DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 188 HE 026 869

AUTHOR Dickens, Cynthia Sullivan
TITLE Collaboration in the Research and Scholarship of Feminist Women Faculty. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Nov 93
NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (18th, Pittsburgh, PA, November 4-7, 1993).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperation; Experimenter Characteristics; Faculty College Relationship; *Feminism; Higher Education; Qualitative Research; Researchers; *Research Projects; Scholarship; Teacher Attitudes; *Women Faculty; Womens Studies
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *Teacher Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This study used qualitative research to develop a richer description and deeper understanding of the collaborative process among 26 feminist women faculty. The participants were all on the faculty full-time at two research universities in the Midwest and espoused feminism as evidenced by their formal association with women's studies programs. In particular the study asked what role collaboration with other women plays in feminist women faculty's construction of their own scholarly identities. The interviews were semi-structured, following a general interview guide of about 35 open-ended questions. Emerging from the participants' narratives were five identity themes: (1) synergy, (2) affirmation, (3) pragmatism, (4) resistance and rebellion, and (5) confirmation and empowerment. The research also suggested that feminist women see collaboration as a way to model and promote feminist values in their scholarship and in the competitive and individualistic culture of the research university. Participants repeatedly expressed the desire to integrate their values and their scholarship by doing research on a topic or using methods which reflect their commitments. A supportive environment may be fostered by ways of collaborating that consciously encourage resistance to hierarchy, exclusion, and exploitation, that encourage creative rebellion, and that lead to a synergy of ideas enlivening scholarship. (Contains 26 references.) (JB)

COLLABORATION IN THE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP OF FEMINIST WOMEN FACULTY

CYNTHIA SULLIVAN DICKENS
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP
MISSISSIPPI STATE UNIVERSITY

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Pittsburgh, PA. November, 1993

ABSRACT

COLLABORATION IN THE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP

OF FEMINIST FACULTY WOMEN

This study attempts to contribute a richer description and a deeper understanding of collaboration as it is practiced by 26 women faculty who work in research universities in the Midwest United States and who espouse feminism as evidenced by their formal association with women's studies programs. Qualitative methods are used to investigate the question: What role does collaboration with other women play in feminist women faculty's construction of their own scholarly identities?

Emerging from the participants' narratives are five identity themes described as: (a) affirmation, (b) resistance and rebellion, (c) synergy, (d) pragmatism, and (e) confirmation and empowerment. This research also suggests that feminist women see collaboration as a way to model and promote feminist values in their scholarship and in the competitive and individualistic culture of the research university.

ASHE

ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
STUDY OF
HIGHER EDUCATION

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Pittsburgh Hilton and Towers, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, November 4-7, 1993. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Prologue

A Choral Poem

My feminism has made me
A very angry person.
Part of the problem
Is maladjustment
To simply being a woman
In this world.

Working with other people
Who recognize my worth
Has a real effect on my relationships
With my friends
With my parents
With my husband. Hmmmmm.

It makes it much more difficult
Of course
To leave work
And live
In the every day world
Of womanhood.

The key to my success
And the success of many women here
Is not solely due to that
Because we're all competent.
We're all good.
We all work very hard.

But what's made it
Much easier
And much more pleasurable
Has been that
Collaboration

Introduction

Despite the fact that the majority of students who are enrolling in colleges and universities in the United States are women, men outnumber women in the American professorate by three to one ("New Federal Data," 1993). Women faculty, particularly those who have secured full-time, tenure track positions in research institutions, are often segregated in traditionally female fields, or they are isolated in departments which are overwhelmingly male (Ransom, 1990). The friendships and relationships which women faculty develop may be of particular importance in helping them to overcome isolation and to construct for themselves identities as competent and self-confident scholars. Moreover, these relationships may provide the mutual support that some women desire and need in order to pursue their particular research agendas in competitive research institutions (Rosenberg, 1979).

To work in collaboration with another woman scholar with whom she shares research interests would seem to offer advantages and to appear particularly attractive to the woman faculty member who has feminist political commitments. However, both feminism and collaboration in academic s scholarship can exact penalties in a culture which values autonomy and independence over mutuality and cooperation (Ward & Grant, 1991). Research and writing which are viewed as representing a political as well as an epistemological challenge to mainstream academic discourses are often criticized as unscientific and biased. Thus academic women who openly espouse feminism and who challenge the individualistic norms of university scholarship would seem to be putting their careers at risk.

As the poem in the prologue suggests, this paper is about feminism, scholarship, and collaboration. It draws on the many stories which I have heard from women faculty who work in research universities and who have chosen to collaborate with other women in their scholarship. My interest in women faculty and how their commitments to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration intersect has deepened and taken shape during the past five years as I have reflected upon my own commitments, values, and aspirations. Like the feminist participants in my research, I have come to appreciate that all scholarship is a reflection of the women and the men who construct it. This study is therefore openly feminist. And central to feminist inquiry, it is grounded in the lived experiences of women. It reflects my concern for women and my desire to place women at the center of my inquiry. Furthermore it reflects my own experiences as a woman, a feminist, and an aspiring scholar who has worked both independently and in collaboration with other women.

The opportunity to collaborate with a faculty colleague developed from a conversation early in my doctoral program. I revealed to my colleague a growing attraction to the topic of collaborative scholarly writing as a possible research topic and my desire to begin writing for publication. I confessed that, despite an undergraduate degree in English, a wealth of well-earned experiences to share, and years of writing reports, memos, business letters, even speeches, I still felt like Annas' (1987) silent students--unable to see myself as a woman who writes.

