

# Feminist Teaching Techniques for the Committed but Exhausted

Gayle MacDonald  
Queen's University

## ABSTRACT

Teaching is one of the most engaging albeit exhausting roles for the academic to perform. This paper explores that process for the feminist teacher. It also presents arguments as to whether or not a feminist teaching technique exists, and outlines tips and strategies, covered in earlier works, that are useful to the categories of teaching.

## RÉSUMÉ

Enseigner est une des fonctions les plus attirantes quoiqu'épuisantes que l'universitaire doit exercer. Dans l'article ci-dessous, on explore cette fonction par rapport à la professeure féministe. On y présente aussi des arguments concernant la question à savoir si une technique d'enseignement féministe existe ou non, et expose brièvement des conseils et des stratégies utiles dans les différentes catégories d'enseignement, tels que présentés dans des ouvrages antérieurs.

If we live in a society where women's knowledge and theories are notable by their absence, in which women's ideas are neither respected nor preserved, it is not because women have not produced valuable cultural forms but because what they have produced has been perceived as dangerous by those who have the power to suppress and remove evidence. (Spender, 1983, p. 2)

This paper<sup>1</sup> deals with the suppression and denial of women's experience in the development of knowledge as defined in traditional pedagogy. It is also about the creation of new forms of knowledge, by and about women, and the application this has for the creation of feminist teaching techniques.

The suppression of knowledge refers to the manner in which female knowledge of the world and its culture has been largely ignored in the realm of university teaching. This paper explores a definition of feminism and a rationale for the necessity of a focus on feminist teaching as an implement for social change. The paper also addresses some specific strategies and techniques that have been successful for feminist teachers.

## A. Feminism, and a Feminist Critique of "Knowledge"

To explain what feminist teaching techniques are, it is at first necessary to define feminism. Feminism encompasses both political activism and an academic or theoretical perspective. For many, to be a feminist is "to do" both, that is, activism and theorizing. For others, theoretical frameworks suffice, and the "personal is political" is not an adage by which their lives are lived. In either case, both viewpoints stress the lived experience and action of women's lives as crucial to any understanding of the social aspects of humanity, and as such, feminism offers both a critique and a remedy for the prevailing male ideology which influences the lives, the ideas, and the physical, emotional or financial well-being of women.

To understand feminism, therefore, is to understand the systemic discrimination with which women live every day in a society which recognizes only the male voice as norm (Gilligan, 1982), only the male record as history (Lerner, p. 5). The noted educator, Paulo Freire, suggests that women have to find their own voice as a vehicle for liberation:<sup>2</sup>

In the process of their struggle, they have to use their own language, not man's language. I believe these language variations (female language, ethnic language, dialects) are intimately interconnected with, coincide with, and express identity. They help defend one's sense of identity and they are absolutely necessary in the process of struggling for liberation. (Freire, 1985, p. 186)

Feminists have long realized the importance of just such a voice and have struggled to liberate women from ideologies and experiences which they find oppressive. Women have struggled with issues affecting their personal lives (battering, sexual assault, marriage breakdown) as well as the more insidious signs of an oppressive culture (unequal pay for work equal to that of men, pornography, lack of control over reproductive rights) often with voices ignored by men with the power to change these situations.

As Dorothy Smith indicates in her analysis of how women are excluded from the discourse of academe<sup>3</sup>, the circle was a closed one to which only men need apply.

Men attend to and treat as significant only what men say. The circle of men whose writing and talk was significant to each other extends backwards in time as far as our records reach. What men were doing was relevant to men, was written by men about men for men. Men listened and listen only to what one man says to another. (Smith, p. 241)

As a direct result, the voice of women was not heard within the theorizing and debates on human existence, and was certainly not included as relevant knowledge in the development of curriculum for future generations of scholars. Indeed, what gets constituted as "knowledge" is an interesting question, and one that has not escaped the scrutiny of feminist scholars. As Dale Spender so aptly puts it:

This is why for women one of the central issues in theories for liberation is who controls the channels of communication, who is it who decides what we know? (Spender, 1983, p. 1)

