Teaching without a Mask?: Collaborative Teaching as Feminist Practice

Elizabeth Colwill, Richard Boyd

NWSA Journal, Volume 20, Number 2, Summer 2008, pp. 216-246 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

Teaching without a Mask? Collaborative Teaching as Feminist Practice

ELIZABETH COLWILL AND RICHARD BOYD

Abstract

This essay explores the complexities of collaborative teaching, a practice often characterized by theorists as particularly consonant with feminist and anticolonial pedagogy. Interweaving the scholarship on collaborative teaching, feminist and critical pedagogies, with narratives from faculty who taught in an innovative, interdisciplinary general education program, our essay suggests that team teaching remains a more vexed process than is typically acknowledged, precisely because our teaching personas are deeply rooted not only in our conscious choices, but also in enduring, and at times unconscious, structures of self. These structures are themselves intertwined with what Chandra Talpade Mohanty has called "the politics of location": the various axes of power that define the modalities and expressions of hierarchy in specific institutional contexts. Indeed, team teaching foregrounds conflict and differences—interpersonal, intellectual, and internal—that can become the very ground of learning. Focusing on the politics and psychodynamics of team teaching, we seek a revision of what constitutes a successful team-teaching experience, and of what makes it a promising site for the implementation of feminist and progressive pedagogies.

Keywords: collaborative teaching / feminist pedagogy / interdisciplinarity / psychoanalytic theory

More than a decade ago, we began work on an interdisciplinary and team-taught set of courses that were intended to provide students at our large, urban university with an alternative general education experience that was grounded in the principles of feminist and progressive pedagogy. As we began the planning for our new program, we had a long tradition of pedagogical experimentation upon which to draw. Since the 1970s, adherents of feminist, anticolonial, and critical pedagogy had described the crossing of disciplinary boundaries and the disruption of traditional power relationships as central to the transformative potential of education, while feminist theorists linked progressive pedagogical practices to content that highlighted gender, race, and class as vectors of analysis. Advocates of the team-teaching model had argued that collaborative teaching not only held

out the possibility of a more integrated learning experience (Boyer 1987, 83), but also harbored the potential to initiate what Giroux (1997, 102) calls an "emancipatory model of authority." By the mid-1990s, scholars from a range of disciplines and perspectives had converged in affirming the promise of collaborative and interdisciplinary models of teaching (Davis 1995; Hohenbrink et al. 1997; Bohen and Stiles 1998; Robinson and Schaible 1995; Bona and Volbrecht 1996).[1]

Yet, as the experiment of our program unfolded, our often tumultuous experiences in the team-taught classroom often seemed remote from such descriptions—our students more combative, our classrooms more contentious, the interactions of our teaching teams sometimes more unsettling and certainly less transparent than the scholarship on team-teaching had suggested. Indeed, the cumulative lessons of those years, gained through our own teaching and from listening to the stories of faculty teams who taught in this innovative program, not only forced us to confront directly our own classroom performances and our goals as teachers, but also called into question dominant assumptions about what learning is and how it happens. We therefore open this essay with a scene drawn from our own team-taught classroom—the first episode in a longer tale woven throughout this piece—a painful moment of rupture among and between students and faculty, that reveals in microcosm the complex dynamics potentially unleashed even, or perhaps especially, through feminist and other progressive pedagogies. Navigating between historical retrospective, narrative, and analysis, interweaving our own voices with those of other faculty, we trace the process through which we came to re-envision both the challenges and possibilities of team-teaching.

Scene I (the classroom):[2] *"Those people who died broke the law, they got what they deserved." It was the final week of the semester. Torn between anticipation and anxiety as their freshman year of university drew to a close, the students had arrived in seminar that day restless, edgy. For our part, our teaching team, with more than the customary end-of-semester angst, had struggled to find texts and approaches that might match the intensity of our collective investment in our interdisciplinary course, "Imagining Communities." The chosen texts—among which figured a journalistic account of the lives of undocumented Mexican workers including the death of several men during a high-speed chase by the U.S. border patrol—were designed to conclude a semester of historical case studies on the shifting nature and meanings of community. How, we'd asked, had communities in various global locations defined themselves by erecting and policing boundaries (national, racial, religious, gendered), frequently against imagined others? In what ways were politically distinct national communities interdependent? This last encounter with one particular tragedy, set in the borderlands of Mexico and the United States, was designed to bring theory home, to allow students and faculty at this southern Californian university to analyze our own distinct positions*

within a transnational exchange often benignly represented in economic texts as supply and demand, denounced as invasion in contemporary political discourse. In my teaching fantasies, this was a moment when the separate strands of the course would interweave, our diverse students might share a moment of reciprocal recognition.

Instead, silence greeted the caustic words of a young Anglo male: "They got what they deserved." I recall registering the set jaws and nods of affirmation from the two white women beside him; the almost imperceptible movement of several students of Mexican origin, seated together, as they glanced down, recoiled. I remember a sensation of weight, the postcollision suspension of hope that comes with the knowledge of pain inflicted, harm done. I remember little of the bitter exchanges that followed that day, including my own response.

As they later described it, the Mexican and Latina/o students in that classroom experienced those words, and others similar to them, as an act of silencing and misrecognition. "Don't they know that my family is undocumented—that they're talking about us? After all of this time together . . . in the end, they didn't even know who we were." If these students felt a powerful sense of betrayal, so—somewhat differently—did we. In that moment, the course title itself had an ironic edge. "Imagining Communities" betrayed: students' betrayal of one another, betrayal of the modes of analysis that grounded our teaching, and the intellectual project that had motivated the course itself. A fracturing of our own mythology that the faculty would advance a common mission, share and sustain a positive experience of community. I had failed in my essential responsibility to create an environment in which students were free from abuse or harassment. But how to fulfill this fundamental charge without foreclosing discussion, falling back on gendered models of professorial authority?

Despite years of teaching that had provided more experience than I might have wished of student resistance and racial and gender conflict, this particular teaching scene was among the most haunting, for it resonated on so many levels.

We had certainly expected something different. As part of the generation that had experienced quite indelibly the transformative impact of progressive pedagogies and gender studies, we'd had good reason to believe that this experiment with feminist team-teaching could do the same for our students. Our interdisciplinary program and pedagogical ideals located us within a particular historical moment, in which two powerful "upheavals" shaking higher education in the United States—"the demographics of a rapidly changing student body and the struggle for a more egalitarian and inclusive knowledge reflecting the far-reaching epistemological revolutions in the scholarly disciplines" (Maher and Tetreault 2001, 2)—had spurred pedagogical innovation.[3] These changes themselves were intimately linked to the histories of social and political resistance and student protests that spread through Europe and the Americas in the 1960s, challenging dominant conceptions of the content, purpose, and meaning

of education. In Brazil, Paulo Freire (1998, 2000) developed a "pedagogy of liberation" with working-class students and peasants, spawning an influential school of "critical pedagogy" that challenged the dominant "banking system" of education that serviced only the elite.[4] In the United States, by the 1970s, new forms of intellectual activism rooted in political unrest had given birth to interdisciplinary programs in Women's, Africana, American Indian, and Chicana/o Studies, whose explicit engagement with the intersections of power, knowledge, and social change incited revisions not only of traditional curricula, but also of traditional pedagogies (Kim 2000; Barkley Brown 1989; Omolade, 1993; Mohanty 1989, 2003a, 2003b; Ayala et al. 2006; Sandoval 1990, 1991; Smith 1990; Cohee et al. 1998; Coffey and Delamont 2000; McLaren et al. 2004).

In recent years, those committed to a progressive educational vision have often extolled the collaborative teaching model as transformative for students and faculty alike: a means to initiate a more integrated and inclusive curriculum and to foreground not only what we teach, but also how we teach (MacGregor 1990; Storrs and Mihelich 1998). For example, Ervin and Fox (1994, 53, 65) define collaboration in both scholarship and teaching as a "political action" that "resist[s] the hierarchical structure" of the university, while Bona, Rinehart, and Vollbrecht view team-teaching as a "practical [way] . . . for incorporating feminist scholarship and pedagogy into the core curriculum" (1996, 116). Collaborative teaching is often described as potentially transgressive, promoting alternative subject positions for faculty that encourage inclusiveness and the redistribution of power (Kluth and Straut 2003).

Feminist critics, in particular, have drawn attention to the ways in which traditional pedagogical structures, including the single authority figure at the front of the classroom, both reflect and reinforce gender hierarchy. In this critique, team-teaching becomes an oppositional practice, which, in the words of Bona et al. (1996), "invites us to trespass, to cross the lines that divide the experts from the ignorant, the masters from the apprentices, the fathers from the sons." Team-teaching, in this view, generates a less hierarchical structure of authority in the classroom, creating a place where "everyone has something to teach and something to learn" and where faculty are actively engaged in "revisioning authority, modeling collaborative learning, and relating to each other dialogically" (Bona et al. 1996, 119–20; Storrs and Mihelich 1998; Mayberry and Rees 1997; Cowan, Ewall, and MacConnell 1995). Anticolonial, antiracist, and feminist theorists who eschew reductionist understandings of gender and cultural pluralism in favor of intersectional theories of power and identity have emphasized the importance of collaborative connections not only among faculty, but also between teacher and students. In the formulation of bell hooks, the act of "being with" is key to an engaged pedagogy, or "teaching for freedom" (hooks 1994; Ayala et al. 2006).

