27, TRAINING TO ENGAGED TRANSFORMATIVE GENDER RESEARCH

September 27, 28, 29, 2015

Amman, Jordan

Table of Contents

TRAINING TO ENGAGED TRANSFORMATIVE GENDER RESEARCH

September 27, 28, 29, 2015

Amman, Jordan

Seminar Program

Training Leader: Dr. Suad Joseph, University of California Davis

Trainers: Dr. Zeina Zaatari, University of California, Davis;

                       Dr. Lena Meari, Birzeit University

                       Lina Abou-Habib, Center for Research, Training and Development.

Overview:

In advance of the seminar, participants will be required to read key documents on Dr. Suad Joseph's website on Qualitative Data Analysis. The seminar will begin with two lectures by Training Leader, Dr. Suad Joseph who will present an overview of the components of the research proposal followed by an overview of data analysis while gathering data. The second and third days of the seminar will feature lectures by trainers Lena Meari, Zeina Zaatari, and Lina Abou Habib,; who will lecture on topics including: power relations in the context of fieldwork, oral history methods, survey methods, fieldwork ethics, as well as discuss data gathering from government sources, community organizations, from NGOs, and while in conditions of political violence.

Participants will work together in writing groups to complete assignments. Each writing group will identify a team leader who will coordinate their schedules. Every day each participant is required to make a presentation to their group and share their assigned work for feedback. On the last day, each participant is required to make a presentation of the methods section of their proposal to all seminar participants.

This is the second of four seminars. The third and fourth will be held in 2016. Those who have successfully completed their proposals have been funded for a pilot project to carry out their research under the mentorship of one of the trainers.

Over the course of two years, the researchers will complete a research proposal, and carry out a research project, which will include emphasis in data gathering, data analysis, writing analysis, and presenting their completed work in a final public conference.

Pre Seminar

Participants are to read the following documents *before* the seminar.

Oral History, Colonialist Dispossession, and the State: the Palestinian Case

Sayigh, Rosemary. "Oral History, Colonist Dispossession, and the State: The Palestinian Case."
        Taylor & Francis Online (2014): n. pag. Web.
        <http://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/X54XZn6Z7fU3t6kByrp5/full#.VLbpgSvF9KJ>

Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations

Ackerly, Brooke, and Jacqui True. "Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on
        International Relations."International Studies Review 10.4 (2008): 693-707. JSTOR. Web. 4
        Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25482017>.

Handbook of Feminist Research

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene. "Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the
        Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method." N.p.: n.p., n.d. N. pag. The
        Handbook of Feminist Research. Sage Publications, Inc. Web.
        <http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/43563_1.pdf>.

Oral History Techniquest: How to Organize and Conduct Oral History Interviews

Truesdell, Barbara. "Oral History Techniques: How to Organize and Conduct Oral History
        Interviews." Center for the Study of History and Memory. Indiana University, n.d. Web. 28
        Jan. 2015. <http://www.indiana.edu/~cshm/oral_history_techniques.pdf>.

Participants are to bring six printed copies of their completed proposals to the seminar.

Seminar Program

September 27, 2015
9:00-9:30   Coffee & Registration
9:30-10:30   Suad Joseph: Re-introductions; brief review of writing experience; Writing Groups
10:30-1:00   Suad Joseph: Overview of Components of A Research Proposal
1:00-2:00   Lunch
2:00-3:30   Suad Joseph: Overview of Data Analysis During Data Gathering
3:30-4:00   "The Danger of a Single Story"
               Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie
     http://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story?language=en

4:00-4:15   Break
4:15-5:30   Organize assignments/writing groups/plan for Seminar
5:30-7:00   Break
7:00-9:00   Dinner together

September 28, 2015
9:00-10:00   Lena Meari: Power Relations in the Fieldwork Context
10:00-11:00   Writing Groups
11:00-11:15   Break
11:15-12:45   Zeina Zaatari: Oral history/life history methods
12:45-2:00   Lunch
2:00-3:30   Lina Abou-Habib: Interview Methods
3:30-3:15   Break
3:15-4:45   Zeina Zaatari/Lena Meari: Survey Methods
4:15-5:30   Writing Groups
5:30-7:00   Break
7:00-9:00   Dinner Together

September 29, 2015
9:00-10:00   Zeina Zaatari: Fieldwork Ethics
10:00-11:00   Writing Groups
11:00-11:15   Break
11:15-12:15   Lena Abou-Habib: Data Gathering from NGO's, community organizations
12:15-1:30   Lunch
1:30-2:30   Lina Abou-Habib: Data Gathering from Government Sources
2:30-3:30   Lena Meari: Data Gathering Under Conditions of Political Violence
3:30-5:30   Presentations
5:30-6:00   Suad Joseph: Writing Groups & Planning for Data Gathering

Training to Engaged Transformative Gender Research
September 27, 28, 29, 2015
Amman, Jordan

Directory of Trainers

Dr. Suad Joseph

Dr. Suad Joseph completed her PhD in Anthropology at Columbia University. She is General Editor of the Encyclopedia of Women and Islamic Cultures (Brill 2003-2007) and EWIC Online (2009 -present). She is editor and co-editor of 8 books, and author of over 100 articles. She founded the Middle East Research Group in Anthropology (the Middle East Section of the American Anthropological Association); the Association for Middle East Women's Studies; the Arab Families Working Group; and a Consortium of 5 universities in Egypt, Lebanon, and Palestine, with UC Davis where she is Distinguished Research Professor and is the founding Director of the Middle East/South Asia Studies Program at University of California, Davis. She co-founded the Association for Arab American Studies and the Association for Middle East Anthropology. She was recognized at UC Davis for service by receiving the Graduate Mentor; the Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award; Chancellor's Award for Diversity and Community; and the UC Davis Prize for Undergraduate Teaching and Research. She was President of the Middle East Studies Association of North American. She has received grants from the Ford Foundation, the Henry Luce Foundation, the International Development Research Center, the Population Council, UNICEF, the Swedish Institute of Alexandria, the National Science Foundation, the US Department of Education, the Open Society Institute and other funders. She has taught proposal writing and research design for over 30 years. (http://sjoseph.ucdavis.edu)