The question of who controls knowledge is crucial to an understanding of how women and women's experience has been ignored in both the development of theory and of teaching in academe. However, the concept of knowledge control is central to a traditional paradigm of pedagogy. That is, teaching traditionally consists of certain modes of transmitting knowledge and proscribes certain knowledge as "valuable." Frances Maher refers to this process as based on one version of knowledge:

The traditional mode of university teaching, that of the lecture, presumes that an expert will present to the students an objective, rationally derived and empirically proven set of information. This mode, no matter how complete, can only reflect one version (usually the one dominant in the culture). It does not necessarily hold personal meaning for all students ....(Maher, p. 29)

What is implicit (and explicit, in her text) within this paradigm is the actual denial of women's knowledge, as it is not part of the dominant culture. Paulo Freire also deplores an education programme which does not take into account the world view of the people who are being taught. This, for Freire, "constitutes cultural invasion, good intentions notwithstanding." (Freire, 1970, p. 84)

Feminism is constantly grappling with the struggle to establish women's culture, and the classroom cannot escape that struggle. It is in the university where decisions over what is "knowledge" are made, and it is here that feminism can make the greatest difference as an implement for social change. Feminist pedagogy offers a critique of the praxis of knowledge control, and techniques to combat an entrenched and dominant male ideology of curriculum.

### **B. Feminist Teaching as Critique and Remedy**

As an academic perspective, feminism provides a "space" for women's thinking and ideas that have been hitherto ignored in the male-oriented bias towards knowledge within the university (Fuchs Epstein in Langland, 1981). The remedy those working within a feminist perspective provide is a re-conceptualization of theory that is inclusive of women and women's experience, and one which women can utilize to explain, share and create women's knowledge.<sup>4</sup>

A suggestion as to how this can be formulated rests basically on what Nancy Schniedewind terms a process/content distinction, that is, feminists not only provide alternative content or visions to disciplines in which they teach, they do so by using alternative processes as well (Schniedewind, 1983). Feminist teaching offers a different way to understand the world, not a different way to manipulate the world. The promise of feminist teaching is to reclaim knowledge, and to challenge existing knowledge as male-defined.

To simply impart that "new" knowledge, however, does not constitute feminist teaching. What remains to be addressed is the process by which this happens. There are

those who suggest that feminist teaching represents an axiom that is crucial to the basic principles of feminism, which is that feminism represents an alternative vision of the world, an alternative way of knowing that is not centered on or defined by male experience, but is focussed on the lives, experiences, and quests for self-discovery of women (Belenky et al., 1986; Bunch, 1983). Schneidewind suggests that "the more classroom interaction reflects feminist principles and the greater the congruence between process and content, the *more* consistent and powerful students' learning can be." (Schneidewind, p. 261)

Others suggest that it is the creation of dialogue that makes feminist teaching an alternative method (Lewis and Simon, 1986). In an argument to encourage dialogue as an exchange rather than a "deposit,"<sup>5</sup> Freire refers to the necessity to recognize interaction as a true sharing of the learning experience — and of the authority and power inherent in the instructor/student interface.

Only dialogue, which requires critical thinking, is also capable of generating critical thinking. Without dialogue there is no communication, and without communication there can be no true education. (Freire, 1970, p. 81)

Let me step back a few thoughts here. To illustrate the necessity for dialogue and exchange of information as crucial for feminist teaching is to expose an essential contradiction that presently exists in the traditional classroom. Inherent in the instructor/student relationship is a tension or contradiction based on power, which is exposed as authority. To create a more egalitarian setting in which to teach, feminists have attempted to expose the tension as power, to name it as such, and to try to present alternative strategies for teaching that will address the inequity of that power relation — its form, its degree and its very presence in the classroom.<sup>6</sup>

For example, an explanation of the hostility encountered by feminist teachers may be due to another tension inherent in the traditional teaching mode, that is, the perception that teaching will leave the students with a set of skills that can then be transferable to the "real" world. The traditional image of education supports that basic premise. An alternative view of the educational process which is offered by feminist teaching is an encouragement of a different "life vision" than the traditional paradigm offers. Similar to Freire's "problem-solving" paradigm for education, feminist teaching offers students intellectual "space" in which to grow, and the ideas and concepts needed to create and sustain that thinking space so that students can express their life-worlds as relevant topics for

discussion. Unfortunately, students from a traditional teaching experience (the lecture as mode, the professor as expert) often see no translation between concepts and skills, or between the development of ideas and "hands on" experience. Not only do they see the two as unrelated, they prefer the latter on a resumé. It is difficult, in any setting, to encourage thinking for its own sake — even if arguments are made as to how "transferable" this skill may actually be.