Our own histories as teachers and codirectors of an interdisciplinary and team-taught program have provided us with abundant evidence of the potential of collaborative models of education, when conceived within the framework of feminist, anticolonial, and critical pedagogies. We have witnessed students' engagement in the process of learning, higher grades and retention rates for nontraditional students, dramatic changes in the faculty's understandings of the purpose and meaning of their work, and the testimony of students for whom the program served as a site not just of enrichment but also of transformation. In the face of such experience, it is easy to invest in utopic visions of a team-taught classroom in particular because of its clear potential to disrupt traditional structures of authority, to foster intellectual exploration, and to open new possibilities of self-fashioning for both students and faculty.

Yet as appealing as such visions may be, our own experience of teaching in and administering an interdisciplinary, collaborative program suggests that "success" is a more elusive process than much in the literature of team-teaching might imply (Nelson 2000; Eisen 2000). As Laurie Finke (1993) argued, "[E]fforts by both feminist and radical teachers to promote nonauthoritarian classroom environments have often ended up mystifying the very forms of authority they sought to exorcise, authority that is both institutionally and psychically embedded in the social relations of education" (7).[5] In recent years, far-reaching critiques of the more utopian formulations of the radical classroom have been launched by theorists associated with anticolonial and feminist pedagogies, critical pedagogy, and psychoanalytic pedagogy (Ropers-Huilman 2003; Pitt 2003; Broughton and Potts 2001; Britzman 1998; Wallace 1999; Ellsworth 1989; Finke 1993; Luke and Gore 1992; hooks 1994; Mohanty 2003a; Smith 1990).

Feminist and womanist interventions that exposed the exclusivity and privilege that circumscribed a feminism understood as "universal sisterhood" simultaneously unsettled utopian visions of the feminist classroom as an equally safe or nurturing space for all participants and challenged monist approaches to the workings of power within and beyond the walls of the university (Alexander and Mohanty 1996; Mohanty 1989, 1993a; Smith 1983; Narayan 1988; Delgado Bernal 2006; hooks 1994; Ng 1995; Nnaemeka 1995; Yamato 2003; Donadey 2002; MacDonald and Sanchez-Casal 2002; Yamada 2003).[6] After several years of negotiating the complex relationships of the team-taught classroom, our collective experience confirms much in these theorists' monitory words. Yet recognition of these political complexities and psychological entanglements is largely absent from scholarship on interdisciplinarity—especially team-teaching.

In our view, interdisciplinary team teaching does indeed speak to the goals of a *feminist, anti-colonial* and *transformative* education, but the struggle for change is an arduous one, not reducible to a simple vision of the "emancipatory" classroom. Utopic visions are seldom realized;

students and teachers never fully inhabit an Arcadian scene in which they exchange roles and redistribute power, moving inexorably toward that "dispersal or even elimination of authority" famously invoked by Constance Penley (1986, 173) two decades ago.[7] When transformation does take place, it occurs not in the achievement of a particular egalitarian endpoint, but inheres rather in the dialectic, experienced differently by each student and faculty member, between resistance, retreat, and embrace of change. Indeed, transformation remains a more vexed process than is typically acknowledged, precisely because our teaching personas are deeply rooted not only in our conscious choices, but also in enduring, and at times unconscious, structures of self.[8] Even more complex are the ways that these structures of self are intertwined with what Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2003b) has called "the politics of location": the various axes of power (marked along the lines of sexuality, gender, race, nationality, class, religion, the global North and South), that define the modalities and expressions of hierarchy in specific institutional contexts.

Labor/Birth: Interdisciplinary Experimental Curriculum

This particular vision of the "emancipatory classroom" and its impact upon our understandings of the transformative potential of team-teaching was for us far in the future when the fledgling Interdisciplinary Experimental Curriculum program (IEC) was established in 1996 at San Diego State University. The program developed from conversations among groups of faculty members and administrators committed to fostering a coherent and critical interdisciplinary experience on a large, diverse, commuter campus.[9] Our goal was to develop learning communities of faculty and students through practices of interdisciplinarity, service learning, engaged pedagogies, and—most significantly for this essay—team teaching. The IEC came to fruition in two different nine-unit, theme-based, experimental general education courses, designed specifically for first-year students, which provided credit in the areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and rhetoric and writing. The team-teaching model that we employed was a highly integrated one: while faculty members ran seminars independently, they were jointly responsible for the syllabus design as well as all assignments and student assessment, and the three instructors attended all large-group class sessions.

From its inception, the curricular contents and modes of learning in the IEC were explicitly transnational in focus and aligned with the aims of feminist and anticolonial pedagogies. Highlighting multiple ways of knowing (Cohee et al. 1998), the historical production of knowledge (Sasaki 2002), and the ethical implications of learning (Mezirow 1991), the curricula each semester engaged a wide range of texts, genres, and

narratives produced by women and men in diverse relationships to power globally (Alexander and Mohanty 1995; McCarthy et al. 2005; Pryse 1998).[10] Faculty designed syllabi intended not only to promote the acquisition of multiple literacies, but also to complicate and challenge, through transnational perspectives, dominant models of self and community. Each incarnation of the program has aimed to historicize shifting constructions of race, class, nation, and gender, to interrogate global asymmetries of power, and to explore the diverse pathways through which power is constructed and deployed (Maher and Tetreault 2001, 14; Scanlon 1993; Pryse 1998; Roman 2005).[11] Extensive community-based service learning projects each semester were designed to address the "split between knowledge and pedagogy, and to bridge the historical divide between academy and community, as well as between theory and practice."[12]

The structure of the IEC program and its pedagogical practices—intensive use of seminars, service learning, the emphasis on student voices, and multiple disciplinary and cultural perspectives—thus identify the program with many of the characteristics of feminist, anticolonial, and engaged teaching described by the literature. Aligned with such renderings of feminist pedagogy as "the development of a critical consciousness empowered to apply learning to social action and social transformation," it adopted an explicitly intersectional approach to relations of power in and outside the classroom (Alexander and Mohanty 1997; Mayberry and Rees 1997; Brookfield 2005).[13] The practices of the IEC converged "in [a] shared . . . challenge to dualistic accounts of theory/practice, public/private, self/other, and knowledge/experience" (Williams and McKenna 2002, 137).[14]

When the IEC faculty began preparing for the first of our courses in the spring of 1998, we brought with us a commitment to various notions of progressive education, even as we anticipated that this would be a challenging process.[15] We had read enough of the literature on both team teaching and feminist pedagogies to realize that even the most harmonious of faculty teams would confront questions concerning the equitable distribution of power and the negotiation of faculty roles both inside and outside the classroom (Hohenbrink et al. 1997; Schaible and Robinson 1995); differences over preferred teaching styles and methods (Forcey and Rainforth 1998); difficulties "of developing a feminist and empowering educational experience within hierarchical institutions" (Storrs and Mihelich 1998; Ellsworth 1989); and disagreements over desired learning outcomes, competing disciplinary paradigms, and methods of student assessment (Davis 1995). Moreover, for nearly all of us, our academic preparation had focused on disciplinary mastery rather than the perils and possibilities of teaching. As one instructor disclosed: "I wasn't taught to reflect upon pedagogy, just to teach the syllabus."

To be sure, over the first eight semesters that this interdisciplinary program was taught, the IEC faculty did encounter nearly all of these

predictable challenges. Yet this was not the whole story: many IEC faculty also registered a deeper and more perplexing current of discomfort, often coupled with a profound sense of professional and personal renewal.[16] The narratives of our experiences were multilayered, laden with meanings not always immediately accessible to interpretation. On the one hand, faculty often told stories of struggle: at times, conflict with others, but most dramatically, conflict within themselves.[17] Yet, almost paradoxically, many of those same faculty members also expressed strong feelings of excitement, engagement, and an appreciation for the program as an opening to growth. For most, the experience triggered unexpected intellectual, pedagogical, and even personal transformations, which they fully discerned, in some cases, only months after the fact. As one of the IEC's senior professors described it, "The profound change that happened with my teaching—that was unexpected. Even though I was sure that I would learn something, never did I think that it would modify me in this way."[18]

Indeed, we came to realize that the sense of dislocation prompted by team-teaching was not a distraction from, but rather the precondition for, transformation. As we will see, even the scene with which we began this essay held within it the potential to revisit and, in some imperfect sense, to rewrite one painful script of racism and nationalism. But for such a revision to emerge, both students and faculty had to confront intersections of power and desire in the classroom that remained, even at the end of the semester, unspoken and scarcely recognized. This and other stories led us back to those psychoanalytically inclined theorists who describe every teaching scene as unavoidably laden with transference and the dynamics of power (Penley 1986; Todd 1997)—psychological and political complexities that are surely heightened in the process of team teaching. We therefore first turned to the *process* of psychic change in collaborative teaching that impels faculty members to risk discomfort and change, loss and gain.