Lina Abou Habib

Lina Abou-Habib is the Director of the Collective for Research and Training on Development – Action (CRTD-A), a regional organization working in research, programme interventions, campaigning and lobbying on gender equality and social justice in the MENA region. Ms. Abou-Habib has been involved in the design and management of research and development programmes in the Middle East and North Africa region on issues related to gender and citizenship, economy, trade and gender and leadership. Ms. Abou-Habib has collaborated with a number of regional and international research and development agencies, including The Royal Tropical Institute, IDRC, UNIFEM, ILO, ESCWA, UNDP, UNRWA, EMHRN, WB, as well as public institutions, in mainstreaming gender in development policies and practices and in building capacities for gender mainstreaming and for initiating research initiatives on gender equality. Prior to that, she was the Programme Coordinator for Oxfam GB in Lebanon. Ms. Abou-Habib is a programme advisor for the Women's Learning Partnership and the Global Fund for Women and is on the editorial board of Oxfam's journal, Gender and Development. Currently, she is coordinating CRTDA's Arab Women's Right to Nationality Campaign as well as the Regional Equality without Reservation Coalition. Lina has served as both Secretary and President of the Board of Directors of the Association of Women's Rights in Development (2008-2012). She is currently a doctoral candidate at the Auckland University of Technology.

Dr. Islah Jad

Dr. Islah Jad is an Associate Professor focusing on gender issues and politics at the Women's Studies Institute and Cultural Studies Department of Birzeit University in the West Bank. She joined Birzeit in 1983, and is a founding member of its women's studies program. She has written books and papers on the role of women in politics, Palestinian women and the relationships among them, Islam, and NGOs. Dr. Jad is also a consultant on gender issues to the United Nations Development Programme and is co-author of the UN's Arab Development Report on Women's Empowerment. Dr. Jad received her Ph.D. from the School of Oriental and African Studies in London in 2004.

Dr. Zeina Zaatari

Dr. Zeina Zaatari is a lecturer and research associate at the University of California, Davis and is an independent consultant focusing on gender and sexuality in the Middle East and North Africa. Previously, she worked as the Regional Director for the MENA Program at Global Fund for Women, (2004-2012). She earned her PhD in Cultural Anthropology with an emphasis in Feminist Theory from the University of California, Davis. Her publications include "Desirable Masculinity/Femininity and Nostalgia of the "Anti-Modernity": Bab el-Hara Television Series as a Site of Production" in Sexuality and Culture (2014), "Re-Imagining Family, Gender, and Sexuality: Feminist and LGBT Activism in the context of the 2006 Invasion of Lebanon" co-written with Nadine Naber in Cultural Dynamics (2014), "Arab Feminist Awakening: Possibilities and Necessities" in Arab Feminisms: A Critical Perspective (2014 & 2012). She currently serves as Secretary of the Board of the Association for Women's Rights in Development, the Associate Editor for the Middle East and Europe FOR THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF WOMEN AND ISLAMIC CULTURES ("http://sjoseph.ucdavis.edu/ewic) and is a core group member of the Arab Families Working Group.

Dr. Lena Meari

Dr. Lena Meari is an Assistant Professor at the Social and Behavioral Science and the Institute of Women's Studies at Birzeit University, Palestine. She received her PhD in Cultural Anthropology with a Designated Emphasis in Feminist Theory and Research from the University of California, Davis. Her dissertation, titled "Sumud: A Philosophy of Confronting Interrogation," investigates transforming colonial relations in colonized Palestine from the perspective of the interrogation encounter. She taught several courses, including Anthropology of the Middle East at the University of California, Davis, as well as Critical Theories in Gender and Development and Qualitative Research Methods for graduate students at Birzeit University. She was the first recipient of the Ibrahim Abu-Lughod Post-Doctoral Fellowship at Columbia University

Training to Engaged Transformative Gender Research
September 27, 28, 29, 2015
Amman, Jordan

Directory of Participants

Iman M.M. Salah

imanassaf1@hotmail.com
Palestine
Head of Gender Unit
Ministry of Labor

Ilham Makki Hammodi

Lebanon
makkiilham@yahoo.com
Anthropology
Saint Joseph's University
Baghdad-Adel Quarter

Kholoud Ahmed Alajarma

kajarma@gmail.com
Palestine
Social Anthropology
University of Bergen
Al-Yasamin St., Bethlehem

Manal Mahmoud Qaisi

op_dep2005@yahoo.com
Palestine
Social Work & Sociology
Al-Quds Open University

Mona Yahya Zaid Al-Mahaqeri

yzmona@hotmail.com
Yemen
Sana'a University-Gender and
Development Center

Directory of Participants

Raoudha Toufic El Guedri

guedri-raoudha86@hotmail.fr
Tunisia
University of Tunis
Faculty of Human and Social Sciences

Rawan Wadie Ibrahim

Ri2184@Columbia.edu,
RawanIbrahim@hotmail.com
Jordan

Dr. Saja Taha Al Zoubi

s.alzoubi@yahoo.com
Syria
General Commission for Scientific
Agricultural Research, Head of Socio-
Economic Studies Research Department
(GCSAR)

Samar Antoine Yaser

syasser@birzeit.edu
Palestine
Institute of Women Studies,
Birzeit University

Rania Jawad

rjawad7@yahoo.com
Palestine
Assistant Professor, Department
of English Literature, Birzeit
University

Directory of Participants

Sara Ababneh

ababnehs22@yahoo.com
Jordan
Birzeit University

Sarah Raouf Shaer

Alshaer.sarah@gmail.com
Dubai
Gender and Public Policy
Program
Mohammed bin Rashid School
of Government