Why was it so difficult to think of myself in new, less-limiting ways? I had returned willingly to the academy as a doctoral student to prepare myself for a faculty position. I knew that career success, even entry into the profession,

depended upon my ability to conduct independent research, to write, and to publish. However, collaboration appeared to be an attractive concept, suggesting a mentoring relationship and a process which offered confirmation and empowerment. Moreover, I regarded it as a way to demystify the academic publishing rituals which seemed remote and intimating despite my seventeen year career in university administration. As a feminist I was also attracted to collaboration as a political strategy, as a way of challenging the hierarchical power relationships which too often characterize academic work and privilege the individual author.

Like other feminist scholars who have been attracted to collaboration as a research topic or work style (Brady, 1988; Ede & Lunsford, 1990; Ward & Grant, 1991, for example), I learned that collaboration is multifaceted, vaguely defined, and often misunderstood. While it is challenging, demanding, and frequently frustrating, it can also be satisfying, rewarding, and even occasionally fun. Kaplan and Rose (1993) describe their own collaboration as intellectually and emotionally synergistic. Belenky suggests that women work better in collaborative situations and adds, "To be noncompetitive--to be connected, to care, to engage in dialogue, to draw out the other person--is a good way to be if you want to sponsor the development of others...it provides a collaborative stance toward the world." (Ashton-Jones & Thomas, 1991, p. 35.)

Enriched by the experience of having worked in collaborative relationships with other women doctoral students and with a mentor who models "a collaborative stance toward the world," I sought to learn more about scholarly collaboration as it is practiced by faculty women. Research into collaboration and coauthorship in

academic scholarship suggests that women are attracted to and benefit from collaboration in distinctive ways (Austin & Baldwin, 1991; Fox & Faver, 1984; Wilkie & Allen, 1975), that women experience writing as empowering (Ede, 1985), and that they tend to collaborate in ways which empower others (Hunter & Kuh, 1987). Feminist research also suggests that women "know" (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986) and make moral judgments (Gilligan, 1982) in ways which express concern for and form connections to others. Missing from the research however are studies which document the penalties exacted against faculty who choose to conduct collaborative scholarship in communities where independent scholarship is highly valued, an unfortunate absence given anecdotal evidence which cautions young scholars against coauthoring until one's reputation is established. Also rare are qualitative studies which explore the relationships which develop between feminist faculty and their collaborating partners and studies which help us to understand how working collaboratively influences the individual scholar. Feminist and other critical studies which focus on underrepresented groups and unmask the political significant of different research and writing strategies are also missing in the growing body of research on faculty collaboration.

Research Design and Methodology

This paper, a brief report of my learnings about feminism, scholarship, and collaboration, is based on my interviews with 26 women who are employed full-time at one of two research universities in the Midwest United States. Each participant is affiliated with the women's studies department on her campus and has collaborated with another woman on a research project, a scholarly paper or article, or project in the creative arts. As in most research institutions, women's studies

faculty--including the participants in this study--come almost exclusively from the humanities, social sciences, and selected professional schools (Rosser, 1983). The final sample includes six assistant professors, eleven associate professors, and nine full professors, representing eighteen different schools and departments. Twenty-three participants are white, three are women of color, and two women claim other ethnic or national heritages. Three identify themselves as lesbian. Fourteen of the participants described themselves in their conversations as currently having life partners, and twelve of those fourteen are either married or remarried. Eight are divorced. Fourteen have children and/or stepchildren. Participants range in age from their mid-thirties to their late sixties and, in the year of the completion of their highest degree, from 1955 to 1990.

My goal in this study was to gain a deeper understanding of collaboration as a dynamic process in which faculty form meaningful relationships in the advancement of their scholarship. In order to accomplish this goal, my inquiry was guided by an overarching research question: How do the commitments which women faculty bring to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration intersect? My desire to conduct research which captures the complex ways in which these commitments intersect called for an interpretive research design and qualitative methods. My search was for methods which would bring me in close contact with women faculty, permit me to share in their meanings, and, through our mutual engagement in the research act, add to our understanding of ourselves as feminist researchers and knowers.

Each interview or conversation (Kvale, 1992) was semi-structured, following a general interview guide (Patton, 1990) which consisted of approximately 35 open-ended questions focusing on the three primary phenomena of interest. The guide

was also designed to elicit participants' perspectives on the research university and disciplinary context, their professional and interpersonal relationship with their collaborators and other women faculty, and their development as scholars and feminists. I conducted each interview privately and in person, at a time and in a location selected by the participant, usually her home or office. With the participants' verbal and written consent, I tape recorded the interviews, taking precautions to protect the identity of the participants.* The transcribed tape recordings, supplemented by my field notes and participants' vitas, were coded and thematically analyzed, using a qualitative data analysis procedure refined by Strauss and Corbin (1990).

As themes and patterns began to emerge from the data, I formulated additional research questions and progressively focused my inquiry on the women faculty as (a) individuals who have constructed personal identities as competent scholars; (b) partners in particular kinds of collaborative relationships; and (c) scholars who employ specific research strategies in order to accommodate the norms of their particular institutions and fields. This paper is limited to the first of these three foci and seeks to answers the question: What role does collaboration with women play in feminist women faculties' constructions of their own scholarly identities?

* All participants names used in this paper are code names. References to their specific institutions, schools, departments, and fields, other than women's studies, have been omitted in order to protect the identities of individual participants.