Dislocations and Desire

Disconnects are inevitable in the interactions of three differently formed human beings engaged in a team-teaching project of this scope and intensity. Instructors' responses can range from mild discomfort with perceived difference in teaching styles or prescribed roles, to a profound sense of loss of control, and occasionally to open conflict.[19] For instance, one instructor who typically claimed expertise as the defining marker of her pedagogical authority[20] felt herself on the margins when her disciplinary expertise suddenly became—in an interdisciplinary, team-teaching context—less centrally important than other ways of knowing, other kinds of expertise. Other instructors reported instances of open political collisions

that manifested not only in predictable conflicts over interpretations of domestic and international policy, but also, more subtly, in debates over the workings of institutional privilege and the construction of power in the classroom.

When teaching, we project, whether consciously or not, an image of ourselves that we hope to see mirrored in the attitudes and responses of our students. In contrast to the solitary professor's experience of classroom authority and disciplinary expertise, when team teaching, each of us confronts our own reflection through two additional pairs of eyes also invested with authority. Long-held and deeply internalized structures of difference that mark a divide between student and teacher suffer a dislocation (Kulynych 1998) as we are suddenly confronted with multiple axes of authority in the classroom—an experience rendered especially acute when we teach with other professors who may hold greater institutional power or feel more comfortable with the content area under consideration. Suddenly, we are forced to consider from a new angle the compelling question of the nature and grounding of our professorial authority.

Other instructors model different ways of being the world with *our* students—a reality that disrupts the kinds of teacherly identities that we can plausibly construct for ourselves. The lone professor, to the extent that he conforms to dominant cultural codings of professorial authority, has the illusion of control over his image in the classroom—so much so that his (if not her) professorial authority may appear natural and thus almost invisible (Kulynych 1998; Wallace 1999).[21] Indeed, the notion of an effortless authority remains a powerful fantasy—an icon of professorial success—even for those of us who do not embody dominant images of authority. If teaching alone in some respects nourishes the dream of a unitary sense of self as teacher, when teaching in a team, that image collides with both students' and colleagues' ways of seeing and their assessment of us as instructors. These collisions manifested themselves in our various and contradictory attempts to narrate our experiences of team teaching, including the one with which we began this essay.

Scene II (the office): *I remember my retreat to the faculty team, my reliance on the conversations that ensued, even overdetermined, as they were, with reciprocal projections. I blamed myself, as I would have had this rupture occurred in any of my classes, but the self-criticism cut the more deeply given the knowledge that in this class, events in my seminar had implications for the students, the teaching team, and for the program as a whole. As I recounted the story, I revisited the scene not only through my own highly self-critical eyes, but also through those of my colleagues who had much more glowing reports of their own seminars. I did so with considerable apprehension. Certainly, the members of our teaching team held different perspectives about what conflicts belonged in the classroom, and how best to discuss them. Their response to what was, after all, a crisis in my seminar, was hardly a foregone conclusion.*

As it happened, my colleagues were supportive, if perplexed, both concerned and disconcerted to hear that my experience had differed so profoundly from their own. One instructor even wondered aloud, "What subjects have I avoided that left my class comparatively peaceful?"

Within this struggle to "compose" ourselves in the face of both student resistance and competing faculty narratives, we encounter the ideological function of narrative itself. As Mark Currie argues, "[Narrative] repeats and confirms the possibilities of identification that have already constituted our subjectivities. . . . narrative is one of the ways in which identity, the ideological subject, is manufactured" (Currie 1998, 32). Such stories are not, however, easily composed. In the scene above, our vision of our own seminars, refracted through our perception of other professors' successes and failures, led us not only into a fundamental struggle to rewrite the boundaries of classroom political discourse, but also to interrogate narratives that had sustained our professional lives.

To be sure, the political and ideological stakes rarely emerge this explicitly. Even discussions with colleagues about formality in the classroom, the use of professional titles, or disciplinary strategies can serve as subterranean debates about the nature of professorial authority, political commitments, and personal identities enacted both inside and outside the classroom.[22] Apparently inconsequential differences in style and approach may loom large because they ultimately function as the field on which significant interpersonal and political conflicts are played out. As one IEC instructor explained her moment of epiphany:

> I've always been troubled by the unequal relations of power that exist in any classroom, but over time I have evolved certain strategies of using authority in subtle and purportedly "benign" ways that allow me to construct myself as a feminist and 'student-friendly' instructor. Yet, on one occasion in our class, another instructor, who typically enacted a much less formal teaching style than I, suddenly chose to participate in the class activity by being what I would regard as a 'model' student: she joined enthusiastically into the discussion, and even offered suggestions about where to go next. The students eagerly responded to her lead–they too felt themselves empowered in ways we hadn't before seen in our class. Although it took me a long time to recognize, my experience that day was a conflicted one, for as much as the class seemed "successful," I also felt uncomfortable by the loss of control I encountered in the class. Not only had the other instructor led students in taking over certain classroom decisions that I always had reserved for myself, but even more she was able to be the true ally of our students and was able to change the traditional dynamics of classroom power (at least for this one day) for them in ways I had never achieved.

Therein lies one of the great values of team teaching, for it defamiliarizes the pedagogical experience by implicitly or explicitly challenging

not only what we teach, but how we teach, who we are in the classroom, and how we understand the relationship of that persona to our other lives in the academy and beyond. Differences among faculty bring to the fore desires and self-representations that had previously gone unrecognized, and may open up a new range of possibilities that can simultaneously provoke anxiety and initiate transformation. Ultimately, then, the loss experienced by many faculty teaching in a team involves not only the surrender of exclusive authority or disciplinary expertise, but more crucially, the loss of familiar narratives of identity that had constituted and confirmed a key foundation of our professional life.

Intersectionality and Uneasy Transformations

It is difficult when teaching collaboratively to transcend roles deeply rooted in identities developed when teaching independently—an insight that emerged uncomfortably as we began to excavate the ways that gender and power worked in our own classrooms. Consider, for instance, another episode from our own teaching collaboration. When we, the authors of this essay—both tenured, white, mid-career—taught on the same teaching team, we found ourselves cast rather swiftly into scripts that fit imperfectly, if at all, our own images of ourselves.

> For me, the very fact of teaching with a woman allowed students to create a reductive familial metaphor that cast us in polarized paternal and maternal roles, both in and outside the classroom. The effects of this typecasting were played out in several weeks of tension, centered on the extent to which students sought out individual faculty members during office hours. Students tended to be more forthcoming with my colleague, and to restrict conversations with me to purely "academic" matters. The tension finally led to a revealing dialogue between the two of us in which I began to question my own, conscious tendency to shield my students from less strictly academic kinds of interchange that I would regard as intrusive. The conversation challenged my easy assumptions about the best ways to define relations of authority between students and teachers. It was uncomfortable to realize that my long-held convictions were linked to a rather familiar model of male reticence that reinforced the same gendered structures of authority that I'd resisted from our students.

The lens provided through the act of team teaching—the opportunity to catch a glimpse of the dynamics of one's classroom through the eyes of another—thus allowed this author to re-envision his own specific constructions of gender, authority, and power in the classroom. Prompted by the "shock of recognition" that followed this incident, he began to re-evaluate other pedagogical self-fashionings that were seemingly even more "natural" than the ones narrated above. The experience of team teaching led to a series of confrontations with his "most favored teaching persona:

that of the progressive instructor," who consciously refuses traditional markers and indices of professorial authority. As he later reflected:

> Teaching with another instructor, specifically one who enacted her own version of radical pedagogy through a very different kind of deployment of institutional power and embodied practice, caused me to see my refusal of certain kinds of masculine authority as itself a kind of playacting that relied upon models of gender and power that were themselves highly resistant to disruption and had scarcely garnered critical reflection on my part in the past. I would do things like begin the class with a mock-serious discussion of the NCAA basketball tournament, a gesture I had previously imagined did little more than humanize me a bit, remove a little of the patina of stodgy professorial authority, open up space for students to speak as something other than "students."
>
> Yet, through the experience of team teaching, I began to perceive how this gesture was a kind of performance that worked very differently than I had once assumed, and that it finally depended upon a more fundamental reassertion of that male authority (I was, after all, just being "one of the boys") to which I imagined myself in opposition. Besides forcing me to ask some very difficult questions of myself and the identities I performed in the classroom, I was also led to consider, in ways I had not previously done, the political meaning of my professional life.

To be sure, every player must play the same scene differently; each move provokes a response that inevitably alters the daily scripting of our classroom performances. Thus, the other author—the sole female professor on this teaching team—consciously chose to enact a more formal teaching persona in the presence of her colleagues, particularly in the large classroom setting, specifically to claim a position of authority against students' tendency to subtly defer to the male professors in the room. Yet, uncomfortable with this (self?)casting in the role of "traditionalist," she simultaneously sought—like many other feminist professors—"alternative grounds for constructing…authority as teachers vis-à-vis both their students and colleagues" (Maher and Tetreault 2001, 128; see also Lewis 1992; Jones 1993; Wallace 1999). As she later described it:

> The hours that I devoted to informal conversations with students in office hours provided, in a sense, ballast against the more traditional public persona that I tended to adopt within my teaching team. Yet this apparently compensatory feint from issues of power in the classroom, and the subterranean tensions that it provoked with colleagues, opened up a process of self-questioning as well. I revisited Laurie Finke's argument that "all pedagogy—including feminist pedagogy—is driven by a psychic interplay of desire and power among teachers and students" (1993, 8; McWilliam 1995, 15).
>
> Could it be, I wondered, that I laid claim to a more traditional professorial voice in the classroom merely to regain the power that I eschewed in personal

> interactions with students? In that case, had I reinforced, in the very attempt to subvert, students' view of the public lecture as a predominantly "masculine" realm, and the office as a more intimate, "domestic space"? Were my pedagogical practices fundamentally contradictory? Or was it possible both to foster a sense of connection between students and professor, and to deploy the authority derived from education and experience to facilitate learning?[23]
>
> As I reflected over the next year on my own evolving praxis, what had initially appeared uniquely as paradox—a collision of formal and informal pedagogical styles—increasingly came to appear as interdependent means of fostering connection. To the extent that students "came to voice" in a variety of more interactive and informal settings, to the extent that they felt visible as persons endowed with emotions and spirit as well as intellect, they helped to forge an intellectual community in the classroom that altered the meanings of my more formal teaching moments (hooks 1994). As I came to understand my own pedagogical choices, the construction of this more fluid relationship opened the space for even lecture itself to become increasingly dialogic, rather than exclusively didactic.

