: Some Considerations on the Role it Plays in Feminist Pedagogy

Claire Carter's research interests include feminist constructions of the self and identity in relation to the body and aging.

Diana asks us to consider the implications of our identities when we act as educators: what are the broader considerations for women's studies if the experiences of students and teachers alike are taken up in the classroom? I am interested in questioning how the inclusion of personal experience can radically transform the feminist classroom.

Many feminist theorists have noted the central role experience has played within feminist theory: some have even gone so far as to say that it "is the basis of feminism in the sense that feminism began the moment when women started talking to each other about their experiences" (Skeggs 1997, 25). However, the notion of women's experience, which became the focus within mainstream feminism, was based upon White middle- and upper-class, heterosexual women, effectively silencing and denying the experiences of women of colour, lesbians, and working-class women. Within the mainstream feminist movement, many White women turned inward, reflecting on their individual experiences, and did not link their lives to broader socio-political relations, and consequently, the feminist movement was stalled (hooks 2000, 26). Such critiques of the concept of women's experience has led to considerable discussion about the use and meaning of experience within feminist theorizing. Whose experience counts? What is meant

by experience, how do experiences relate and speak to differences among women, and whether it should continue to play such a critical role within feminism.

Despite the critiques, many feminists have been reluctant to let go of experience altogether (Agathangelou 2004; Bannerji 1995) and instead have proposed that we revise how we conceive of and use experience within feminist theory and action. For example, Scott's analysis of experience - she argues that individuals do not have experiences but rather are constituted through experience - shifts the role of experience from being "the origin of our explanation" to "that which we seek to explain, that about which knowledge is produced" (Scott 1992, 26). Similarly, Skeggs argues that rather than viewing experience as a foundation for theory or as a truth of women's identities, we should instead utilize it as an entry point, to see how women take up and occupy the category "women" (Skeggs 1997, 25). While these developments have been both exciting and insightful, there remains uncertainty and disagreement over the role experience should have within feminism.

As a graduate student and teaching assistant in women's studies, I have witnessed and participated in the uneasy relationship between experience and feminism. In several graduate seminars, professors have instructed students to try and leave their personal experiences aside and to focus on the course material. Being asked to engage with material on a surface level, rather than taking it up more fully, has challenged my understanding and approach to pedagogy. To me, learning involves an attempt to connect with the ideas and arguments presented in readings as well as with the other people in the room, rather than emotional disengagement. The request to leave experience outside the classroom has been an issue of concern for several of my colleagues and for Women's Studies students more generally (Thompson 2001). I think some of my professors' concerns derive from critiques of early feminist work

that positioned experience as truth - as if a woman's experience of something could explain or define a particular social issue or identity for all women. I also believe that some of my professors' anxiety about discussing personal experiences stems from debates around identity politics, which often led to competing dialogues over who was more oppressed. While I share these very valid concerns, I do not feel that the necessary response to it is to bar or discourage discussion of experience.

When our lives are made present in the classroom, the space can change into one that is uncomfortable and messy. However, for me, it is those moments of discomfort and uneasiness that challenge me, my framework and my world view, and out of which I have learnt the most. These moments are precisely why I try to encourage my students to share and critically engage with their experiences. But this is not an easy task. I have had a few difficult situations as a teaching assistant. When I felt unsure of how to proceed after students had revealed very personal information to me or the class, I have wondered how to balance encouraging my students to constructively share their experiences against the possibility that such disclosure may trigger deep-seated emotions. While I know that these are not new concerns (McKay 1993), I believe they remain unresolved and need to be continually re-visited.

It seems that these concerns are critical to Women's Studies as a discipline - to the debates and developments it has come through, and to where it wants to go as a discipline - negotiating its relationship both to academia and to feminist movement more generally. The practice of politicizing personal experiences has always been central to Women's Studies, and feminist theorizing more generally (Guy-Sheftall 1993). As Agathangelou states, we "need to begin with ourselves and our lives as the launching point for our explanatory and analytical inquiries, especially if we are committed to a

revolutionary and transformative politics" (2004, 169).

As graduate students and feminist scholars we need to talk about this dilemma because Women's Studies courses deal with complicated, personal and political issues. Whether or not it is encouraged, our students' lives, as well as our own, are being discussed and are present in the classroom.

Similar to Diana, I argue a feminist classroom should be a space where we are able to reflect on and re-think our worldviews and frameworks. This involves examining, and at times sharing, experiences. The classroom is a complicated, uncomfortable and risky space - but as I have suggested above, those spaces are often critical for learning. While the relationship between experience and feminism is fraught with challenges, it is one that remains critical to feminist pedagogy.