The Multiple Meanings of Collaboration

Although the women in the study all share the experience of having collaborated with a woman colleague at least once, they vary significantly in their descriptions of the collaboration process and it's defining characteristics . For some, the definition of collaboration is as simple as Lori's, a senior faculty member in a humanities field: "Any process of people working together on the same project." Others distinguish among several models, or view collaboration as a continuum of relationships ranging from an informal network of scholars who share information but never actually coauthor to formal relationships with clearly defined roles, responsibilities, and rules of author attribution. Lucy, an associate professor with an interdisciplinary speciality, explains:

> I would define it in two ways....There is what I would consider "formal collaboration" when two people, in doing research or doing a publication or some other very specific project, are dividing up the labor and then are ultimately responsible for the final product, which is the product of the research. And then in a broader sense, I would use "collaboration" as people who talk to each other, give support to each other, that is, read each other's work or recommend ideas. All of those kinds of things are one kind of collaboration that is informal...but it's more than just being a colleague....I would say that collaboration is when you're actually focusing on something, something that actually takes your time and draws upon your own expertise in some way that you're involved with another person.

Collaboration where the roles are divided up, each person does her part, and all the parts are put back together is a fairly accurate description for some participants

but is insufficient for others. As Pat, an associate professor in a professional field, notes, "It doesn't matter so much who does what piece, it's the environment...a supportive environment, one where you're learning together." "Real collaboration," a phrase I heard often, is differentiated from the mechanical process of dividing up and recombining the component parts. Jillian, an assistant professor in the social sciences, tells about doing one collaborative paper "in chunks and then putting them together" but admits that it didn't "feel like the next level of meaning and understanding came to that piece." Phyllis, an associate professor in a professional field who frequently collaborates using several different models, describes true collaboration "where the ideas are coming from both of us. [It's] truly creative in a symbiotic kind of way, or a synergistic way."

These multiple meanings and experiences confirm that there is no single definition or model of collaboration. To collaborate in scholarship and research, in the writing of a paper, or in the creation of an artistic work implies a wide range of activities and consequences depending on one's field, specialization, academic role, and status. Collaboration based on a physical sciences model, for example, can mean being part of a large team whose members rarely have face to face contact. This form of collaboration, however, was rare in my study. More commonly, collaborative partnerships involve only two or three people, a pattern which I saw most frequently. For some participants, particularly faculty representing the humanities, collaboration and coauthorship is limited to edited books, anthologies, and special journal issues with only an introduction being coauthored. In fields such as English, classics, history, and foreign languages, individual journal articles and "major" books are rarely, if ever, coauthored. In other fields,

colleagues may collaborate on a research project but then write and publish findings as individual authors. More commonly collaborative research ends in one or more coauthored papers.

In their recent review of the literature on collaboration in academic research and teaching, Austin and Baldwin (1991, p. 5) define academic collaboration as "a cooperative endeavor that involves common goals, coordinated effort, and outcomes or products for which the collaborators share responsibility and credit." Many of my participants would argue that such a definition does not accurately represent their experiences. Echoing Reither 's (1987, p. 5) broader definition, "making meaning in community," they suggest that collaboration may mean even more.

Defining Academic Feminism(s)

Just as collaboration takes on multiple dimensions in the work of women faculty, so does feminism. All but one of the participants identify themselves as feminists. Although there is general agreement as to what feminism means, women of color and foreign-born participants express particular dissatisfaction with forms of academic feminism that they associate with white, middle class, American women. Carol, for example, an associate professor in the social sciences, rejects American feminism:

> I've always had problems with the identification. I'm a woman who has social roles in different situations and who has to defend herself....If you call this a feminist--this identification is used in so many circumstances that I disagree profoundly with that I have some difficulty with the word.

Carol shares her experiences working with a group of women in her native country and explains:

> No one used the word ["feminist"]. And we never talked about this. We just did what we did. And of course the ideology was there--to help female emancipation in the population we were interested in. But that's not the kind of feminist I found here.

Nina, an untenured professor in the social sciences, is also uneasy with the label of feminist which she sees as limited to white women and not inclusive of women of color: "I'm very interested in women and women's lives, and what's going on that affects women's lives." Her relationship with women's studies, like Carol's, is an uneasy one, and she admits to feelings of suspicion.

Associate professor in a humanities field, Karyn does claim the label, describing herself as "a feminist womanist," and adds:

> I'm not a feminist that feels the need to criticize what anyone is doing....I have met too many feminists who, without even thinking, position themselves to minimize my discourse, my voice. So I'm a feminist but my alignments are very carefully chosen. I have watched people say, "We want to give women of color voice" and so a woman of color raises her hand and whatever she said, they say, "Oh, yeh. Right." Business as usual.

Myra, an associate professor in the social sciences, also accepts the term but also hastens to give her own definition. Closely aligned with women's studies on her campus, she notes, "We still have a problem with that racism/sexism interface in women's studies, so that's still troublesome."

Like collaboration with its multiple meanings, definitions of feminism vary in their specificity. For Mildred, a professor in the social sciences with a long association with women's studies, feminism is simply "believing in equality of opportunity for both sexes." For Edythe, also a senior woman, feminism is action-oriented, "You have to live what you are saying." Jillian similarly sees her feminism as "a part of how you do life." Fay, a younger untenured professor in the humanities, experiences feminism as "an angle of vision" which has changed in its meaning as she as matured:

> In college, feminism then was making me aware that I was a woman and what difference that made--pretty narcissistic. Later it became a way to turn intellectual issues into political things...to make them passionate, not just an intellectual concern....It was not about me, but the situation of women. And now I don't think it's just about the situation of women at all. It informs things that I look at all the time...not theoretical but experiential... Now it's come back to be a more lived thing.