Our own tales of conflict and reflection, then, suggest that experiences of team teaching are varied and complex precisely because they involve not only conscious pedagogical strategies, but also psychological responses to the particular dynamics of each teaching team, themselves entangled within broader structures of power. This becomes particularly apparent when we attend to the ways that race, sexuality, religion, and nationality, in conjunction with gender, inflect the circulation of power in the classroom. There is in the literature of team teaching a tendency to posit an endpoint of harmonious collaboration, in which unity and consensus anchor a distinctly democratic pedagogical space.[24] Yet in the collaborative classroom, as in any other, the workings of power and discourses of difference constrain our freedom to invent ourselves, pinioning us within unitary identities that we do not in fact inhabit. In some cases, team teaching may highlight and even amplify difference, acting as a catalyst to students' transposition of prior—and often stereotypical—assumptions.

In short, whatever the pedagogical allegiances that may guide individual instructors, this vision is constrained by students' understandings of how power works. Students' images of their teachers are complicated by the fact that instructors have different access to power, determined by their institutional positions and tied to their gender, race, religion, ethnicity, and sexual preference (Kulynych 1998; Basow 2000; Bauer 1990; hooks 1994). In our interviews, several teaching faculty recounted, in tones ranging from amusement to frustration and pain, tales of how students read relations of authority in the classroom through the filter of their own, deeply engrained presumptions about what power looks like. One faculty member conveyed that the presence in her classroom of two Anglo

co-teachers born in the United States, magnified white students' perception of her own "difference" living in what Gloria Anzaldúa has labeled the "borderlands" as a bilingual, binational woman of color (Anzaldúa 1990).[25] A second instructor, herself a woman of color, revealed that in her own classroom, white students rarely challenged her authority directly, but when she taught with a team of white faculty, some students seemed to see both her race and her age as a provocation that authorized accusations about bias in her teaching.

In these and other cases, the grid of power that students assumed through previous experience, superimposed on nontraditional classrooms, obviated, at least in part, the faculty's conscious attempts to rewrite the dynamics of the classroom.[26] Ironically, for some students, the act of team-teaching itself became the vehicle for stereotypical projections of the "proper" embodiment of authority, even as the presence of diverse identities and perspectives among the faculty opened possibilities of identification and growth for others. If the teaching team can usefully highlight differences of method, interpretation, and disciplinary orientation among faculty members, it can also underscore forms of difference (racial, religious, sexual) that remain lightning rods of social conflict, igniting tensions within and between faculty teams and students.

Several faculty who described their team-teaching experience as fundamentally harmonious recounted the ways in which negotiations over difference might both facilitate growth and essentialize identities. One professor noted the propensity of his colleagues and students to assume that he would mentor students of color—a role that he embraced even as he expressed discomfort with the expectation that students should be distributed among faculty primarily on the basis of race or ethnicity. For any historically marginalized population of students at the university—students of color, first-generation college students, LGBT students—identifications with faculty perceived as "like" can lead to relationships that facilitate learning and are profoundly affirming for both students and faculty. Yet processes of identification are not always equally benign. Most troubling in our experience was the tendency of some students in several predominantly white classes to collapse and essentialize categories of difference as varied as skin color, religion, sexuality, or nationality, projecting identities onto each faculty member in ways that caused personal anguish and constrained the possibilities for learning in the classroom.

Scene II: the office (continued): *As the faculty continued to mull over the eruption in my seminar and the dissolution of our imagined community, I struggled not only with my own projections onto other faculty, but also with students' projections onto me. I was deeply troubled at the thought that the white students had found authorization in my very presence to speak as they had. Would they have dared, I wondered, to challenge my male colleagues so*

directly? Would those words have been voiced in my classroom had I not been white? Given my own position, I registered relief when an email arrived from one of the Latino students, requesting that the faculty meet with him and his friends in my office. Despite the wounding words of a few hours before, the students had chosen to speak out—and to speak to us. Yet the prospect of the meeting also opened the floodgate of self-questioning. How, my colleagues asked, could we (Anglo faculty) speak in any meaningful way to their pain and outrage? How could we negotiate the delicate divide between teacher and student, when that very relationship was overdetermined by both class and race?

Theorists of intersectionality explode precisely these kinds of moves to universalize identity, rewriting it instead as defined by the hybrid identities that we inhabit (Anzaldúa 1990; Elenes 2006; Hill Collins 1998, 215; McCann and Kim 2003, 148–61; Scott 1991; Mohanty 2003b).[27] Despite its potential to foreground possibly regressive gestures of essentializing difference, collaborative teaching also has the potential to historicize and challenge students' understandings of the various boundaries that demarcate "the self." The collaborative-teaching experience thus returns us to questions at the heart of contemporary debates within feminist and critical theory, for it exposes the ways that diverse axes of power inflect the teaching personae that we perform in the classroom.

As we have seen, teaching with (and sometimes against) other faculty caused many IEC instructors to reflect upon the basis of their classroom authority. In some cases, the complex dynamics of a teaching performance witnessed by other—equally authoritative—eyes led to alliances within teaching teams that allowed the play of difference to be negotiated in new and, in their words, "liberating" modes. One seasoned professor, for example, recounted his experience of aligning himself most closely with the "junior" member of the teaching team, and through such an identification coming to understand for himself a quite different way of inhabiting authority in the classroom, one that was more receptive to fostering connections with and among students in the classroom. Not surprisingly, this instructor described himself as permanently changed by the experience of team teaching.[28]

Paradise Regained? Intersecting Identities

Undoubtedly, the scholarly literature is correct: teaching in a team can be a transformative practice for faculty. Such metamorphoses are possible, argue many proponents of team teaching, to the extent that the faculty develop trust and a sense of community with one another.[29] Certainly, for change to occur, even on the most simple of levels, the teaching team must

open a space in which individual faculty can critically examine their own investment in particular teaching practices and identities. But that is not the entire story. It is clear, on the basis of these faculty narratives, that an intellectual allegiance to interdisciplinarity or a "progressive" pedagogical agenda provides no guarantee of successful collaboration. Neither faculty "development" seminars, institutional support, nor loyalty to a theoretical paradigm can alone ensure success, for teaching is not reducible to a recipe of techniques or a set of readings (Gillespie and Frost 1998; Robinson and Schaible 1995; Bohen and Stiles 1998). Rather, we have to take into account that faculty will experience loss in the act of teaching collaboratively, and that a class can only be successful if it acknowledges the discomfort arising from loss, difference, and confrontation.

Clearly, team teaching does not immediately generate the utopian classroom envisioned by many progressive educational reformers. To accept this proposition is to acknowledge the permeability of structures of identity and authority in the classroom and the world at large; neither students nor faculty can—or should—shed identities, marked by gender, language, nationality, race, and class, at the classroom door. As Maher and Tetreault have argued, "Teachers and students may assume, aspire to, and/or directly challenge and undermine the social structures they inhabit, but they cannot completely step outside them" (2001, 203).

Only in the process of unearthing less conscious motives and desires, and in the fracturing of familiar teaching personas, do new possibilities emerge for the recomposition of ourselves as teachers. This is no simple matter, for our self-construction is rooted within complex histories, buffeted by powers inextricably social, cultural, and political.[30] It is alluring to imagine that initiating a pedagogical reform like team teaching can usher in an Arcadian scene where faculty are "revisioning authority, modeling collaborative learning, and relating to each other dialogically" (Bona et al. 1996, 199–200). But team teaching, and whatever transformative potential it does hold, operates in a rather different manner: foregrounding conflict and differences— interpersonal, intellectual, and internal—that become the very ground of learning in the classroom.

As Adrianna Hernandez establishes in *Pedagogy, Democracy, and Feminism*, "the conception of the subject as 'compound identities' points to a pedagogy that recognizes not only the multiplicity of subject positions but also the tension among them" (1997, 19). Teaching in a team assuredly corresponds to Hernandez's rubric and, when conditions are right and those tensions can be engaged creatively, it allows faculty to experience in generative ways the fluidity of identities and to renegotiate operations of power in the classroom. Our experience suggests that teaching in a team necessarily entails some degree of psychic loss. Yet precisely this experience of loss can serve as a chrysalis for change.