Conclusion

What, then, does it mean to be a graduate student, a teacher, and a researcher in Women's Studies? In part, it involves coming to terms with a discipline that is interdisciplinary and still struggling to find a home in academia (both literally and metaphorically). In practical terms this has meant giving weight to the bodies and lives in the classroom, challenging traditional methodologies, and bridging research and pedagogy. We have intentionally posed many more questions than answers with the knowledge that over time, as we continue in the academy, our questions will not only become more precise but they will multiply and develop. We trust that as we pursue our careers as feminist academics we will continue to grow and adapt within and alongside the Women's Studies field. It is our intention to go on participating in the dialogue that helps shape, transform, and strengthen this discipline.

References

Agathangelou, Anna. *The Global Political Economy of*

Sex. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004.

Bannerji, Himani. *Thinking Through: Essays on Feminism, Marxism, and Anti-Racism*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1995.

Borda, Orlando Fals and Mohammad Anisur Rahman. *Action and Knowledge: Breaking the Monopoly With Participatory Action-Research*. New York: The Apex Press, 1991.

Britzman, Deborah. "Is There a Queer Pedagogy: Or Stop Reading Straight," *Educational Theory* 45.2 (June 1995): 151-65.

Brydon-Miller, Mary, Davydd Greenwood and Patricia Maguire. "Why Action Research?" *Action Research*. 1.1 (July 2003): 9-28.

Buss, Helen. "Constructing Female Subjects in the Archive: A Reading of Three Versions of One Woman's Subjectivity," *Working in Women's Archives: Researching Women's Private Literature and Archival Documents*, Helen Buss and Marlene Kadar, eds. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier Press, 2001, pp. 23-34. _____ and Marlene Kadar, eds. *Working in Women's Archives: Researching Women's Private Literature and Archival Documents*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfred Laurier Press, 2001.

Butler, Judith. "Critically Queer," *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 1.1 (1993): 17-32. _____. *Gender Trouble (10th Anniversary Edition)*. New York: Routledge, 1999.

Chiu, Lai Fong. "Transformational Potential of Focus Groups Practice in Participatory Action Research," *Action Research* 1.2 (October 2003): 165-83.

Code, Lorraine. "How Do We Know? Questions of

- Method in Feminist Practice," *Changing Methods: Feminists Transforming Practice*, Sandra Burt and Lorraine Code, eds. Peterborough, ON: Broadview, 1995.
- Ellworth, Elizabeth. *Places of Learning: Media, Architecture, Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge, 2005.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 1970.
- Guy-Sheftall, Beverly. "A Black Feminist Perspective on Transforming the Academy: the Case of Spelman College," *Theorizing Black Feminisms: the Visionary Pragmatism of Black Women*, Stanlie M. James and Abena P.A. Busia, eds. New York: Routledge, 1993, pp. 77-89.
- Haraway, Donna. *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Free Association Books, 1991.
- Hill, Michael. *Archival Strategies and Techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1993.
- hooks, bell. *Teaching to Transgress*. New York: Routledge, 1994.
- _____. *Feminist Theory from Margin to Centre*, 2nd Ed., New York: Routledge, 2000.
- Kadar, Marlene. *Life Writing: From Genre to Critical Practice*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- Kleinsasser, Audrey. "Researchers, Reflexivity and Good Data: Writing to Unlearn," *Theory Into Practice* 39.3 (2000): 155-62.
- McKay, Nellie "Acknowledging Differences: Can Women Find Unity Through Diversity?," *Theorizing Black Feminisms: the Visionary Pragmatism of Black Women*, Stanlie M. James and Abena P.A. Busia, eds. New York: Routledge, 1993, pp. 267-82.
- Martin, Jane Roland. "Methodological Essentialism, False Difference and Other Dangerous Traps," *Signs* 19.3 (Spring 1994): 630-57.
- Minh-Ha, Trinh T. *Woman, Native, Other: Writing, Postcoloniality, and Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1989.
- Reinharz, Shulamit. *Feminist Methods in Social Research*. New York: Oxford UP, 1992.
- Richardson, Laurel. "Writing: A Method of Inquiry," *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2nd edition. N.K. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln, eds. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 2000, pp. 923-48.
- Scott, Joan. "'Experience'," *Feminists Theorize the Political*, Butler and Scott, eds. New York: Routledge 1992.
- Skeggs, Beverly. *Formations of Class and Gender*. London: Sage Publications, 1997.
- Thompson, Leah "The Silencing of Young Wimmin's Voices in Women's Studies," *Canadian Woman Studies* 20/1. 4/1 (2001): 136-8.
- Whyte, William Foote. *Participatory Action Research*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1991.