Shaden Abu Harb

shadin_2000@yahoo.com
Palestine
Palestinian News Agency

Sawsan Adnan Samara

sawsans@gmail.com
Jordan

Souad Eddaouda

eddouada@yahoo.com
Morocco
Iben Tofail University in Kenitra

TRAINING TO ENGAGED TRANSFORMATIVE GENDER RESEARCH

September 27, 28, 29, 2015

Amman, Jordan

Participant Projects

Iman M.M. Salah

Ilham Makki Hammodi

Islamic Feminism – in Iraqi Society: Women between Hawza and Religious Parties

Kholoud Ahmed Alajarma

Women of Palestine: Resistance, Identity and Solidarity through Food Production

Manal Mahmoud Qaisi

The Effects of Care Programs for Battered Women in East Jerusalem from their Perspective

Mona Yahya Zaid

الرواية النسوية العربية سؤال الخصوصية وتحدي الاختلاف

Rania Jawad

Performing Gender Inequalities Onstage: The Politics of Western Funding and Cultural Production in the Colonized West Bank

Raouda Toufic El Guedri

La théorie féministe, le corps et l'identité des femmes

Rawan Wadi Ibrahim

How do Unwed Adolescent Mothers Navigate Reintegrating in the Jordanian and Patriarchal Society?

Dr. Saja Taha Al Zoubi

Assessing The Impact Of Training And Microfinance On Agricultural Productivity, Women Income And Decision Making

Samar Antoine Yaser

أثر اتفاقية أوسلو على مفهوم ثقافة المقاومة لدى الاسيرات السياسيات الفلسطينيات المحررات

Sara Ababneh

The Jordanian Popular Protest Movement: A Challenge to Commonly Held Truths about Identity, Gender and Economics in Jordan

Sarah Raouf Shaer

Nationalist Discourse and Negotiating Patriarchy in the UAE

Shaden Abu Harb

اثر الخطاب العالمي الليبرالي ما بعد اوسلو على اعادة تشكيل هوية

المرأة الفلسطينية بمخاطبة النزعة الاستهلاكية

Sawsan Adnan Samara

Are Educated Jordanian Women really interested in Seeking Political and Leadership Positions in the Jordanian Public Sector?

Souad Eddaouda

Women, The State and Grassroot Change in Morocco: Constraints, Opportunities and Prospects The Case of Soulaliyat Women in Kenitra Region

TRAINING TO ENGAGED TRANSFORMATIVE GENDER RESEARCH

September 27, 28, 29, 2015

Amman, Jordan

Proposal Writing Assignments

ASSIGNMENT 1: DUE February 20, 2015
1. Write the Statement of the Problem, the Hypothesis (Alternative hypothesis optional, but recommended).   Total length 1-2pp
2: Guidelines:
      a. Make sure to have a *genuine question*.
      b. Make sure the question asks about a *relationship* between variables.
      c. Your *point of departure* drives all components in the proposal.
      d. Make sure you clearly identify the value added
B. ASSIGNMENT 2: DUE March 6, 2015
1. Revise the Literature Review. Total 3pp
2. Guidelines:
      a. Make sure that you review the literature relevant to your point of departure
      b. Start with an overview of main schools of thought, methods, etc
      c. Review the approaches you are most critical of first and the ones you will build on last
      d. Summarize key points in an evaluative manner
      e. Review only those aspects that you will address in your research project
      f. Build the basis for your need (what is missing) as you write your literature review
      g. Build the basis for your value added (significance) as you write the literature review.
C. ASSIGNMENT 3: DUE MARCH 13, 2015
1. Revise the Need & Significance. Total 1-1.5 pages
2. Guidelines:
      a. Make sure the need emerges directly from your evaluation of what is missing in your literature review. Need is what you are doing that you say has not been done.
      b. Make sure the significance has a value added. What can we do as a result of your research that we could not do without the research. It is the deliverable.
      c. Make sure you go back and revise problem statement & hypothesis so they are all logically and necessarily connected to need and significance.
D. ASSIGNMENT 4: DUE March 26, 2015
1. Revise the Theory (Developing alternative hypothesis optional but recommended) Total length 3-4pp
2. Guidelines:
      a. Be clear about what the *key concepts* which drive your project.
      b. *Define* all key concepts and terms if you have not already done so.
      c. Be clear to state the *assumptions* underpinning the concepts.
      d. Make sure the *propositions* (hypothesis) are logically derived from concepts and assumptions.

E. ASSIGNMENT 5: DUE APRIL 16, 2015 Total length 2-3 pages.

1. Revise Method
2. Guidelines:
>   a. Identify clearly, each *step* you will take for data collection, explain all *instrument*s needed, identify all *sites to be visited*, and population sampling necessary to gather the evidence that you need to answer the question.
>   b. Operationalize concepts and terms so a data plan will produce evidence of the existence or processes of the concepts and terms; and instruments
>   c. Specify what data looks like; how will you recognize data when you see it.
>   d. Specify how you select your population, site.
>   e. Summarize the preliminary steps in gathering data.
>   f. Include examples of preliminary data in the report to the mentor.
>   g. Track record A: What you have already done on the project: preliminary results
>   h. Track record B: What qualifies you to do this research

F. ASSIGNMENT 6: DUE APRIL 30, 2015 Total Length 3pp
1. Preliminary Data Analysis
2. Guidelines
>   a. Summarize at length the data collected for each concept, process, and relationship in your hypothesis
>   b. Summarize at length the steps taken to analyze the data, to interpret the results.
>   c. Give preliminary evaluation of whether the data is supporting the hypothesis (or alternative hypothesis).

G. ASSIGNMENT 7: DUE MAY 14, 2015 Total Length 2 pp
1. Revise Budget
2. Guidelines:
>   a. Budget is driven by *method*s
>   b. Everything in budget must be explicitly developed in methods
>   c. Anticipate *all possible* costs.
>   d. Ask for *what is needed* for the project, not what you think you can get.
>   e. Write budget justification for any big ticket items.

H. ASSIGNMENT 8: DUE JUNE 4, 2015. Total Length 3-6pp
1. Revise Time Table, Abstract, CV, Bibliography
2. Guidelines:
>   a. Time table is driven by *methods*. Everything in timetable must be explicitly developed in methods.
>   b. Abstract needs to be succinct, accessible, and *dramatically attention-getting*
>   c. Do *maximal and targeted* CV.
>   d. Put only what you cite in bib; make sure *all critical sources* are cited.