A More Analytical Turn

> Feminist pedagogy, then, must avoid reproducing a simplistic inside/outside dichotomy which locates oppression, anxiety, and resistance either exclusively within the individual, the result of psychic forces of which the individual is not consciously aware, or exclusively outside the individual in the cultural and historical forces that act on her. . . . The former calls for a psychoanalytic pedagogy; the latter a political one. The task of a feminist pedagogy seems to demand some integration of both approaches. (Finke 1993, 9)

The practice of collaborative teaching demands a similarly integrated understanding of classroom dynamics. As we have seen, our self-representations as teachers are constantly redefined not only by the intersection of individual faculty members' desires, but also by the operations of student transference and countertransference, and the positions—chosen and unchosen—that we inhabit. We belong to different, and in some sense, competing communities, which extend beyond the immediate faculty team. Ultimately, whether or not any particular faculty member finds the team-teaching experience rewarding will depend not only on her relationship to a particular team, but also on her sense of professional identity, on the roles into which she and her students are reciprocally cast, and on the particular classroom dynamics unleashed by broader social relations of power.

At the most obvious level, team teaching in a general education program requires professors to modify their affiliations with the academy, their sense of place and relationship to an academic community—in other words, their geography of the professional self. As members of teaching teams on other campuses report with regularity, to teach outside one's area of specialization is often to place oneself in a position of vulnerability (Beyler, Halka, and Labissiere 1999).[31] If interdisciplinary team teaching requires the realignment of membership in different academic communities, and even the sacrifice of certain public markers of professional success, then our research suggests that there must be powerful psychological forces at work in such a move. An instructor's response may serve, in some cases, as a register of her own degree of comfort or discomfort with the position of marginality. Her critical sensibilities toward institutional or disciplinary structures, her psychic distance from the politics of the university and from dominant modes of pedagogy may help explain her affinity with collaborative, interdisciplinary teaching.[32] Ironically, this very willingness to assume a position "on the border"[33] can itself trigger conflict, for team teaching general education not only presents specific challenges to traditional notions of expertise, but also calls into question the authenticity of identities crafted, more or less consciously, around the trope of self-identified "outlaw academic."

Of course that story, like all our stories, is also one of operations of power, from which the (gendered, raced, national) body is never absent (hooks 1994). Many of the narratives recounted in this essay raise the question of what it means to choose a position of (relative) outsider when one is already positioned by the dominant university community as "on the border" (Anzaldúa 1990). What positions are available to inhabit, given our varied political locations? What does it mean to claim a transgressive classroom identity from a position of more or less privilege?[34]

> **Scene III (home):** *In the anxious night that followed, I must have revisited every unsettling episode of the semester, replaying each hint of racial and gender tensions, reaching for an historical narrative in which to contextualize the outburst that I'd witnessed that day. I noticed, among other things, the silence of several of the Mexican and Mexican-American women students in seminar, the repeated absences of two self-described "alienated" young men, above all, the disapproving glares and hostile questions of a knot of Anglo males directed at a guest lecturer (white, female, young graduate student) who had presented her research on an African-American radical theorist. In fact, the latter episode had provoked a heated exchange between two members of the teaching team about the extent to which the faculty should have intervened. I felt that in our failure to act, we had left her exposed. My teaching partner was less certain. Wouldn't our direct intervention have been experienced as insulting to the lecturer, who seemed unflustered by the attack? What lessons would the students have drawn from our interference? We left the conversation equally unsatisfied.*

Our experience, then, provides a distinctly different lens on those renderings of team teaching as emancipatory practice that aspire toward a utopian, authority-free classroom in which professors and students together pursue education as egalitarian venture—a formulation that, to our minds, elides the intricacies of psychic conflict and social relations of power in the learning process.[35] Like MacDonald and Sanchez-Cassal, we view identities as simultaneously "politically and epistemically significant," and as "variable, nonessential and radically historical" (2002, 1). The more utopian perspective may unintentionally obscure not only the dialectics of loss, resistance, and change within the interactions of any teaching team, but also the complexities of students' and teachers' psyches. Yet our experience suggests that these elusive dynamics constitute the very process through which transformation can occur.

Team teaching compels us to inhabit different narratives of ourselves; indeed, one of the challenges of the teaching is to construct new and potentially transformative stories. Not surprisingly, the kinds of narratives recounted in this essay are not success stories typical of the scholarship of team teaching. Nonetheless, we read them as narratives of success, for they register the ways that collaborative teaching provokes self-interrogation and can thus become a catalyst for change. Our point is not simply that

we enact a complex set of largely unexamined identities in the classroom or that the current team-teaching literature fails to adequately account for this complexity. Rather, by focusing on the politics and psychodynamics of team-teaching, we seek a revision of our notion of what constitutes a successful team-teaching experience, and of what makes it a promising site for the implementation of feminist and progressive pedagogies.

From this perspective, the presence of conflicts manifested in our faculty reports are not mere registers of tension, but markers of active confrontation with structures of power, identity, and difference—interrogations that many feminist educators, ourselves included, argue should be fundamental to the educational process.[36] As MacDonald and Sanchez-Casal have written, "[b]y reframing the discussion . . . we are able to break open the dyad of teacher/student by placing it in dynamic and continuous dialogue with a third term, *difference*" (2002, 3). Collaborative teaching thus casts into relief issues central to our pedagogical mission.

> **Scene IV (the office):** *We arrived the next morning, feeling weary and inadequate, to attend the meeting with five Latina/o students. It was, in part, our own emotional and political entanglement, in part the experience of team teaching itself that led us that morning to forsake more directive "professorial" roles. Instead, we listened. Given the space to speak their sense of betrayal, the students did so, powerfully and at length. Without prior planning or consultation, we, the "teachers," heard them out, offered no solutions, asked for guidance. "How would you handle this?" The significance of the meeting lay, then, far less in our words than theirs, or, rather, in their initiative, their articulation of their experience, and our attention. In fact, one of the women students later confided that what most struck her in that encounter was our presence, our evident engagement. For they saw that, from very different locations, in very different ways, we, too, felt angry and betrayed. To the extent that the meeting disrupted the students' prior sense of what the "natural" lines of identification would be, it subtly altered the impact and meaning of the previous day's events.*

Teaching in a team compels us to address conflict, to question the nature of authority and our own pedagogical strategies, to speak across disciplinary boundaries and myriad political and cultural borders. It also compels us to attend to silences. The two women in the student group spoke little in that private session, or, for that matter, in the seminar as a whole. Yet silence is subject to multiple interpretations: in this case, a reminder not only of the significance of gender in authorizing speech, but also of the varied pathways through which one can make one's presence felt and voice heard.

> **Scene V (the classroom):** *What I remember most about the next class was the spacial positioning in the room: a rough horseshoe with faculty seated together in the center, the Latino students positioned closest to us, the Anglo*

students across the divide—the classroom geography itself a register of rupture. The faculty's intervention that day was carefully scripted, the product of hours of labor. Although it was certainly not the first time that any of the instructors had negotiated painful disputes in the classroom, it was the first time that we had done so collectively, an effort that required a more elaborate choreography.

Our script opened, in keeping with the spirit of the course, with historical retrospective. Revisiting themes and theories drawn from the entire semester concerning boundaries and borders, we asked students to reconsider now-familiar questions: How does war both fracture or reinforce old forms of community and create new ones? How do the boundaries of insider/outsider shift in the context of political revolution? How is gender relevant to debates over national culture? How is the body politic mapped upon the physical body and defined through its exclusions?

We moved next to the reading assigned for that week, bringing the authors—including Ruth Rosen on the splintering of feminism, Mei Elliott on shifting national boundaries in Vietnam, Ruben Martinez on the contested Mexico/U.S. border—into dialogue with one another, suggesting through example the kinds of dialogue still possible in that room. In a move that involved more personal exposure than we typically risk in the classroom, one instructor spoke of his own experience of negotiating the California border, concluding with questions: "What do those interconnections and intersections mean? In what sense are we in fact interdependent?"

Then, with little drama, we spoke directly to our own moments of rupture in seminar. "Words were spoken without considering their impact on others in the room; people slipped, at times, into language of 'us' (insiders) and 'them' (outsiders), language that erected boundaries and borders among ourselves . . . Yet the conflict, so openly expressed, also opens the possibility that we—and we include ourselves here—reconsider our words, in order to reflect on the intersections of language and power, and on the nature of community that we wish to create here. If this course has challenged us all to pose difficult questions, this experience provides us with the opportunity to question ourselves, and perhaps to reconnect on different ground."

It was a risky moment for everyone in the room. It might also appear to some a suspicious political gesture that the faculty assumed the voice of authority and orchestrated the class as we did. Yet our method was a response to the Latino/a students' expressed desire that we take responsibility—that we teach; our words did not substitute for their own. For these students, who had already claimed "an active, oppositional, and collective voice" (Mohanty 1989, 208), the faculty's willingness to speak, and to speak to their concerns, confirmed their own view that the rupture was too serious to conceal with platitudes. This final seminar signaled our readiness to risk the existing community, such as it was, by calling out those who had broken trust, and calling upon each member of the class to analyze and historicize her or his own interests, views, and positions.