Little wonder, then, that the feminist guest lecturer in a traditionally taught classroom experiences hostility and resistance from her students. Already primed with expectations regarding "skills," and teacher as expert, student as recipient, a teacher who "shares concepts" is neither welcomed nor valued. If anything, she serves to threaten the premise on which traditional expectations are constructed.

What is at issue, then, is not only the content of a feminist teacher's "lecture" but the process by which she communicates knowledge. The process by which teaching occurs in a feminist classroom is one which is very different from techniques/pedagogy used in other settings. A feminist teacher tends to share her knowledge rather than assert its primacy. To that end, students can contribute to the creation of new knowledge by suggesting interpretation, meaning or alternative content. Indeed, what may often be uncovered in this process, which is often a risky business for most, is that knowledge rests on a precarious base, is not carved in stone, nor is "true" simply because the professor says it is. This process is addressed quite directly in the working entitled *Women's Ways of Knowing*:

So long as teachers hide the imperfect processes of their thinking, allowing their students to glimpse only the polished products, students will remain convinced that only Einstein — or a professor — could think up a theory. (Belenky et al., p. 215)

Thus to encourage students to become part of the process, to consider their own experience as knowledge and that their knowledge is valuable, is to revolutionize the ideas of teaching, and directly challenge the status quo. Dialogue instead of lecture, discussion rather than dogma, and participation rather than silence can serve to offer both teacher and student a more rewarding and educational experience in the classroom.

### C. Feminist Teaching Techniques

Educators who do their work uncritically, just to preserve their jobs, have not yet grasped the political nature of education. (Freire, 1985, p. 180)

To teach from a feminist perspective is to politicize the nature of teaching, that is, to create and encourage the power to change thinking is to activate and awaken a new way of knowing. But how does a teacher reach this level of change in her classroom? What are the techniques and how are they applied? There are some methods already available in the literature. Maher outlines three assumptions behind the search for appropriate teaching styles for and about women which reflect this politicization:

- (1) that women's experiences are inherently, intrinsically valuable and necessary to any civilization;
- (2) that public examination of women's lives (half the race) have been buried recently; and
- (3) that appropriate teaching styles to recover the female experience can also be applied to the education of all people. (paraphrased from Maher, 1985)

The political nature of adapting techniques to a classroom can be demonstrated in Lewis and Simon's article entitled "A Discourse not intended for her" (Lewis and Simon, 1986).

The article describes the interactions between a male professor and the students of his mixed-sex graduate course. It does so rather well, and essentially reveals that the unstated norm for any classroom appears to be male, regardless of the number of female students in the class or of the feminist material being discussed. The argument is developed that patriarchy as practised in the classroom maintains the distance between male and female. That is, an atmosphere of male dominance does not allow the participants to find a common voice. To illustrate — when referring to the oft-experienced (by those of us who are still graduate students) male monopolizing of discussion that occurs in many classrooms, Magda Lewis writes:

they sparred, duelled and charged at each other like gladiators in a Roman arena. Yet their camaraderie intensified with encounter. Throughout this exchange, the women were relegated to the position of spectators. When a woman speaks, it means that a man cannot speak, and when a man cannot speak it means that social relations among the men are disrupted. Women, therefore, have no place on this playing field. (p. 461)

It became apparent to the male professor who, although increasingly aware of the space that was violated for wom-

en, was by his own admission contributing to the fray by creating "space" for the women to speak, which reinforced the idea that women did not really have a legitimate right to speak, but needed permission. Everything he tried to do, in fact, simply reinforced the notion that women did not really belong to any discussion at all.<sup>7</sup> In her recounting of the experience, Lewis pointed out the contradictory nature of this kind of solution by stating that "one cannot simply donate freedom from a position that does not challenge privilege" (p. 470).