I. ASSIGNMENT 9: DUE JUNE 25, 2015:
1. Submit final proposal Length 10pp typed single spaced.

TIPS FOR SUCCESSFUL PROPOSAL WRITING

Suad Joseph

University of California, Davis

The terminology used by funding agencies for the various components of a research proposal (and their sequence) varies. I have used fairly standard terminology. Almost every agency expects you to address the 10 questions below in some part of the proposal. You will change terms and sequencing to satisfy the requirements of the particular agency.

TEN QUESTIONS:
1. What = the research question (research problem).
2. Answer = hypothesis.
3. Why this is a plausible answer = theory.
4. How other scholars have answered the question = literature review.
5. Why other answers are inadequate = need.
6. Why answer this question = significance.
7. How to answer the question = methods.
8. How you know when you have answered = evaluation.
9. How much time you need to answer the question = time table.
10. How much it will cost to answer the question = budget.

TEN TIPS:
1. The question you want to answer is your research problem.
2. The answer to your research question is your hypothesis.
3. The set of logically connected assumptions that are necessary to make your answer to the question plausible is your theory.
4. How the research question has been answered before by others is your literature review. This is also the basis of the alternative hypothesis.
5. What is missing in how others have answered this question is your statement of need.
6. Why it is important to answer this question is your statement of significance.
7. The steps you will take to answer the question is your methodology.
8. How you will know that you have answered the question is your evaluation techniques.
9. How long it will take you to answer the question is your time table.
10. How much it will cost to answer the question is your budget.

SUMMARY: What is your question? What is your answer? How have others answered? Why is your answer better? Why do we need to do this research? What will we be able to do as a result of doing this research? How are you going to answer the question? How will you know you have answered the question? How long will it take? How much will it cost?

Revised April 2013

Proposal Writing Workshops

Suad Joseph

University of California, Davis

COMPONENTS OF A HUMANITIES/SOCIAL SCIENCES RESEARCH PROPOSAL

The basic components of research proposals are the same in humanities and social sciences. How they are phrased and staged varies by discipline and by funding agency. The questions posed below are required by most agencies in some form. If you answer the "maximal" components below, you should be able to write proposals for most funding agencies. The components may seem more "social science" than "humanities", but in fact, humanities funders ask the same questions, sometimes using different language. Decode the language for your discipline. Keep in mind, many agencies are interdisciplinary in their funding and have interdisciplinary review panels. Follow the guidelines of your funding agency, answer the questions the funder poses, and use the funder's language for the components described below.

I. Statement of the Problem (the questions you are trying to answer)

First paragraph or first page gives a brief summary of the whole project including:

A. Statement of Problem / Statement of Question / Statement of Project Objective

1. State objectives / what you intend to do / the questions you will answer

Every project seeks an answer to a question. The clearer the question, the more convincing the project

a. Analytical, problem solving, hypothesis testing

Ex: Test the hypothesis that the higher the level of education, the more positive are attitudes towards women's rights among men between 20-50 in Cairo, Egypt

Ex: Explain why the French Revolution limited democratization in municipal institutions (Ted Margadant* UCD History, by permission)

b. Descriptive

Ex: Identify the differences in representations of father/son and mother/son relations and in Naguib Mahfouz's Palace Walk

Ex: Compare the materialist orientations towards geography in the Roman Empire to the symbolic/metaphorical orientation towards geography by early Christian writers (Brenda Schildgen* UCD Comp. Lit. by permission)

2. Objectives should be:

a. specific, concrete [you & others can attain them and agree they have been attained]

b. researchable [Question can be answered in reasonable time with reasonable funds]

c. measurable [Specify the criteria by which you will know you have found what you are looking for. Humanities note: criteria may but need not numerical.]

3. Statement of objectives should be:

a. declarative (I will measure levels of education and attitudes towards women's rights among men... / I will identify the continuities and discontinuities in their representation of father/son and mother/son relations in Mahfouz's Palace Walk.

Not: If I get funds, I will...)

b. prioritized – listed in order of priority. If you have more than one objective, question to answer, the priority will determine the rest of the proposal. The review of literature, theoretical framework, hypothesis, methodology, reflect the same ordering

B. What you expect to find / answer to the question / results to be reached / hypothesis

1. Builds on respected theory / research

2. Offers plausible alternative to respected theory / research

3. Your point of departure needs to be utterly clear

Ex: your point of departure is: the impact of level of education on...

Ex: your point of departure is: what explains attitudes towards women's rights...

Ex: your point of departure is: describing how father/son vs. mother/son relations are represented.

Ex: your point of departure is: explaining why there are differences in representation of father/son vs. mother/son relations in Egyptian literary culture.

Ex: your point of departure is: explaining Mahfouz's relationship to his father vs. his mother (as a semi-autobiographical text).

Ex: your point of departure is: describing the gendering of representational forms.

Ex: your point of departure is: demonstrate that Christian geography was not anti-scientific

Ex: your point of departure is: shattering the illusion that geography is static & fixed

Ex: your point of departure is: analyzing social order through analysis of institutions and practices of criminal justice

Ex: your point of departure is: documenting the limits of revolutionary change

C. Other answers, Need, Theory, Significance, Site

Summary of state of the art, why research is needed, why your answer is better, why research is important, where it will be conducted

D. Summary of Proposal

One paragraph summary of question, answer, relevant literature, the need for this research; your theoretical framework, hypotheses; locale, population to be studied, research site; significance of the research.

II. Review of the Literature (how the questions have been answered before)

A. Summarize only the relevant research, key paradigms, models, theories, approaches

B. Identify the limitations of past research on the question

C. Specify the positive contributions of previous research on which you will build

D. Review should be synthesizing; show the themes in the literature; do not summarize at length any one piece unless it is the dominant paradigm; demonstrate control of scholarship; do not quote; be highly selective in references cited

III. Statement of Need (why answering these questions is important)

A. Build on limitations cited in literature review; indicate that your research will overcome those limitations.

Ex: There are contradictory explanations of "X" which you will resolve.