And in fact, in words and gestures, at that seminar and in the final sessions of the class, many students responded to that call. They did so alone and collectively, sometimes awkwardly, sometimes graciously, and often by indirection.

Perhaps they recognized in the manner that the conflict had unfolded, a violation of the history that we had studied and the analytical models employed. Perhaps the willingness of some students, both Latino/a and Anglo, to take the lead provided the opening for a few of the more vociferous antagonists to shed defensive postures and allow others to emerge. Perhaps it was the challenge: in setting aside veiled teacherly personas to make ourselves more visible to the students, we called for a similar gesture on their part. Or perhaps, because a different model of power had been working in the classroom, students were better positioned to respond to the invocation of community—to the hope that something of our collective vision might be recovered.

The final seminar, then, was designed to puncture assumptions of uniformity and unanimity in ways that might allow students to entertain perspectives and identities that they may formerly have perceived as incompatible. If indeed the experience of team teaching had schooled the faculty in a kind of self-critical reflexivity, our practice in the final seminar invited students to reflect upon their own hybridity, and upon what their speech and silences might mean to the community as a whole.

Wherein lies the transformative potential of collaborative and interdisciplinary teaching? Not, to be sure, in a quixotic quest to create a "conflict-free" classroom. Whatever our personal desires, attempting to purge the classroom of conflict never creates a "safe space," for to cleanse the classroom of discord is also to cleanse it of difference. The world inevitably intrudes on our classroom experiences; indeed, in this intrusion lies the potential of progressive pedagogies to open a space where the conflicts that mark and sometimes scar us can be analyzed, and thus experienced, differently. In exposing the workings of authority in the classroom and in inviting faculty to reflect on these processes in ways that may challenge not only *how* we teach, but *why*, the practice of collaborative teaching engages faculty along with students in resisting the naturalization of identities in and beyond the classroom. And we continue to hope that to structure pedagogies intentionally, within transnational curricula that highlight "the vital porosity that exists among and between human groups," is to foster what McCarthy et al. recently termed "a critical global intelligence" (2005, 164).[37]

To conclude on such a note may recall the opening pages of this essay—specifically, scholars' celebration of collaborative teaching as utopian practice. But that would imply a certainty and singular endpoint that we deliberately renounce. No semester's experiment—and each course remains, after nearly a decade of experience, an experiment—is reducible to a single script; each incarnation of the course harbors numerous, and often competing, narratives. The dynamism of each class is unleashed by a unique combination of elements: the needs that particular instructors and students bring to the collaborative effort; the ways that our distinct historical locations shape our collisions with curricula and with one another; the representations that we seek to enact and the ways that

others invent us. They depend, as well, on our willingness as teachers to interrogate our own pedagogical desires. For transformation to occur, we must be intrigued as well as discomforted by surprises, willing to linger in unexpected places long enough to explore their possibilities and confront their challenges. Above all, we must be willing to risk the possibilities of change as our own desire.[38]

Elizabeth Colwill *is Associate Professor of Women's Studies at San Diego State University and former co-director of the Interdisciplinary Experimental Curriculum program. Her research and teaching focuses on the intersecting histories of gender, sexuality, slavery, and colonialism in France and the Caribbean.*

Richard Boyd *teaches in the Department of Rhetoric and Writing Studies at San Diego State University and is a former co-director of the Interdisciplinary Experimental Curriculum program at the same institution.*

Notes

1. James R. Davis, a leading voice in support of the collaborative model, argues forcefully that "[t]eam teaching, when effectively implemented . . . not only changes the arrangements for learning, it engages team members in serious and continuous reflection on what they are doing . . . In the ideal team-taught course, the faculty have successfully met the challenges of 'connecting learning' and the students have a chance to see the relationships that they don't get to see in other courses" (1995, xiv, 51).

2. The "I" in this first-person narrative, which wends its way through different portion of the essay, is one of the two authors, Elizabeth Colwill, in whose classroom the incident occurred.

3. It should be noted that the institutional imperatives of U.S. colleges and universities coincide uneasily, at best, with the goals professed by adherents of feminist, anticolonial, and critical pedagogy. The educational perspectives of these constituencies are frequently disparate, sometimes inhospitable, and the progressive agendas initiated by faculty are often carried out with scant funding and in the face of such institutional barriers as increasing class sizes, and the sovereignty of standardized learning outcomes. For an interesting discussion of how institutional assessments of student performance conflict with the more egalitarian impulses of feminist pedagogy, see Maher and Tetreault (2001, 213).

4. Freire's (1998, 2000) critical pedagogy has proven widely influential for many schools and theorists of progressive pedagogy (i.e., McLaren 2006; hooks 1994).

5. Finke continues, "They have done so because these relations cannot so easily be reduced to a simple dichotomy between conformity and resistance." Concerning institutional constraints on feminist pedagogical praxis, see Webber (2006).

6. As interdisciplinary departments have matured and institutionalized, pedagogical experimentation has seemed increasingly at odds with professional advancement and shifting theoretical paradigms (Coffey and Delamont 2000). See Kim (2000) on the evolution of the Asian American Women's Studies Survey through the phases of "experimentation," "institutionalization," and "professionalization."

7. Sharon Todd's incisive critique of the "claims to decentering authority from those post-structuralist-feminist positions advocated in [such texts as] *Feminism and Critical Pedagogy*" is applicable here too (1997, 68). As Laurie Finke argues (1993, 8), "[u]nable to articulate a pedagogical politics that is not simply oppositional, some feminists write about pedagogy as if they believe that the classroom is a universal and ahistorical place, rather than a local and particular space embedded within a specific institutional culture that serves a range of disciplinary and institutional objectives."

8. To be sure, feminist educators such as Ellsworth (1989), Cannon (1990), Bohmer and Briggs (1991), and Lee (1993) have long recognized the challenges inherent in implementation of progressive and feminist pedagogies in university settings. Yet even in the work of those scholars who acknowledge the potential for such difficulties, intimations of a more utopian classroom remain. For example, Storrs and Mihelich (1998, 7) counsel faculty to address tensions arising from struggles between female and male professors over dominance in the classrooms with "a quick discussion during break." While we appreciate the wide range of techniques that the authors propose to mitigate the effects of gender hierarchy in the classroom, our experience suggests that "gender awareness" does not free us from "gendered stereotypes" or the complex operations of power in the classroom.

9. Work groups composed of some forty faculty members were initiated by Paul Strand, Dean of the College of Arts and Letters and Joyce Gattas, Dean of Professional Studies and Fine Arts in 1996. The first incarnation of the interdisciplinary General Education program was taught in Spring 1999.

10. As Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1989, 185) put it, subjugated knowledges "need to be understood and defined pedagogically, as questions of strategy and practice as well as scholarship, in order to transform educational institutions radically."

11. Our goals here are in alignment with those of other feminist scholars and proponents of team teaching (e.g., Storrs and Mihelich 1998; Clark and Hogan 2002).

12. On fostering students' view of themselves as "active agents of social change," see Storrs and Mihelich (1998) and Lambert and Parker (2006). Nancy Schniedewind suggests that a fundamental component of feminist pedagogy is "learning a process for applying theory to practice, attempting to change a concrete situation based on that learning, and recreating theory based on that activity" (1993, 25). From a different philosophical perspective, Vietnamese Buddhist monk Thich Nhat Hanh emphasizes the importance of students' engagement in the world, linking awareness to practice (quoted in hooks 1994, 14).

13. For example, in the course that initiates this essay, the curricular content focused on the shifting meanings of racial, national, gendered, sexual, and religious identities within the intersecting histories of 20th-century Vietnam, Mexico, France, and the United States. It was in part because of this curricular orientation that the conflict that unfolded in the last days of the semester had such an impact.

14. The affiliations between feminist pedagogy and community-based service learning—what Williams and McKenna (2002, 137) describe as "two potentially radicalizing nontraditional forms of pedagogical practice"—have not fully been explored in the scholarly literature. The link is an important one; however, the authors also caution against a too easy equivalency between the two practices. See also Michelson (1996).

15. In this sense we replicated the phenomena in feminist pedagogy described by Maher and Tetreault (2001, 5): "When we began our study, we had a somewhat simplistic and dichotomized view of the authoritarian, male-dominated 'traditional classroom' versus the idealized 'feminist teacher'—a notion embedded in many early collections of work describing feminist teaching practices."

16. Our recognition of this complex and seemingly contradictory dynamic in team teaching emerged through a series of open-ended interviews with IEC faculty, ranging from one to three hours in length, which focused on issues of student growth, faculty renewal, and assessment of the overall success of the course. We asked instructors to speak freely about their experience of collaborative teaching, and to reflect specifically upon its impact on their professional identities as teachers and as scholars. By the end of this process, we had conducted end-of-semester interviews with seventeen of the twenty-one IEC faculty who had taught in the program. Brookfield (1995) argues for the potential of faculty narratives, including autobiographies, to foster critical reflection and growth among progressive teachers.

17. Kulynych (1998) notes a similar unease in her experience of team teaching at Winthrop University.

18. In this way, the IEC experience reiterates the secondary literature, in which faculty transformation does occasionally appear as a primary trope. For

example, see Beyler et al. (1999) and Bona et al. (1996). Yet, given the degree to which team teaching denaturalizes the teaching process, it is not surprising that not every member of the IEC faculty afterwards described the experience as transformative; a few found it a frustrating experience that seemed only to confirm long-held conceptions formed through solitary teaching, even though they had entered the semester quite committed to collaborative teaching.