Some of the suggestions for altering this situation were also outlined in the article. They ranged from suggesting that it was necessary for "the men to see the women's developing political protest, not as individual moments of hysteria, for which the cure was the calming hand of the Father, but as legitimate anger at the inequities in the situation," to a requirement that men "take equal responsibility for naming patriarchy as an immorally oppressive social form that denies freedom and human possibility."

So how can a feminist teacher recognize these situations? What are some techniques that can be used to avoid these hostilities and frustrations before they mushroom in a classroom? Nancy Schneidewind, in an essay on feminist teaching, presents five goals which she terms "process goals" that have implications for teaching methodology.

The first "process goal" is *interpersonal connection*, which she does at the beginning of a course. She instructs students to pair up with a person they do not know and discuss a woman who served as a positive role model to them, why she served as a role model, what she represented, how the student related to her, did they see her as achieving everything she wanted, etc. The second goal was *to encourage honesty* which she accomplished with "I"-messages, for example, when you [*behaviour*], I feel [*feeling*], because [*consequences*]. The third goal was to allow *democratic processes* to occur. She accomplishes this by asking the students to brainstorm a list of functions within a class, asking them to identify with one and asking which role is useful and when. The categories are organizer, devil's advocate, includer, clarifier, withdrawer. (I would add to this list the roles of intruder or disrupter.) The fourth goal is called *share leadership* which gives students a chance to share the leadership of the course. The fifth goal includes any type of *festive procedures* as they serve as community builders. She suggests that refreshments during the break, potluck dinners, integration of poetry and songs into the course could be examples of festive procedures.

The shared leadership of the course began with the instructor taking authority over the course until such time as the students were ready to assume more responsibility. This responsibility could be applied or adjusted to the level of the class, where a lower-level class would need more authority and leadership from the instructor. In fact, if egalitarian measures are used with a lower-level class, they often resent it. (Universities, after all, are not democratic institutions, contrary to popular belief in the community outside the university setting.) A higher-level class, such as a fourth-year seminar or a graduate class, can often assume more responsibility for the sharing of leadership.

Other techniques<sup>8</sup> to reduce hostility in the classroom may include some of the following suggestions:

(1) *Let the students in on the fact that you are a feminist teacher* and that this means certain things about the way you teach and then try to name them. For example, claim feminism as an academic perspective and outline the tenets of feminism that you follow and compare this with other bodies of knowledge with theoretical underpinnings and predictable foci, such as Marxism. This could be done verbally at the very beginning of the course or written in a syllabus.

What this technique allows the teacher, then, is some safety. It helps both to defray hostility and to aid the student in the contextualization of argument. That is, as "biases" concerning a feminist approach come up, are argued with, for, or against in a classroom, or if the use of female "language" is debated, the initial agreement in the syllabus, whether done as diagrams, charts, or explanation, is referred to and cited as an agreement which includes the student's approval. Students always have the option of withdrawing from a class early in the term if they find the feminist perspective untenable. In fact, many would prefer the option of choice, as many claim at a later point, "I didn't know this was going to be a feminist course; there was nothing written in the course description to tell me that."

A similar suggestion includes an option that one professor I know uses: he describes various perspectives on the particular course content as different visions through which phenomena can be studied or explained. He then examines each of the perspectives, (all in the first couple of classes) and gives the limitations and advantages of each, and finally arrives at the one from which he teaches. In this way, the students are informed as to the process by which an instructor arrives at a particular perspective, and why.

(2) *Instructors who are being "upstaged" by demanding, rude or simply competitive students can resort to a number of different tactics.* Not "answering" all questions; that is, by realizing that a question will take you off into a potential quagmire of tangential but irrelevant discussion, or will put you/your work/feminism on the defensive, you can always:

(a) ignore the question;

(b) treat it as a comment (by responding "That's an interesting point" and continuing with your lecture);

(c) remind the student that this is how you teach/the perspective from which you teach or the contract that the syllabus represents;

(d) tell students the proverbial "short answer, long answer" scenario, that is, give them a quick short answer and ask to see them privately to give them the longer answer; or

(e) use the opportunity to teach the student about usual reactions to sensitive issues and respect for other people. For example, if the hostile student makes a disparaging remark about battered women in a lecture on women and violence (one of my experiences), it might be useful to point out that whether he realized it or not, he may be sitting in the same classroom as a battered woman, and his remark might damage her sense of safety on speaking out on the issue. I have found that if this technique is used in a firm but gentle manner, it will not be perceived as an attack on the student who caused the disruption, especially if you insist that what you are doing is examining the comment and people's reaction to discomfort, rather than putting the student "on the spot."