Collaboration and the Construction of the Scholarly Identity

The 26 women who shared their collaboration stories with me tell of experiences that occurred during their years of doctoral study, early in their faculty careers, during their middle years as tenured professors, and well into their years as senior faculty members. Across the sample as a whole, meaningful collaborations were not limited to any particular age, rank, or period of their careers. However they repeatedly tell of being advised not to collaborate as junior faculty, if at all, and getting a clear message that independent scholarship and single authored publications are more highly valued than coauthored work. For participants

working in the social sciences, collaborative research is becoming increasingly common, and many acknowledge that interdisciplinary collaboration is encouraged for faculty of all ranks. In conflict with these signals, however, faculty feel that the publications which result from their collaborative research will "count less" for faculty who are not the primary or first author. Many expressed the need to balance their coauthored work with single-authored papers or books, or to make sure that first name position is alternated on large projects that generate several papers.

Tenured faculty, women who have accommodated the norms of the discipline in order to advance in their careers, often reflect upon collaboration as something they would have found particularly attractive and useful as they were beginning their faculty careers. A full professor in a humanities discipline where coauthored work is still rare, Mildred admits, "I would have valued it early on. I really would have. And I think I would have learned a lot. I would have made fewer mistakes, fewer enemies."

Pat, a tenured associate professor in a professional program and an avid proponent of collaboration, was told to publish more on her own after she had collaborated on several significant projects. Frustrated and angry, she longs for a time when she will be free to work collaboratively again but realizes that she must continue to work independently in order to be promoted. Highly motivated to reach full professor, she admits, "I think at that point I can get back to where I was....I won't have to care whether it counts or not. I can just care about whether or not I learn from it."

The senior women in the study offer a perspective on the academy which comes from long, often difficult careers, greater experience evaluating scholarship and, in

turn, having their scholarship evaluated by others. They are able to put their careers and their scholarship into an historical perspective. Perhaps not unexpectedly, I found junior faculty, those women who have more recently entered the professorate, to be particularly and immediately concerned with the construction of their own scholarly identities. In pursuing these concerns in conversations with the participants, especially the assistant professors and associates who have only recently been tenured and promoted, I identified five recurring identity themes which I describe in this paper as: (a) affiliation; (b) rebellion and resistance; (c) synergy; (d) pragmatism; and (e) confirmation and empowerment.

Affiliation

To coauthor a publication or to copresent a conference paper is to make a public declaration of a professional affiliation with another scholar. Collaboration is one way to proclaim one's membership in a community of like-minded people. It symbolizes an endorsement or sanctioning of another's work, point of view, methodology, or research interest. More personal than the acceptance of one's writing or research by an editorial board or program reader, it links scholars together in a relationship, as faculty and student, as colleagues, as members of a particular network or "invisible college" (Crane, 1972.) For a graduate student or new faculty member, affiliation with an established scholar or team of scholars can be both intimidating and comforting.

Phyllis, an associate professor in a professional field, describes her first coauthored article as "unsettling." Because of her particular expertise, she was invited as a doctoral student to collaborate with two young faculty and remembers, "That really wasn't such a satisfying research experience. I wasn't far enough

along to really know what I was doing. What if someone asked me details about this paper?" In contrast, Lisa, a recently tenured faculty member in a different professional field, was offered the opportunity as a doctoral student to join a team of women faculty and students whose numerous projects often resulted in conference presentations. She explains, "We met on a regular basis and we did things together. And we created all kinds of projects. We did a lot of neat stuff. So I had that in my doctoral education and realized what a benefit that was." Describing how she was prepared to do independent work in a community environment, Lisa remembers, "Each individual cared about her own work and the joint project she had with the other person. But we also cared about everybody else's work and helping them get that done as well."

Affiliation with other scholars does not mean uncritical endorsement of their work. Nor does it assume that feminist values are modeled in all relationships. In fact, hierarchical relationships between junior and senior faculty members, women and men, and doctoral students and faculty are much more typically modeled in collaborative relations than democratic relationships between equals (Wilkie and Allen, 1975). Participants in this study who had collaborative research experiences where there were significant differences in status or power often found it difficult to overcome those differences. Edythe, who collaborated as a student with a professor she describes as jealous and controlling, notes: "With students it's very hard to have an egalitarian kind of relationship when they're still students--I don't think I should [collaborate] cause we're not equal. I know that the power's in my corner." In contrast, Lisa's membership in a group which stressed mutuality and equality colors her own expectations of the doctoral student with whom she

collaborates. She expects them to speak out and not be intimated by faculty--adding however that she thinks students still expect to be told what to do. Although she finds collaborative research to be meaningful for herself and for her students, she laments, "It would only be better if it were another faculty member and we were on a more equal level educationally so that we could be contributing more."

MaryAnn, as assistant professor who has undertaken a large research project and recently coauthored a book with a colleague from her previous institution, describes her collaborator as a supportive feminist and her senior in rank, national reputation, professional networks, and number of publications. MaryAnn admits that she found the relationship to be both flattering and intimidating initially and describes her own behavior as deferential, "feeling like a grad assistant at first and not an equal partner." Her colleague, however, "immediately and consistently took steps to make sure we were working together equally....she was trying to help me feel we were both participating at the same level." Despite her colleague's efforts, however, it was not until they presented a conference paper and Mary Ann began to receive public recognition that she "began to feel more engaged in the process" and that she could "question and contradict." She adds, "then your collaborator starts to treat you a little different and to see that you have ideas of your own."