Ex: The methodologies for resolving "X" are inadequate; your research will produce a superior methodology

Ex: No research has been conducted on "X"– your research fills a significant gap in scientific knowledge.

Ex: No research has tested this explanation of "X". You will provide the test.

Ex: No research has observed these patterns, these representations, these relationships. You will describe, explore, analyze newly observed patterns, representations, relationships.

Ex: The previous research is excellent, foundational, you will refine, advance

IV. Statement of Significance of this Research (why the answers to the questions are important and therefore why proposal should be funded)

A. Demonstrate how this research goes beyond limitations of existing works

B. Should be a synthesis of problem statement and review of literature

C. Show significance of each item listed in objective and in that order

D. Significance can be advancing theory, offering application to critical social problems, filling a critical void in a field of knowledge, opening new ways of thinking about an area of investigation.

V. Theoretical Framework (why you answer the questions that way; justify your answer)

A. Clearly outline the theory, model, perspective, or conceptual framework from which you will generate the answer to the question (hypothesis for social scientists).

1. This should be written as your position.

2. Identify where you build on others and where you differ.

3. Define all terms necessary to the theoretical framework and the answer to the question (hypotheses). Definitions should allow you to operationalize the terms. This means that you establish the criteria (measurement) by which you know that you have found what you are looking for so that the research findings can be clearly recognized, identified, and evaluated to produce the answer. Measurement means you have clear criteria for knowing you have found what you think you have found.

B. Statement of Hypotheses (projected answers to the questions).

1. Hypothesis is a statement of a relationship between at least two variables. Variables are the different agents which are answered or help answer your question. The hypothesis indicates a process, change.

Ex: If "z" happens to 'Y' then "w" happens to "y"

Ex: As level of education increases among men between 25-50 in Cairo, a positive attitude towards women's rights increases.

2. Variables must be identifiable, operationalizable.

3. Change must be identifiable, measurable.

4. Hypothesis should be ordered in same sequence as objectives.

C. Optional: Statement of Alternative Hypotheses (the competing answers)

1. Research (science) never conclusively answers question; it only increases the probability of one answer by eliminating competing explanations.

2. Thus a hypothesis must be falsifiable.

3. State dominant alternative hypotheses concerning the relationship between the variables you are investigating (how others have answered the questions).

4. Order these in same sequence as objectives and hypotheses.

VI. Method/Design (how you will achieve objectives, answer the questions)

A. Specify research site.

1. Justify choice. Show how the "where/what" fits problem situation, maximizes possibility of controlling research information, allows you to answer the questions.

2. Show how all objectives of research can be met in the "where/what", in order of priority of objectives.

3. Review literature on that where/what – population, site, archives, texts…

4. Enumerate skills you have, information, contacts, experience in relationship to population/site that makes this a good choice.

a. Ex: language skill

b. Ex: have contacts with local government or university which you will gain your entry into the research site

c. Ex: have done research there before

B. Specify kinds of data / research information needed

1. Data should constitute information that will allow you to answer the questions.

2. Show that data / research information will answer all questions listed in problem

C. Methods

1. Techniques, instruments, data-gathering methods.

2. Ex: surveys, questionnaires, participant observation, content analysis, close reading, archival searches (discipline specific)

3. Explain how these techniques will produce information to answer questions

4. Indicate how techniques are related to questions and expected answers

5. Order in same sequence as objectives

D. Validity

1. Internal

a. Tests measure what they say they will measure

b. Ex: use pre-tests, post-tests, control groups, work of other researchers

2. External

a. Procedures can be repeated by your or others and produce the same results

b. Generalizable – can be applied to others situations with same conditions

E. Analysis of Data (using the research information to answer the questions)

1. Procedures that will be used to transform raw data into answers to the question.

2. Methods of reading / interpreting research information

3. Be specific. Show that procedures will produce answers to full lists of questions, objectives, hypotheses, from the raw data

VII. Time Table (how long it will take to achieve the objectives, answer the questions)

A. Anticipated schedule by days, weeks, months.

1. Include pre-research preparations if you want to be paid for it.

a. Ex: Language training

b. Ex: Archival work

2. Include consultation time.

3. Include time for data analysis.

B. Should parallel list of objectives and cover all objectives.

C. Be reasonable and precise.

VIII. Budget (how much it will cost to answer the questions)

A. List all personnel salaries, including yourself.

B. Include: equipment, computers, photo/video equipment, supplies, travel, training time,insurance, visas, per diem for special trips, medical supplies, fees to informants, gifts to informants or other research related personnel, car or other local transportation, permits and costs of gaining access to research facilities, research assistants/consultants, photocopying, later reproduction or dissemination costs, translation into local language, permits to use archives, purchase texts, indirect costs to university (varies by agency)

C. Consider inflation.

D. Justify budget in relation to method/design.

XI. Abstract

A. Brief statement of research question, objectives, answer, significance.

B. Short, powerful, attention-getting.

C. Usually repeats the first paragraph of Problem Statement

X. Vitae

A. Short, focus on the background and skills that qualify you to do this research.

B. Vitae of other personnel on the project.

XI. Bibliography

A. List only references sited.

B. Keep short, but complete. Include literature that one must know to do this project

TRAINING TO ENGAGED TRANSFORMATIVE GENDER RESEARCH

September 27, 28, 29, 2015

Amman, Jordan

Proposed Template: Video Interviews on Engaged Transformative Gender Research

Name:

Title:

Affiliation:

Where have you conducted research?

On which topics has your research focused?

Have you found research methods that have worked particularly well for engaging your community around gender research? Conversely, have you found any research methods to be problematic?

Are there any specific obstacles that you have encountered carrying out transformative engaged gender research? What would you recommend to avoid them? How did you overcome them?

Do you have a preferred method for engaging community members during the course of your research?