(3) *Encourage strongly the reading and understanding of the full meaning of the information contained in the syllabus.* In the syllabus, explain not only the goals of the course, but what content will be offered and what the students should expect in terms of work/assignment load. The students can debate some of this information initially. Some of it is negotiable, some of it is not. The Schneidewind article, for example, treats as non-negotiable the suggestions not to write essays, or not to attend classes.

At this point, of course, the nature of syllabus as a form of agreed upon contract between the students and the teacher is needed. For lower-level students, input should be minimal; for higher-level students (and the teacher can usually judge this: some second-year classes are very

mature, some fourth-year classes are not) the possibility of negotiation of certain items is possible.

(4) *Never forget the value of humour.* By laughing at your own biases, or at the quandary some issues present for life in the everyday world for men and women, and dragging out all the "feminist" jokes, you can often get a class more "with" you than against you. For example, consider such dilemmas as, "Should you or should you not open the door for a woman, and how long do you stand in the hallway deciding?" or "Who gets yelled at when a woman goes home after hearing a feminist lecture?" Students often appreciate knowing the "human" aspects of an instructor. Although it should be stated here that many students actually want the instructor to remain aloof, authoritative figure, it somehow makes them more comfortable. Caution should be exercised too, as there is often a fine line between making a class feel at ease, and retaining authority in some form. The retention of some form of authority (at least enough order to continue the lecture) is not difficult to do, as long as you do not come down too "heavily" regarding discipline after you have just created the very mood you now want to eliminate. Most often, gentle reminders that more work remains to be done will suffice. (One useful result of this technique is to erase the stereotype of feminists as being humourless.)

(5) *Be honest with your students if the situation is appropriate.* Honesty can take many forms. An instructor can use it to name her feelings ("I'm very angry right now"), or to name something she sees in the class ("I can see this topic is frustrating to you. Can you tell me what you're looking for from me right now?" or "Yes, I agree, what happened to your father is not fair; it is discrimination"<sup>9</sup>).

What this technique offers is an opportunity to reinforce the basic "alternative" techniques that feminism espouses, by making a student feel "heard." Done well, you will have friends at the end of a class. Done poorly, and you can create an atmosphere of attack, in which a student will feel extremely vulnerable, and "put on the spot."

This technique should be used very carefully. Those who are anti-feminist can try and co-opt the mood of the class to reinforce the stereotype of the feminist instructor as being "typically female" and/or emotional.

Other useful techniques take a somewhat different approach. Some teachers use a model of feminist theory to aid instruction in classes. A good example of this comes

from the work of Charlotte Bunch (Bunch, 1983). Her four-part model consists of dividing theory into four interrelated parts: description, analysis, vision and strategy (p. 251). **Description** involves describing what exists, or interpreting/naming reality. **Analysis** involves analysing why that reality exists, the origins and reasons for its perpetuation. **Vision** refers to the determination of what should exist, the principles or setting of goals. Finally, **strategy** basically hypothesizes how to change *what is to what should be*. Bunch repeatedly emphasizes the interconnectedness of these four divisions as necessary for any change.

In her teaching, Bunch also emphasizes reading and writing skills as critical to the women's movement, and therefore crucial for a course in feminism. She begins by introducing her four-part model of theory and encourages students to use the model to explain everything around them, not just the written word. She then asks them to examine feminist and non-feminist magazines for images of women, and to explain these images using the model. Another technique she employs to encourage the examination of the connection between theory and action in everyday life is to give the students positions on a fictional women's group board of directors and ask them to justify expenditures, create projects, ask corporations for money — with the model in mind.