19. Upon surveying faculty involved with Harvard's team-taught interdisciplinary program, Davis (1995) notes a similar reporting of "loss" among teachers, although these feelings cluster around issues of classroom authority and autonomy rather than the more deeply rooted sense of psychic loss we suggest here.

20. A conceptualization that elides the intersections of expertise and class, race, and gender. See, for example, Larson (1997).

21. As bell hooks has explained, only "the person who is most powerful has the privilege of denying their body" in the classroom (1994, 137). For different perspectives on the ways in which embodiment inflects the experience of teaching, see McWilliam (1996) and Bartlett (1998).

22. On the question of professional titles, see Crabtree and Sapp (2003, 135–36). Davis likewise cautions: "because of differing value systems, some faculty [in teaching teams] may find themselves in conflict, again and again, over deep philosophical issues" (1995, 88).

23. Miriam L. Wallace argues that "the pedagogical problem, then, is not only how to question institutional authority but how simultaneously to manage the dynamics of power and emotion in a very volatile environment." She defines the problem as "[u]nsettling mastery without structural abandonment." Quoting Jane Gallop, she continues: "one can effectively undo authority only from the position of authority, in a way that exposes the illusions of that position without renouncing it" (1999, 191).

24. This is not the case in most contemporary scholarship on feminist pedagogy, in which the analysis of power is considerably more complex than that in literature focused on team teaching or interdisciplinary teaching.

25. Chandra Mohanty (1989, 194) has drawn attention to the tendency of white students to view professors of color in the role of authentic "native informant."

26. Anne Donadey (2002) provides an insightful account of student resistance in her graduate seminar on Feminist Theory to the recognition of race as central to women's experiences of interlocking oppression.

27. Scott cautions against the ways in which the evidence of experience can become "evidence for the fact of difference, rather than a way of exploring how

difference is established, how it operates, how and in what ways it constitutes subjects who see and act in the world" (1991, 777).

28. For a careful discussion of how positionality finds expression in the feminist classroom, see Maher and Tetreault (2001, 164–200).

29. Davis declares that "[w]hat we know about effective teams . . . suggests that faculty not only need to commit themselves to the course but to each other as a team" (1995, 94). See also Hohenbrink et al. (1997) and Robinson & Schaible (1995) for other endorsements of the importance of trust among faculty.

30. The dynamics at work are far more complex than stock generalizations about group process would suggest (e.g. Bakken and Clark 1998).

31. Faculty may struggle to reconcile the intense claims of team teaching with membership in larger departmental, national, and international discipline-based research communities. Meanwhile, instructors typically receive few professional rewards (such as tenure/promotion or merit increases) for participation in programs like the IEC; teaching freshman general education is not a high-status occupation, either within or beyond the university.

32. Most of our teaching teams were comprised of faculty with highly varied institutional titles, from full professor to lecturer, and with varied kinds and amounts of academic training.

33. We adopt, here, the metaphorical sense of the term, as defined by C. Alejandra Elenes (2006, 215): "the symbolic barriers that divide communities along race, class, gender, and sexual orientation lines, academic disciplines, and organizational structures."

34. Crabtree and Sapp's (2003) experiments with feminist pedagogies in their own classrooms suggested that students were far more accepting of the male than of the female teacher; Storrs and Mihelich (1998, 109) suggested, on the contrary, that in their team-taught course, "students' evaluations indicate that there is little perception of dominance of either instructor."

35. Our formulation is not intended to deny the sophistication of many analyses of feminist pedagogy, but rather to draw attention to certain silences in the literature of team teaching.

36. See, for example, Sasaki's claim that feminist pedagogy "means reframing the dominant notion of difference as something purely outside oneself to include an interrogation of one's own subjectivity" (2002, 35). Our position is also is reminiscent of MacDonald and Sanchez-Casel's notion of "Diversity Curriculum Clusters, themed groupings of courses in a variety of disciplines that situate antiracist, feminist curricula sequentially" (2002, 14–15).

37. A large literature explores the various ways that identities are performed in the classroom, but this discussion has tended to ignore the experience of collaborative teaching.

38. In Fall 2006, in an era of rising undergraduate class size and increasing emphasis on graduate education, the IEC program was discontinued by the university administration "for the foreseeable future." Its termination raises once again the question posed by Nancy I. Kim (2000, 56): "Can instructors continue to change institutions in the process of academic assimilation if the course is dependent on the institution it wishes to change?"

References

Alexander, Jacqui M., and Chandra Talpade Mohanty. 1996. *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. New York: Routledge.

Anzaldúa, Gloria, ed. 1990. *Making Face, Making Soul. Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Feminist of Color*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.

Ayala, J., P. Herrera, L. Jiménez, and I. Lara. 2006. "Transgressing the Borders of Community and Academy." In *Chicana/Latina Education in Everyday Life: Feminista Perspectives on Pedagogy and Epistemology*, eds. Dolores Delgado Bernal, et al., 261–80. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bakken, Lori, and Frances L. Clark. 1998. "Collaborative Teaching." *College Teaching* 46(4):154–57.

Barkley Brown, Elsa. 1989. "African-American Women's Quilting: A Framework for Conceptualizing and Teaching African-American Women's History." *Signs* 14(4):921–29.

Bartlett, Alison. 1998. "A Passionate Subject: Representations of Desire in Feminist Pedagogy." *Gender & Education* 10(1):85–92.

Basow, Susan A. 2000. "Best and Worst Professors: Gender Patterns in Students' Choices." *Sex Roles* 43(5–6):407–17.

Bauer, Dale M. 1990. "The other 'F' word: The feminist in the classroom." *College English* 52(4):385–96.

Beyler, Richard H., Monica Halka, and Yves Labissiere. 1999. "The Teaching Fellows Program: Transformations in Identity, Pedagogy, and Academe." *Journal of General Education* 48(3):176–87.

Bohen, Shawn Jacqueline, and James Stiles. 1998. "Experimenting with Models of Faculty Collaboration: Factors that Promote Their Success." In *Using Teams in Higher Education: Cultural Foundations for Productive Change*, ed. Susan H. Frost, 39–55. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bona, M., J. Rinehart, and R. Volbrecht. 1996. "Show Me How to Do Like You: Co-Mentoring as Feminist Pedagogy." *Feminist Teacher* 9:116–24.

Boyer, Ernest L. 1987. *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*. New York: Harper and Row.

Britzman, Deborah P. 1998. *Lost Subjects, Contested Objects: Toward a*

Psychoanalytic Inquiry of Learning. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Brookfield, Stephen D. 2005. *The Power of Critical Theory Liberating Adult Learning and Teaching.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Brookfield, Stephen D. 1995. *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Broughton, Trev Lynn, and Laura Potts. 2001. "Dissonant Voices: the Teacher's 'Personal' in Women's Studies." *Gender and Education* 13(4):373–85.
Coffey, Amanda, and Sara Delamont. 2000. *Feminism and the Classroom Teacher: Research, Praxis, and Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
Cohee, Gail E., et al., eds. 1998. *The Feminist Teacher Anthology: Pedagogies and Classroom Strategies.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Cowan, Michael A., Barbara C. Ewell, and P. McConnell. 1995. "Creating Conversations: An Experiment in Interdisciplinary Team Teaching." *College Teaching* 43(4):127–31.
Crabtree, Robin D., and David Alan Sapp. 2003. "Theoretical, Political and Pedagogical Challenges in the Feminist Classroom: Our Struggles to Walk the Walk." *College Teaching* 51(4):131–40.
Currie, Mark. 1998. *Postmodern Narrative Theory*. Basingstoke: Macmillan Press.
Davis, James R. 1995. *Interdisciplinary Courses and Team Teaching: New Arrangements for Learning.* Phoenix: Oryx Press.
Delgado Bernal, Dolores, C. Alejanra Elenes, Francisca E. Godinez, and Sofia Villenas, eds. 2006. *Chicana/Latina education in everyday life: feminista perspectives on pedagogy and epistemology*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Donadey, Anne. 2002. "Negotiating Tensions: Teaching About Race Issues in Graduate Feminist Classrooms." *NWSA Journal* 14(1):82–102.
Eisen, M.-J., ed. 2000. "The Many Faces of Team Teaching and Learning: An Overview." *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, 5–14. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Elenes, C. Alejandra. 2006. "Transformando Fronteras. Chicana Feminist Transformative Pedagogies." In *Chicana/Latina Education in Everyday Life*, ed. Delgado Bernal et al., 245–59. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Ellsworth, Elizabeth. 1989. "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy." *Harvard Educational Review* 59(3):297–324.
Ervin, Elizabeth, and Dana L. Fox. 1994. "Collaboration as Political Action." *Journal of Advanced Composition* 14:53–71.
Finke, Laurie. 1993. "Knowledge as Bait: Feminism, Voice, and the Pedagogical Unconscious," *College English* 55(1):7–27.
Forcey, Linda Rennie, and Beverly Rainforth. 1998. "Team teaching 'Conflict Resolution in Educational and Community Settings': An Experiment in Collaboration and Conflict Resolution." *Peace & Change* 23(3):373–85.
Freire, Paulo. 1998. *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
Freire, Paulo. 2000. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed,* trans. M.B. Raos. New York: Continuum.
Gillespie, Theresa W., and Susan H. Frost. 1998. "Organizations, Culture, and Teams: Links Toward Genuine Change." In *Using Teams in Higher Education:*