How have you disseminated your research?

What impact do you believe your research has had?

TRAINING TO ENGAGED TRANSFORMATIVE GENDER RESEARCH

September 27, 28, 29, 2015

Amman, Jordan

Reimbursement Forms

معلومات لوجستية للمشاركين/ات

الرجاء تعبئة هذا النموذج وتسليمه مع كافة الأوراق المطلوبة عند الساعة... صباحا من يوم .... الواقع في 201.... في باحة الفندق للمنسقة الإدارية السيدة هدى الياسى والأنسة نبيهه الجمل .

طلب تسديد مصاريف

الأسم:

الفعالية:

التاريخ: من ـــــــــــــــــــ **الى** ـــــــــــــــــــ ـــــــــــــــــــ

رقم الإيصال أو الفاتورة المرفقة	المبلغ بالعملة المحلية	المصدر	شرح المصاريف	التاريخ

التوقيع: ـــــــــــــــــــ

المرفقات:

o   **طلب التسديد مكتملاً (نموذج مرفق)**
o   **الفواتير والإيصالات الأصلية اللازمة**

TRAINING TO ENGAGED TRANSFORMATIVE GENDER RESEARCH

September 27, 28, 29, 2015

Amman, Jordan

Funding Agencies and Foundations

Egypt
The Arab Network for NGOs
http://www.shabakaegypt.org/english.php

Arab Organization for Human Rights
http://www.aohr.net/?p=1288

The Association for the Development and Enhancement of Women (ADEW)
http://www.adew.org/en/?action=&sub=1

CARE International in Egypt
http://www.care.org.eg/

Center for Egyptian Women's Legal Assistance (CEWLA)
http://www.cewla.org/index.php?lang=en

Egyptian Centre for Women's Rights (ECWR)
http://ecwronline.org/

The Egyptian Initiative for Personal Rights (EIPR)
http://eipr.org/en

The New Woman Foundation (NWF)
http://nwrcegypt.org/en/

The Egyptian Organization for Human Rights (EOHR)
http://en.eohr.org/about/

El Nadeem Center for Rehabilitation of Victims of Violence
https://alnadeem.org/ar/node/23

Plan Egypt
http://plan-international.org/where-we-work/africa/egypt

Unicef Egypt
http://www.unicef.org/egypt/

Women and Memory Forum
http://www.wmf.org.eg/

Lebanon
Bahithat- The Lebanese Association of Women Researchers
http://www.bahithat.org/

Collective for Research & Training on Development-Action (CRTD.A)
http://crtda.org.lb/

Foundation for Human and Humanitarian Rights (FHHRL)
http://www.fhhrl.org/

NGO Working Group (NGOWG)
http://womenpeacesecurity.org/

Lebanese Center for Human Rights (CLDH)
http://www.cldh-lebanon.org/

North America
Association for Middle East Women's Studies (AMEWS)
http://www.amews.org/site/

Palestine
Adalah
http://www.adalah.org/eng/index.php

ASALA -The Palestinian Businesswomen's Association
http://www.asala-pal.com/

Assiwar- The Feminist Arab Movement In Support Victims Of Sexual Abuse
http://www.assiwar.org/Association of Women Committees for Social Work (AWCSW)

Center for Women's Legal Research and Consulting (CWLRC)
http://www.cwlrc.ps/en/
Defense for Children International- Palestine Section (DCI- Palestine)
http://www.dci-palestine.org/

Filastiniyat
http://www.filastiniyat.org/

General Union of Palestinian Women (GUPW)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/General_Union_of_
Palestinian_Women

Kayan
http://www.kayan.org.il/

*Muntada - The Arab Forum for Sexuality, Education
and Health*
http://www.jensaneya.org/

*Palestinian Developmental Women's Studies
Association (PDWSA)*
http://www.pdwsa.ps/ar/index.php

*Palestinian Family Planning and Protection
Association (PFPPA)*
http://www.pfppa.org/

Palestine International Institute (PII)
http://www.pii-diaspora.org/

*Palestinian Non-Governmental Organizations'
Network*
http://www.pngo.net/

*Palestinian Women's Research and Documentation
Centre (PWRDC)*
http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-
human-sciences/themes/gender-equality/gender-
peace-and-conflict/pwrdc/

*Palestinian Working Woman Society for
Development (PWWSD)*
http://www.pwwsd.org/

*Palestinian Youth Association for Leadership and
Rights Activation (PYALARA)*
http://www.pyalara.org/about_us.php?lang=1

Sawa
http://www.sawa.ps/en/
Shashat
http://www.shashat.org/

Stars of Hope Society
http://www.starsofhope.org/

Union of Palestinian Women Committees (UPWC)
http://www.upwc.org.ps/

Women's Affairs Center
http://www.wac.org.ps/
Women's Affairs Technical Committee (WATC)
http://www.watcpal.org/

Women Against Violence
http://www.wavo.org/nv/en/

*Women's Centre for Legal Aid and Counseling
(WCLAC)*
http://www.wclac.org/

Women And Family Affairs Center (WAFAC)
wafsum@yahoo.com

Women and Horizons-Nissa wa Aafaq
http://www.wiser.org/organization/view/ae359
5c8a1aeda785c5b26de035fc99a

Women, Media & Development (TAM)
http://tam.ps/ar/

Tunisia
*Center of Arab Women for Training and Research
(CAWTAR)*
http://www.cawtar.org/

TRAINING TO ENGAGED TRANSFORMATIVE GENDER RESEARCH

September 27, 28, 29, 2015

Amman, Jordan

Bibliography

"Principles and Best Practices for Oral History." Oral History Association. N.p., Oct. 2009. Web. 28 Jan. 2015. <http://www.oralhistory.org/about/principles-and-practices/>.

Abu-Lughod, Lila. "Orientalism and Middle East Feminist Studies." Feminist Studies 27.1 (2001): 101-13. Feminist Studies, Inc. Web. <https://tavaana.org/sites/default/files/orientalism.pdf>.