## Conclusion

Finally, any "good" teaching technique can apply to feminist teaching if the teacher is cognizant of the process/content distinction and the necessity of it as a guideline. The style and technique can never replace content; the content can never ignore process. As Maher indicates:

—the study of women as a major methodological shift — away from the traditional search for objectivity and towards a multilayered and comparative construction of social realities. (Maher, p. 36)

I would argue that such a shift methodologically requires a simultaneous shift in pedagogy. Women can no longer rely on traditional methods of teaching to deliver decidedly non-traditional ideas and research. If feminism challenges the idea of "expert" in traditional knowledge or history, then so too must the notion of "expert" in a classroom be challenged. A teacher's job is to guide, to explain, to share and help create knowledge, not to "determine" knowledge. Feminist teaching is an attempt to transform the traditional classroom in a way that reactivates and re-awakens the experience, lives and knowl-

edge of women, and ensures that this information is accessible to all those who wish to share it.

#### POSTSCRIPT: October 1989

Now that I am a "real" (read full-time-one-lecture-ahead-of-the-students) professor teaching sociology at Queen's University, I have modified my own advice on feminist teaching somewhat. Teaching 180 introductory students does not always lend itself to stimulating feminist discourse, but there do appear to be opportunities. Although I have not identified myself as a feminist teacher *per se*, I do recite the names, lives and work of women constantly, as examples of theorists, methodologists and actual subjects of the work we do in sociology.

I have also discussed my choice of a text (which is popular because students "like" it, and is unpopular because it is "difficult" to work with) based on a question asked of me by a student, namely, "Do all sociology textbooks look like this one? Like, I mean, can't we just buy any old book and come to class?" I replied that no, all sociology textbooks do not look like this one; many look like the history of sociology according to the "great men."<sup>10</sup>

In addition, I have incorporated the use of techniques<sup>11</sup> I thought possible only in women's studies classes, with a surprising degree of success. (I conducted a creative visualization which, I am given to understand, has entered the common parlance of students as "That day she hypnotized us!")

All of this is to say that I am as much in the process of revising, revamping and revisiting my feminist teaching techniques as anyone else. And yes, I'm still committed ... and maybe just a bit exhausted.

#### NOTES

1. This paper was originally presented at the Canadian Sociology and Anthropology meetings held at McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario in June 1987. Please refer to postscript.
2. In a dialogue with his translator ("Rethinking Critical Pedagogy"), Freire indicates his sympathy with the women's movement, but feels he cannot fight their battle because he is a man. He sees women's liberation as a struggle that only women can accomplish (Freire, 1985, p. 186).
3. One of the earliest works on the lack of opportunities for women in the realm of education came from Mary Wollstonecraft's essay entitled "A Vindication of the Rights of Woman," first published in 1792 (as reprinted in Rossi, 1973).
4. Jaggar and Rothenberg refer to that process as the creation of feminist frameworks, which they see as necessary theoretical tools for feminists to use in their work (Jaggar and Rothenberg, 1978, p. xii).

5. Freire refers to the transmission of knowledge in a traditional (read uncritical) classroom as analogous to a "bank deposit" with the instructor as the depositor and the student as the recipient (Freire, 1970).
6. Feminists recognize that much of the tension in an instructor-student relationship may also be created by the fact that the instructor is a woman. As such, the tension named may always exist for women instructors and needs to be addressed in a systemic fashion. For example, simply hiring more females and thus exposing students to the female instructor as "norm" could be a fairly easy remedy.
7. The irony of the whole encounter lay in the fact that the discussion article addressed the very issue that was unfolding in the classroom, that is, the lack of women's space in male-dominated educational settings.
8. These ideas were generated at a Women's Research/Study Group meeting held at my home on Tuesday, May 12, 1987. I am grateful to those who attended for their suggestions.
9. This comment came from a belligerent student who challenged feminism on the basis that his father was discriminated against. I responded that by focussing on women I was not suggesting, by default, that injustice in other situations was any less painful or serious. I stressed that feminism seeks to remedy injustice by emphasizing the value of equality in any sphere, be it race, class or sex.
10. In sociology, this list normally includes Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber and Auguste Comte — to name a few.
11. The techniques include: creative visualization, small personal (read journal-like) writing assignments of 1-2 pages every second week, giving them "quickie" thought exercises in class which involve debate, consultation and discussion.