Rebellion and Resistance

Affiliation with a supportive colleague in a collaborative project can provide the impetus to tackle topics and to take stands in one's scholarship that one might not risk if working independently. For participants like Karyn, Lori, Maggie, Marjorie, and others in the study whose scholarship follows the humanities tradition, to coauthor a scholarly paper or book is to challenge the norms of

acceptable academic scholarship and to risk resistance and even rejection of one's ideas. Women faculty who work in history, English, philosophy, classics or other humanities-based subspecialties frequently comment that collaboration "just isn't done" or "we don't really talk about it." Not atypically, Maggie, a recently tenured associate professor in a professional field, observes, "If you share your argument, that means you haven't done anything. If they see two names, they want to see who did the most, to find out who did the 'real' thinking on this article."

Karyn approaches collaborative work as a way of innovating, taking intellectual risks, and modeling possibilities. Still believing that "collaboration really out to be the wave of the future" and a way "to really make our voices heard," Karyn finds that her coauthored work, a conference paper which developed into a book, has been dismissed as unscholarly. Because of its experimental form as well as its focus on the coauthors' experiences as Black women, Karyn laments, "People were not willing to process the possibility of collaboration, to allow the experiment to be an experiment, to give us positive, sensible, intelligent feedback."

In contrast, Lori's coauthored book, also unusual in her discipline, was much more positively receive. She recalls that coming up for tenure "I was getting some messages that because I had coauthored this book that might be a problem, that it might not count.....But that didn't happen at all." She admits that the collaboration "worked really well and of course it's against all the rules of how you're suppose to do it."

Women who work in fields in which collaboration is more common and positively received describe their work with women colleagues as giving them support to take risks in other aspects of their scholarship. Pat, for example, admits

to sending her work to a former collaborator "every time I've written something where I thought I was hanging myself out to dry." Nina frequently works with other women, often other women of color, on her large, grant-funded projects. She describes a current project as appearing mainstream in many ways; it is an extensive study using a mixture of quantitative and qualitative methodologies which are widely accepted and widely used in her field. To do scholarly work that is highly valued is particularly important to Nina who, as a woman of color, feels that she faces additional layers of stereotyping and prejudices against her work. Caught between conflicting pressures--to do work which is relevant to her ethnic community and to produce scholarship which is highly valued in her field--Nina collaborates with carefully selected partners on topics of mutual interest in order to do research which is ethical, important, and viewed as valuable in both communities.

Images of themselves as rebels appear frequently in the stories which feminist women tell about their scholarship. When asked if they had ever been told not to collaborate or coauthor or to avoid collaborating with another feminist, a frequent response was, "They wouldn't dare tell me that" or "They know it wouldn't do any good." Jillian laughs at her resistance to the received wisdom which cautioned her against collaborating, against doing qualitative research, and against publishing a coauthored book early in her career. Having successfully managed all three, she describes how she learned to trust her feelings and her need to work with other people. "Sometimes when you do this type of work, you really need to talk. Talking through ideas about what you're beginning to see in the data--it's nice it

have somebody who's already up to speed....Sharing ideas like that is a type of collaboration."

Working closely with her feminist collaborator gave MaryAnn the courage to proclaim her own feminism in an environment which is hostile to feminist politics, scholarship, and pedagogy. Working with a feminist partner and using feminist methodology helped MaryAnn to realize how she had been shaped by all the men she had worked with and made her conscious of the kind of scholar and person she wanted to be. "Now when my work is reviewed, it is reviewed as feminist research...so that's a transformation that occurred." She continues, "I think I really learned a lot about being a feminist by collaborating....[It] gives you more strength to be a feminist when you see someone else who is one who is very successful at it."

Synergy

Three concepts that reappear as women faculty describe the process and products of collaborative research, its advantages, or their growth as scholars are "expansive, " "enlarging," and "synergistic." Participants often experience collaboration between two or more scholars as leading to a research product that is qualitatively better and larger than the research that a single individual can do. As Lisa explains:

> Ideally collaboration is both parties or all parties contributing--I'd like to say equally--I think that's never really possible because people have different skills and knowledge. But I think that the collaboration is that people contribute what they have to the larger venture--which becomes larger

because there are more people working on it. And it's better because there are more people working on it.

Lori's agrees:

> The big benefit is the product. You just know it's better because it has two people's thinking and training and disciplines in it. So that's real exciting. And of course, how much I learn from it that I wouldn't otherwise know.

A tenured professor approaching retirement and self-described militant feminist and rebel, Betsy distinguishes collaboration from cooperation, a process she sees as simply working with a shared idea. She explains:

> When I collaborate, you and I enter into something--and we may have some idea--but the idea we come out with is entirely different. It represents real collaboration...the spark, the spirit, and the gem and the earthiness of your ideas and mine. It's something that I alone could not have done and you alone could not have done it. And so it's bigger and better and brighter and clearer, and I hope huge!

In a successful collaboration, not only does the product itself becomes larger and better, but the process itself becomes expansive and takes on a different quality. Participants learn from each other, develop new skills, have old ideas challenged, and describe themselves as doing more and being more than they were before the project. Pat, for example, describes the experience of being in a collaborative partnership that is going well, "Everything is flowing and moving well--sympatico--this energy builds. And you do more than you can imagine and you see more. Learning is affective. When I'm really learning, it is an emotional thing for me."