Acker, Joan, Kate Berry, and Joke Esseveld. "Objectivity and Truth: Problems in Doing Feminist Research." Women's Studies International Forum 6.4 (1983): 423-35. ScienceDirect. Web. <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0277539583900353>.

Ackerly, Brooke, and Jacqui True. "Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations."International Studies Review 10.4 (2008): 693-707. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25482017>.

Ali, Alisha. "A Framework for Emancipatory Inquiry in Psychology: Lessons from Feminist Methodology." Race, Gender & Class 13.1/2 (2006): 26-35. JSTOR. Web. 1 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41675218>.

Alterman, Jon B. "Counting Nodes and Counting Noses: Understanding New Media in the Middle East." Middle East Journal 54.3 (2000): 355-61. JSTOR. Web. 3 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4329505>.

Amin, Nuzhat. "Chapter Nine: Voices of Minority Immigrant Women: Language, Race, and Anti-Racist Feminist Methodologies." Counterpoints 252 (2005): 183-204. JSTOR. Web. 1 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42978750>.

Anderson, Elizabeth. "Uses of Value Judgments in Science: A General Argument, with Lessons from a Case Study of Feminist Research on Divorce." Hypatia 19.1 (2004): 1-24. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3810929>.

Anderson, Emily E. "Views of Academic and Community Partners Regarding Participant Protections and Research Integrity: A Pilot Focus Group Study." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics 8.1 (2013): 20-31. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2013.8.1.20>.

Anderson, Emily E., Stephanie Solomon, Elizabeth Heitman, James M. DuBois, Celia B. Fisher, Rhonda G. Kost, Mary Ellen Lawless, Cornelia Ramsey, Bonnie Jones, Alice Ammerman, and Lainie Friedman Ross. "Research Ethics Education for Community-Engaged Research: A Review and Research

Agenda." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics 7.2 (2012): 3-19. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2012.7.2.3>.

"Bader, Russell; Revital Wanono, Sami Hamden and Harvey A. Skinner

Canadian Journal of Public Health / Revue Canadienne de Sante'e Publique

Vol. 98, No. 1 (JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2007), pp. 21-25"

Badran, Margot. "Between Secular and Islamic Feminism/s: Reflections on the Middle East and Beyond." Journal of Middle East Women's Studies 1.1 (2005): 6-28. JSTOR. Web. 3 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40326847>.

Beetham, Gwendolyn, and Justina Demetriades. "Feminist Research Methodologies and Development: Overview and Practical Application." Gender and Development 15.2 (2007): 199-216. JSTOR. Web. 3 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20461201>.

Beetham, Gwendoyln, and Justina Demetriades. "Feminist Research Methodologies and Development: Overview and Practical Application." Gender and Development 15.2 (2007): 199-216. JSTOR. Web. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20461201?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents>.

Bernick, Susan E. "Toward a Value-Laden Theory: Feminism and Social Science." Hypatia 6.2 (1991): 118-36. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3810099>

Bex Lempert, Lora. "Cross-Race, Cross-Culture, Cross-National, Cross-Class, but Same-Gender: Musings on Research in South Africa." NWSA Journal 19.2 (2007): 79-103. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40071206>.

Bizzell, Patricia. "Feminist Methods of Research in the History of Rhetoric: What Difference Do They Make?" Rhetoric Society Quarterly30.4 (2000): 5-17. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3886115>.

Blackman, Shane J. "'Hidden Ethnography': Crossing Emotional Borders in Qualitative Accounts of Young People's Lives."Sociology 41.4 (2007): 699-716. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42857032>.

Breese, Jeffrey R. "Sociology: A Community Engagement Discipline."Journal of Applied Social Science 5.1 (2011): 78-86. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23548947>.

Cancian, Francesca M. "Feminist Science: Methodologies That Challenge Inequality." Gender and Society 6.4 (1992): 623-42. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/189729>.

Caprioli, Mary. "Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology: A Critical Analysis." International Studies Review 6.2 (2004): 253-69. JSTOR. Web. 6 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3699593>.

Charles, Carolle. "Feminist Action and Research in Haiti." Carribbean Studies 28.1 (1995): 61-75. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25613293>

Charrad, Mounira M. "Gender in the Middle East: Islam, State, Agency." Annual Review of Sociology 37 (2011): 417-37. JSTOR. Web. 3 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41288615>.

Clark, Janine A. "Field Research Methods in the Middle East." PS: Political Science and Politics 39.3 (2006): 417-23. JSTOR. Web. 6 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20451776>.

Clarke, Kamari M. "Toward a Critically Engaged Ethnographic Practice." Current Anthropology51.S2 (2010): S301-312. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/653673>.

Cohen, Rachel Lara, Christina Hughes, and Richard Lampard. "The Methodological Impact for Feminism: A Troubling Issue for Sociology?" Sociology 45.4 (2011): 570-86. JSTOR. Web. 10 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42857555>.

Colon Warren, Alice E. "Puerto Rico: Feminism and Feminist Studies."Gender and Society 17.5 (2003): 664-90. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3594704>.

Cosgrove, Lisa. "Feminism, Postmodernism, and Psychological Research."Hypatia 18.3 (2003): 85-112. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3810865>.

Cotterill, Pamela, and Gayle Letherby. "Weaving Stories: Personal Auto/Biographies in Feminist Research." Sociology 27.1 (1993): 67-79. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42855041>

Da, Nan Z., and Wang Zheng. "Feminist Sinologies: An Introduction." Signs 40.3 (2015): 545-62. JSTOR. Web. 6 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/679610>.

Deare, Fredericka M. "Feminist Research and Action Methodology: The Experiences of the Caribbean Association for Feminist Research and Action." Caribbean Studies 28.1 (1995): 30-60. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25613292>.

Deem, Rosemary. "Talking to Manager - Academics: Methodological Dilemmas and Feminist Research Strategies." Sociology 36.4 (2002): 835-55. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42856469>.

Deem, Rosemary. "Talking to Manager- Academics: Methodological Dilemmas and Feminist Research Strategies." Sociology 36.4 (2002): 835-55. JSTOR. Web. 10 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42856469>.