#### REFERENCES

- Belenky, Mary Field, Blythe McVicker Clinchy, Nancy Rule Goldberger, Jill Mattuck Tarule. *Women's Ways of Knowing — The Development of Self, Voice and Mind*, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1986.
- Bunch, Charlotte and Sandra Pollack. *Learning Our Way — Essays in Feminist Education*, Trumansburg, New York: The Crossing Press Feminist Series, 1983.
- Bunch, Charlotte. "Not by Degrees: Feminist theory and Education," in *Learning Our Way — Essays in Feminist Education*, Bunch and Pollack (eds.), Trumansburg, New York: The Crossing Press, 1983.
- Culley, Margo and Catherine Portuges (eds.). *Gendered Subjects — the Dynamics of Feminist Teaching*, Boston and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.
- Ericksen, Stanford C. *The Essence of Good Teaching*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.
- Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.
- Freire, Paulo. *The Politics of Education — Culture Power and Liberation*, translated by Donald Macedo, Massachusetts: Bergin and Garvey Publishers, Inc., 1985.
- Freidman, Susan Stanford. "Authority in the Feminist Classroom: a contradiction in terms?" in *Gendered Subjects*, Belenky et al., Boston and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.
- Gilligan, Carol. *In a Different Voice*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1982.
- Katz, Joseph (ed.). *Teaching as Though Students Mattered*, New Directions for Teaching and Learning, no. 21, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1985.
- Langland, Elizabeth and Walter Gove (eds.). *A Feminist Perspective in the Academy — the difference it makes*, "Women in Sociological Analysis: New Scholarship versus Old Paradigms," Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.

- Lerner, Gerda. *The Creation of Patriarchy*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Lewis, Magda and Roger Simon. "A discourse not intended for Her: Learning and Teaching within Patriarchy," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. 56, No. 4, November 1986, pp. 457-471.
- Maher, Frances. "Classroom Pedagogy and the New Scholarship on Women," in *Gendered Subjects*, Belenky et al., Boston and London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1985.
- McHoul, A.W. "Writing, Sexism and Schooling: A Discourse-Analytic Investigation of Some Recent Documents on Sexism and Education in Queensland," in *Discourse and Institutional Authority: Medicine, Education and Law*, Fisher and Todd (eds.), New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Co., 1986.
- Rossi, Alice S. (ed.). *The Feminist Papers*, Toronto: Bantam Books, 1973.
- Schniedewind, Nancy. "Feminist Values: Guidelines for Teaching Methodology in Women's Studies," in *Learning Our Way*, Bunch and Pollack (eds.), Trumansburg, New York: The Crossing Press, 1983.
- Smith, Dorothy E. "An Analysis of Ideological Structures and How Women are Excluded: Considerations for Academic Women," in *Women and Education — A Canadian Perspective*, Jane Gaskell and Arlene McLaren (eds.), Calgary: Detselig Enterprises, Limited, 1987, pp. 241-264.
- Spender, Dale (ed.). *Feminist Theories — three centuries of women's intellectual traditions*, London: The Women's Press, 1983.
- Spender, Dale. *Man-Made Language*, London and Boston: Routledge and Keagan Paul, 1980.

## ACCOMPLICES

Dreams come home to die and find  
 no welcome there, for home is  
 the one place that insists  
 on living continually. If in  
 desperation or weariness  
 we look for that dark womb  
 as wounded animals do, we find it  
 populated with memories  
 crackling with energy.  
 Even an unhappy childhood  
 or chaotic snatches of infancy  
 have a sturdiness about them  
 to defeat our planned release.  
 You return to your stories  
 of neighbors, long-dead relatives,  
 and stir a brighter light in the  
 room. I counter with tales  
 long-hidden of projects and actions  
 you had forbidden but we managed  
 anyway. *How did you do that?*  
 you ask. *The same way you did,*  
*when you were sixteen and rebellious,*  
 I reply. Amused at our shared  
 reactions, we both grow younger  
 and stronger, at least for a few  
 heartbeats. You cannot beg  
 for mercy here: we will only  
 give you complicity.

*Amy Jo Schoonover*  
*Mechanicsburg, Ohio*