Similarly, Jillian explains her positive feelings toward collaboration:

> Connecting with another person, in person or over the phone or whatever, you get the feeling of "Yes! Now it makes sense." It's difficult to say what's going on here....when you're firing on all cylinders. It's just really neat. You feel like something is going on here bigger than you are. Maybe that's what it is. It makes you feel expansive.

Karyn describes her experience,

> There is a way in which a certain level of thinking is just wild. And we were wild thinkers! So we kept going, "What if...?, What if..?, What if...? until suddenly we had this really extraordinary idea! So I generated the questions that shaped the book from what I'd been thinking and they jived with what she'd been thinking about and we said, "Let's do it."

Pragmatism

Although all the women in the study enjoy certain aspects of their collaborative research projects and relationships, not all describe it in such glowing terms. Some approach it as an effective strategy for busy faculty to employ in order to generate the large numbers of publications demanded in research universities. Because she has a particular methodological expertise and frequent opportunities to collaborate on research that is peripheral to her own interests, Phyllis has used those opportunities to build a very strong vita. Nina is also in a department where numbers count and observes:

> I think that the nature of the academy has gotten to the point where in many disciplines, including ours, given the expectations they have, the kinds of publications they want...it would be very, very difficult for sole authors to

generate three, four, five articles a year individually. In our discipline we see sole-authored work, but we see more and more collaborative efforts. And I think some of us are taking the lead from the natural sciences where you have this string of authors. They know that if you really want to punch out work in a hurry, get a group together and then you take the lead on different things so that you can publish what the expectation is.

Participants throughout the social sciences and in many of the professional schools agree with Nina's views. Collaboration and coauthored publications, modeled after the highly valued and heavily funded teams characterizing research in the physical and life sciences, are not only becoming more common but are setting a standard for quantity that many, if not most, scholars are finding difficult to achieve. Kate, an untenured professor in a social science field, keeps a listing of her publications above her desk at eye-level as a reminder of the number she needs for tenure. Like Nina, she is committed to doing policy-based research which benefits the ethnic populations she studies. She collaborates in her research because she simply cannot teach regularly, work with graduate students, write grant proposals, do all the field work, write reports for use in the community, and publish her findings in refereed journals. Collaboration is a way to divide the work load and to publish more articles faster. Furthermore, collaboration with community policy specialists means that she can share the writing and focus more on her scholarly articles.

Pat's initial reason for involving other, better known scholars in the development of an edited book was her difficulty in finding a publisher. By involving others in the project, she was able to maximize her own abilities and

capitalize on the strengths that others brought to the project. Lori's coauthored book grew from a similar recognition that a topic in which she and her partner shared an interest could benefit from an interdisciplinary perspective and their complementary research skills and training. Ellen, an associate professor in the social sciences, agrees that collaborative work allows scholars to work more efficiently by bringing together people with complementary skills, work styles, and levels of expertise. Despite taking time off to have a baby, she finished two papers because she "had coauthors who could take up the slack." She admits too that collaboration has helped her to feel more confident and competent in her quantitatively-driven department "because I'm getting more stuff out faster."

Confirmation and Empowerment

The close personal and professional bonds which characterize many of the collaborative partnerships described in this study provide new faculty the courage to trust their own experiences, feelings, and knowledge. Many participants report that working closely with other women confirms the expressive aspects of their personalities, aspects which are often concealed in the construction of the scholarly self. MaryAnn, struggling to find the exact words to describe her feelings, confesses, "You get to a stage where you try to keep your feelings closed in, so to articulate them is a new experience." A feminist working in a department where "feminism is a dirty word", MaryAnn protects herself in conversation with other faculty. However, she describes her collaborative research experience as "exciting...a very emotional experience." She explains:

> I was reluctant to get involved in collaboration because I'd always done research singly, but after I moved here and left my collaborator behind, we

would spend a week together continuing our research. And that became very, very important, especially in this environment, to sustain me. And I have come to really appreciate the level of discussion and the support.

In contrast, Jillian's stories about her research, her teaching, her relationships, and her growth as a feminist scholar illustrate just how comfortable she is with her own feelings and the emotional expressions of others. A woman who once thought of herself as "too stupid" to take a class, Jillian is committed to doing social science research that moves people. When she shares her research with others, including students in the classroom, they often respond emotionally. She sees herself fundamentally as a teacher who uses collaboration to mentor and describes herself as "loving to encourage students to become more of themselves, to become more content of themselves."

A recurring theme appearing in the collaboration stories which women share is the confirmation of their personal values and the enactment of their values through their scholarship. Lisa, for example, talks about her inability to separate her identity, her feminism, and her scholarship "because they are all a part of what I do, what I am." She sees working collaboratively with other women as part of her feminist commitment; "I guess it's the same kind of thing--working together makes things better for change. One person can't do much alone, so we have to work together."

Maggie works in a field where "it is legitimate to bring women into the conversation, but to start with a political position like feminism or to start theoretically with a politically located theory is not appreciated. It's tolerated...but it's punished." Therefore the collaborative writing she does with a feminist

colleague is separate from the "scholarly" writing she does in her field. She explains:

> What it [collaboration] does for me is to push my ideas away from that traditional view of scholarship towards a different sort of understanding about what it is, what the enterprise is all about. It's a different framework. And what it does for me at least, it makes it so much like a real thing, like an ordinary thing that people can do. Scholarship is a funny word to me. I've always been scared of that, it sounds very impressive. But when [my colleague] and I collaborate, I think it's scholarly like crazy but it's not scholarship with a capital S, in that way that makes you think it's important and imposing and intimidating and wonderful. This is much more like a conversation to me---that real people do to think. You don't put yourself outside your life to do it....I don't leave me behind at all.