Cultural Foundations for Productive Change, ed. S. Frost, 5–15. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Giroux, Henry A. 1997. *Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and Schooling: A Critical Reader.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Hernandez, Adriana. 1997. *Pedagogy, Democracy, and Feminism*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
Hill Collins, Patricia. 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Hohenbrink, J., M. Johnston, and L. Westhoven. 1997. "Collaborative Teaching of a Social Studies Methods Course: Intimidation and Change." *Journal of Teacher Education* 48:293–300.
hooks, bell. 1994. *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom.* New York: Routledge.
Jones, Kathleen B. 1993. *Compassionate Authority: Democracy and the Representation of Women*. New York: Routledge.
Kim, Nancy I. 2000. "The General Survey Course on Asian American Women: Transformative Education and Asian American Feminist Pedagogy." *Journal of Asian American Studies* 3(1):37–65.
Kluth, P. and D. Straut. 2003. "Do As We Say *And* As We Do: Teaching and Modeling Collaborative Practice in the University Classroom." *Journal of Teacher Education* 54:228–40.
Kulynych, Jessica. 1998. "Crossing Disciplines." *College Teaching* 46(4):144–49.
Lambert, Cath, and Andrew Parker. 2006. "Imagination, Hope and the Positive Face of Feminism: Pro/feminist Pedagogy in 'Post' Feminist Times?" *Studies in Higher Education* 31(4):469–82.
Larson, Magali Safatti. 1977. *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Lewis, Magda. 1992. "Interrupting Patriarchy: Politics, Resistance, and Transformation in the Feminist Classroom." In *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*, ed. Carmen Luke and Jennifer Gore, 167–91. New York: Routledge.
Luke, C. and J. Gore, eds. 1992. *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*. New York: Routledge.
MacDonald, Amie A., and Susan Sanchez-Casal. 2002. "Feminist Reflections on the Pedagogical Relevance of Identity." In *Twenty-First Century Feminist Classrooms: Pedagogies of Identity and Difference*, ed. Amie A. MacDonald and Susan Sanchez-Casal, 1–28. New York: Palgrave/MacMillan.
MacGregor, Jean. 1990. "Collaboration Learning: Shared Inquiry as a Process of Reform." In *The Changing Face of College Teaching*, ed. Marilla D. Svinicki. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Maher, Frances A., and Mary Kay Thompson Tetreault. 2001. *The Feminist Classroom : Dynamics of Gender, Race, and Privilege*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
Mayberry, Maralee, and Margaret N. Rees. 1997. "Feminist Pedagogy, Interdisciplinary Praxis, and Science Education." *NWSA Journal* 9(1):57–66.
McCann, Carole R., and Seung-Kyung Kim, eds. 2003. *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
McCarthy, C., M. Giardina, S. Harewood, and J.-K. Park. 2005. "Contesting Culture: Identity and Curriculum Dilemmas in the Age of Globalization,

Postcolonialism, and Multiplicity." In *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education*, ed. McCarthy, et al., 153–65. New York: Routledge.
McLaren, Gustavo E., Peter Synker, Heinz Lankshear, and Colin Fischman, eds. 2004. *Critical Theories, Radical Pedagogies, and Global Conflicts*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
McLaren, P. 2006. *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*, 5th Ed. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
McWilliam, Erica. 1995. "(S)education: A Risky Inquiry into Pleasurable Teaching." *Education and Society* 14:15–24.
McWilliam, Erica. 1996. "Seductress or Schoolmarm: On the Improbability of the Great Female Teacher." *Interchange* 27(1):1–11.
Mezirow, Jack. 1991. *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1989. "On Race and Voice: Challenges for Liberation Education in the 1990s." *Cultural Critique* 14:179–208.
Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 2003a. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 2003b. "Feminist Encounters: Locating the Politics of Experience." In *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives*, eds. Carole R. McCann, and Seung-Kyung Kim, 460–71. New York: Routledge.
Narayan, U. 1988. "Working Together Across Difference: Some Considerations on Emotions and Political Practice." *Hypatia* 3(2):31–47.
Ng, R. 1995. "Teaching Against the Grain: Contradictions and Possibilities." In *Anti-Racism, Feminism, and Critical Approaches to Education*, eds. Roxana Ng, Pat Staton, and Joyce Scane, 129–52. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.
Nnaemeka, O. 1994. "Bringing African Women into the Classroom: Rethinking Pedagogy and Epistemology." In *Borderwork: Feminist Engagements with Comparative Literature*, ed. Margaret R. Higonnet, 301–18. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Nelson, Michael and Associates, eds. 2000. *Alive at the Core: Exemplary Approaches to General Education in the Humanities.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Omolade, Barbara. 1993. "A Black Feminist Pedagogy." *NWSA Journal* 21(3–4): 31–38.
Penley, Constance. 1986. "Teaching in Your Sleep: Feminism and Psychoanalysis." In *Theory in the Classroom*, ed. C. Nelson, 129–48. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Pitt, Alice J. 2003. *The Play of the Personal: Psychoanalytic Narratives of Feminist Education.* New York: Peter Lang.
Pryse, Marjorie. 1998. "Critical Interdisciplinary, Women's Studies, and Cross-Cultural Insight." *NWSA Journal* 10(1):1–22.
Robinson, Betty, and Robert M. Schaible. 1995. "Collaborative Teaching: Reaping the Benefits." *College Teaching* 43:57–59.
Roman, L.B. 2005. "States of Insecurity: Cold War Memory, 'Global Citizenship' and Its Discontents." In *Race, Identity, and Representation in Education*, ed. McCarthy et al., 72–94. New York: Routledge.
Ropers-Huilman, Becky, ed. 2003. *Gendered Futures in Higher Education: Critical Perspectives for Change*. Albany: SUNY.
Sandoval, Chela. 1991. "U.S. Third World Feminism: The Theory and Method of

Oppositional Consciousness in the Postmodern World." *Genders* 10: 1–24.
Sandoval, Chela. 1990. "Feminism and Racism: A Report on the 1981 National Women's Studies Association Conference." In *Making Face, Making Soul: Haciendo caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color*, ed. Gloria Anzaldúa, 55–71. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Foundation Books.
Sasaki, Betty. 2002. "Toward a Pedagogy of Coalition." In *Twenty-First-Century Classrooms: Pedagogies of Identity and Difference*, ed. Amie A. MacDonald and Susan Sanchez-Casal, 31–57. New York: MacMillan.
Scanlon, Jennifer. 1993. "Keeping Our Activist Selves Alive in the Classroom: Feminist Pedagogy and Political Activism." *Feminist Teacher* 7(2):8–14.
Schaible, Robert M. and Betty Robinson. 1995. "Collaborating Teachers as Models for Students." *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching* 6(1):9–16.
Schniedewind, Nancy. 1993. "Teaching Feminist Process in the 1990s." *Women's Studies Quarterly* 21(3–4):19–30.
Scott, Joan W. 1991. "The Evidence of Experience." *Critical Inquiry* 17:773–97.
Smith, Barbara. 1990. "Racism and Women's Studies." In *Making Face, Making Soul,* ed. Gloria Anzaldúa, 25–28.
Smith, Barbara, ed. 1983. *Home Girls: A Black Feminist Anthology*. New York: Kitchen Table Press.
Storrs, Debbie and John Mihelich. 1998. "Beyond Essentialisms: Team Teaching Gender and Sexuality." *NWSA Journal* 10(1):87–118.
Todd, Sharon. 1997. "Psychoanalytic Questions, Pedagogical Possibilities and Authority: Encountering the 'And.'" In *Education and Cultural Studies: Toward A Performative Interrogation and Revision of the Dynamic of Authority*, ed. H. Giroux and P. Shannon, 67–78. New York: Routledge.
Wallace, Miriam L. 1999. "Beyond Love and Battle: Practicing Feminist Pedagogy." *Feminist Teacher* 12(3):184–97.
Webber, Michelle. 2006. "Transgressive Pedagogies? Exploring the Difficult Realities of Enacting Feminist Pedagogies in Undergraduate Classrooms in a Canadian University." *Studies in Higher Education* 31(4):453–67.
Williams, Tamara, and Erin McKenna. 2002. "Negotiating Subject Positions in a Service-Learning Context: Toward a Feminist Critique of Experiential Learning." In *Twenty-First-Century Feminist Classrooms*, eds. Annie A. MacDonald and Susan Sanchez-Casal, 135–54. New York: Palgrave/MacMillan.
Yamada, Mitsuye. 2003. "Invisibility is an Unnatural Disaster: Reflections of an Asian American Woman." In *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives,* eds. C. R. McCann and S.-K. Kim, 174–78. New York: Routledge.
Yamato, Gloria. 2003. "Something about the Subject Makes it Hard to Name." In *Race, Class, and Gender: an Anthology W/infotrac*, eds. Margaret L. Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins, 99–102. Belmont, CA: P. Wadsworth Publishers.