As Maggie, Lisa, Jillian, and MaryAnn reveal in different ways, collaboration is a way of personalizing the context in which research is done, a way of bringing the self back into one's scholarship. It allows the scholar to acknowledge her emotions, experiences, and values, and in many cases to express and enact them in her scholarship. For many of these women, it is both confirming and empowering to work with a person who supports and respects those aspects of the self that are often minimized, controlled, and hidden in traditional scholarship.

Limitations of the Study

This study which draws on the collaboration experiences of a selected group of women who work in research universities, like every study, is limited in several

important ways. First, it excludes important groups of women faculty: (a) feminist women who work in other types of colleges and universities and who have constructed their own strong scholarly identities in different environments; (b) feminist women in the natural and physical sciences or in professional schools, such as engineering and medicine, where collaborative research is the norm; (c) women who are not affiliated with women's studies programs; and (e) collaborating faculty women whose careers have been unsuccessful and who have left the research university environment. Clearly our understanding of feminist, scholarship, and collaboration would be enhanced by hearing the stories of women faculty from these important groups.

A second limitation is the small number of minority women who participated in the study. Women of color, lesbian and gay scholars, and others who are isolated and underrepresented in higher education bring different experiences and meanings to the scholar role. These experiences are important in any study which purports to present a richer description of the collaboration of feminist scholars.

Third, participants in the study were interviewed individually and privately rather than as collaborating pairs or teams of faculty women. Knowledge of collaboration constructed by groups of women might provide a view of relationships and socially constructed identities missing in this study.

As a final note, I remind the reader that qualitative inquiry "explores the poorly understood territories of human interaction" (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992, p.173) and allows the research to approach an understanding of the meanings which others make of a phenomenon. Its goal is not generalizability but depth of understanding and richness of detail. The usefulness of my research must be measured by the

extent to which it motivates the participants to act on their insights, not to the extent that it explains the collaborative scholarship and feminism of other scholars in other settings. Its transferability, however, can and must be determined by the reader.

These limitations should not prevent important questions from being asked of a specific group of faculty women about the connections they make between their feminism, their scholarship, and collaboration. To seek to understand their friendships and to capture the meanings they make of their lives is to honor their struggles and accomplishments and to offer strategies to other women who seek to live productive and confirming lives as academic women.

Discussion

A theme which flows throughout these stories and many others that I heard from feminist women faculty in the course of this study is the importance of their scholarship and their personal values. Participants repeatedly express the desire to integrate their values and their scholarship by doing research on a topic or using methods which reflect their commitments--to their communities, to other women, to equality, to justice and fairness, and to change. They express a need for personal and professional integrity and a desire to work in challenging harmony--what Annas (1987, p. 14) calls "nurturing but rigorous/tough space--with their peers. As feminist women in research universities where the majority of faculty in most departments are white men, the enactment of their commitments to feminism and scholarship demands both personal and professional resources. The participants in this study find that collaboration with other women is a powerful way to increase those resources.

Appley and Winder (1977) argue that collaboration is a value system which can provide an alternative way of solving the diffuse and complex problems which characterize contemporary society. In contrast to our traditional value system which is based on competition, hierarchy, and limited resources, they suggest that a turbulent environment calls for:

> ...a relational system in which: 1) individuals in a group share mutual aspirations and a common framework; 2) the interactions among individuals are characterized by "justice as fairness"; and 3) these aspirations and conceptualizations are characterized by each individual's consciousness of her/his motives toward the other; by caring or concern for the other; and by commitment to work with the other over time provided that this commitment is a matter of choice. (Appley & Winder, 1977, p. 281.)

With particularly relevance to this study, Appley and Winder's work acknowledges the values upon which collaborative relationships are based, emphasizing the themes of caring, commitment, and choice that are central in feminist ethics, pedagogy, and inquiry. The views and experiences of women faculty in this study suggest that collaboration as a process of working together can be practiced in ways which do in fact reinforce feminist values. Most of the collaborations between women described in this paper strive to model those values. However, it is also apparent that collaborative groups can work in ways that resist feminist values, confirming and supporting competition, hierarchy, patriarchy, limited choice, and even exploitation. These traditional relationships and values also influence the identities which scholars are able to construct.

Collaboration, as we have seen, cannot be understood as a simple process leading to a predictable result. Women faculty participating in this study show us that collaboration is neither inherently empowering nor exploiting, egalitarian nor hierarchical, secure nor risky. It is all of those things. Both the advantages and disadvantages of formal collaboration as a mode of research and scholarly writing depend greatly upon the evolving norms of the discipline or field and the values of the people who are involved. Lori's experience illustrates that a coauthored book may be well received and rewarded in the humanities, but Karyn's experience shows that violating community norms can be painful. In collaborative work as in all scholarship, there are no absolutes. Not all women or feminists are successful collaborators, and many men are. It is clear, however, that collaboration is an appealing concept to *many* feminist women faculty for *some* research and writing projects. It is also clear that the norms that determine scholarship are powerful and rarely static or unambiguous.

Moore and Sagaria (1991), in a study of coalitions in elite research universities and editorial boards, suggest that women can help to change the competitive culture of the academy:

> Feminist scholars have argued that women must create a major shift in ideology that should and would change academic culture by making it more inclusive, humane, and collegial. It could also bring a shift in the way academic power is determined and move personnel decisions from a competitive to a collaborative mode. Emphasis for change would be less on the legalistic mechanisms and hierarchical structures of the academy and more on the dynamic function and social interactions of the members. This

could result in rethinking graduate education and junior faculty experiences as a time of individualistic challenge and competition to a time of mutual investment in talent development, generativity, and collaboration.

One of the ways in which feminism, scholarship, and collaboration intersect is at the level of the individual scholar and in her construction of her own scholarly identity. This study suggests that many feminist women faculty would welcome and benefit from a rethinking of the doctoral and junior faculty experiences and would benefit in ways which influence the constructions of their own identities. Collaboration by itself, however, will not create the changes that are necessary to make academic culture more inclusive, humane, and collegial. Women who enter into collaborative relationships expecting synergy may come into conflict with collaborative pragmatists. Scholars who have been socialized to believe the "lone scholar myth" (Hood, 1985) will find it difficult to accept that thinking is a social process and that ideas can indeed be shared.

Ways of collaborating that consciously encourage resistance to hierarchy, exclusion, and exploitation, that encourage creative rebellion, that lead to a synergy of ideas that enlivens scholarship may help to create the kind of environment that Pat calls "a supportive environment where you're learning together." Affiliation, pragmatism, confirmation, and empowerment can also be practiced by faculty working with their students and colleagues in ways that reaffirm feminist values and help other scholars to construct identities as confident scholars. Faculty women who are committed to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration show us by their words as by their example that their commitments do intersect in diverse and powerful ways. These are not however commitments which can be easily learned

or enacted in isolation. They must be examined critically, refined, and then passed on to others.

Directions for Future Research

In this paper I have attempted to provide some insight into the relationship between collaboration with another faculty woman and a scholar's construction of her own identity. Clearly there is need for future study if this relationship is too be both well-understood and useful in our work as faculty. My conversations with women who collaborate successfully suggest that in-depth studies are also needed to explore other common types of collaborations, with student/faculty research partnerships being a particularly rich area for study. Similarly, other collaborations that display power and status differences, such as those involving men and women, senior and junior faculty, African-American and white faculty, and Western and non-Western faculty, deserve scholarly attention. These collaborative relationships raise questions about how the partners manage their differences and how these perceived differences both promote and inhibit the relationship, the individual scholars, and their research.

References

Annas, P. (1987). Silences: Feminist language research and the teaching of writing. In C. L. Caywood & G. R. Overing (Eds.), Teaching writing: Pedagogy, gender, and equity (pp. 3-17). Albany: State University of New York.

Appley, D.G. & Winder, A. E. (1977). Values, attitudes, and skills. Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, 13(3), 279-291.

Ashton-Jones, E. & Thomas, D. K. (1991). Composition, collaboration, and women's ways of knowing: A conversation with Mary Belenky. In G. Olson & I. Gale (Eds.), (Inter)views: Cross-disciplinary perspectives on rhetoric and literacy (pp. 27-44). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.

Austin, A. E. & Baldwin, R. G. (1991). Faculty collaboration: Enhancing the quality of scholarship and teaching. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7. Washington, D.C.: George Washington, School of Education and Human Development.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R. & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Brady, L. A. (1988). Collaborative literary writing: Issues of authorship and authority. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Crane, D. (1972). Invisible colleges: Diffusion of knowledge in scientific communities. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Ede, L. (1985, November). The concept of authorship: An historical perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English. Philadelphia, Pa. (ED266481).

Ede, L. & Lunsford, A. (1990). Singular texts/plural authors: Perspectives on collaborative writing. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University.

Fox, M. F. & Faver, C. (1984). Independence and cooperation in research: The motivations and costs of collaboration. Journal of Higher Education, 55, 347-359.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.

Glesne, C. & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman.

Hood, J.C. (1985). The lone scholar myth. In M.F. Fox (Ed.) Scholarly writing and publishing: Issues,problems, and solutions, (pp.111-125). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Hunter, D. E. & Kuh, G. D. (1987). The "write wing". Journal of Higher Education, 58, 443-462.

Kaplan, C. & Rose, E.C. (1993). Strange bedfellows: Feminist collaboration. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 18(3), 547-561.

Kvale, S. (1992, April). Inter views and postmodern knowledge. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Moore, K. M. & Sagaria, M.A. D. (1991). The situation of women in research universities in the United States: Within the inner circles of academic power. In G. P. Kelly & S. Slaughter (Eds.). Women's higher education in comparative perspective (pp. 185-200). The Netherlands: Kluwer.

New federal data show that minority group members and women slightly increased their share of faculty jobs between 1989 and 1991. (1993, January 6). The Chronicle of Higher Education. p. A15.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park: Sage.

Ransom, M.R. (1990). Gender segregation by field in higher education. Research in Higher Education, 31(5), 477-494.

Reither, J. A. (1987, March) What do we mean by "collaborative writing" (and what difference might it make)? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the College Composition and Communication Convention. Atlanta, Ga. (ED2600).

Rosenberg, R. (1979). The academic prism: The new view of American women. In R. Berkin & M.B. Norton (Eds.), Women of America: A history (pp. 318-341). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rosser, S. V. (1986). The relationship between women's studies and women in science. In. R. Bleier (Ed.), Feminist approaches to science (pp. 165-180). New York: Pergamon.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.. Newbury Park: Sage.

Ward, K. B. & Grant, L. (1991). Coauthorship, gender, and publication among sociologists. In M. M. Fonow & J. Cook (Eds.), Feminist strategies in the study of gender (pp. 248-264). Bloomington: Indiana University.

Wilkie, J. R. & Allen, I. L. (1975). Women sociologists and co-authorship with men. American Sociologist, 10, 19-24.