Dolfsma, Wilfred, and Hella Hoppe. "On Feminist Economics." Feminist Review 75 (2003): 118-28. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1395865>.

Dushku, Silvana. "Conducting Individual and Focus Group Interviews in Research in Albania." TESOL Quarterly 34.4 (2000): 763-68.JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3587789>.

Dyrness, Andrea. "Research for Change versus Research as Change: Lessons from a 'Mujerista' Participatory Research Team."Anthropology & Education Quarterly 39.1 (2008): 23-44. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25166646>.

Eldridge, Laurie A. "Ruthe Blalock Jones: Native American Artist and Educator." Visual Arts Research 35.2 (2009): 72-85. JSTOR. Web. 3 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20715504>.

Ewick, Patricia. "Integrating Feminist Epistemologies in Undergraduate Research Methods." Gender and Society 8.1 (1994): 92-108.JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/190073>.

Figart, Deborah M. "Gender as More Than a Dummy Variable: Feminist Approaches to Discrimination." Review of Social Economy 63.3 (2005): 509-36. JSTOR. Web. 10 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29770334>.

Figart, Deborah M. "Gender as More Than a Dummy Variable: Feminist Approaches to Discrimination." Review of Social Economy 63.3 (20058): 509-36. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29770334>.

Finerman, Ruthbeth, Charles Williams, and Linda A. Bennett. "Health Disparities and Engaged Medical Anthropology In The United States Mid-South." Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development 39.3 (2010): 265-97.JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41291326>.

Fonow, Mary Margaret, and Judith A. Cook. "Feminist Methodology: New Applications in the Academy and Public Policy." Signs 30.4 (2005): 2211-236. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/428417>.

Friedman Ross, Lainie, Allan Loup, Robert M. Nelson, Jeffrey R. Botkin, Rhonda Kost, George R. Smith, Jr., and Sarah Gehlert. "Human Subjects Protections in Community-Engaged Research: A Research Ethics Framework." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics 5.1 (2010): 5-18. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2010.5.1.5>.

Friedman Ross, Lainie, Allan Loup, Robert M. Nelson, Jeffrey R. Botkin, Rhonda Kost, George R. Smith, Jr., and Sarah Gehlert. "Human Subjects Protections in Community-Engaged Research: A Research Ethics Framework." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics 5.1 (2010): 5-18. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2010.5.1.5>.

Friedman Ross, Lainie, Allan Loup, Robert M. Nelson, Rhonda Kost, George R. Smith, and Sarah Gehlert. "The Challenge of Collaboration for Academic and Community Partners in a Research Partnership: Points to Consider." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics 5.1 (2010): 19-32. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2010.5.1.19>.

Gilmore, Sarah, and Kate Kenny. "Work-worlds Colliding: Self-reflexivity, Power and Emotion in Organizational Ethnography." Human Relations 68.1 (2015): 55-78. Scopus. Web. 11 Mar. 2015. <http://hum.sagepub.com/cgi/content/long/68/1/55>.

Goss, Jon D., and Thomas R. Leinbach. "Focus Groups as Alternative Research Practice: Experience with Transmigrants in Indonesia."Area 28.2 (1996): 115-23. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20003647>.

Grasswick, Heidi E. "Scientific and Lay Communities: Earning Epistemic Trust through Knowledge Sharing." Synthese 177.3 (2010): 387-409. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40985710>.

Grauerholz, Liz, and Lori Baker-Sperry. "Feminist Research in the Public Domain: Risks and Recommendations." Gender and Society21.2 (2007): 272-94. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27640962>

Hale, Charles R. "Activist Research v. Cultural Critique: Indigenous Land Rights and the Contradictions of Politically Engaged Anthropology." Cultural Anthropology 21.1 (2006): 96-120. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3651549>.

Hankinson Nelson, Lynn. "A Question of Evidence." Hypatia 8.2 (1993): 172-89. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3810344>.

Harding, Sandra, and Kathryn Norberg. "New Feminist Approaches to Social Science Methodologies: An Introduction." Signs 30.4 (2005): 2009-015. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/428420>.

Harding, Sandra. "The Method Question." Hypatia 2.3 (1987): 19-35. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3810120>.

Harnois, Catherine E. "Different Paths to Different Feminisms? Bridging Multiracial Feminist Theory and Quantitative Sociological Gender Research." Gender and Society 19.6 (2005): 809-28. JSTOR. Web. 2 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27640852>.

Harvey, Graham. "Guesthood as Ethical Decolonising Research Method." Numen 50.2 (2003): 125-46. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3270516>.

Hasso, Frances S. "Problems and Promise in Middle East and North Africa Gender Research." Feminist Studies 31.3 (2005): 653-78.JSTOR. Web. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20459056?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents>.

Hasso, Frances S. "Problems and Promise in Middle East and North Africa Gender Research." Feminist Studies 31.3 (2005): 653-78.JSTOR. Web. 3 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20459056>.

Hemming, Peter J. "Mixing Qualitative Research Methods in Children's Geographies." Area 40.2 (2008): 152-62. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40346110>.

Hesse, Sharlene N. "An Invitation to Feminist Research." Feminist Research Practice: A Primer. By Abigail Brooks. 1st ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2007. 1-24. City of Education Foundation Online. Web.

<http://www.onlinecef.net/file.php/1/CEF_Resources/Research%20%20Method/12935_Chapter 1.pdf>

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene N. Feminist Research Practice: A Primer. 2nd ed. Boston College: Sage Publications, 2014.Occupytampa.org. Web. <http://occupytampa.org/files/tristan/fem/feminist.research.practice.pdf>.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene. "Feminist Research: Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method." N.p.: n.p., n.d. N. pag. The Handbook of Feminist Research. Sage Publications, Inc. Web. <http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/43563_1.pdf>.

Hochfeld, Tessa, and Shahana Rasool Bassadien. "Participation, Values, and Implementation: Three Research Challenges in Developing Gender-Sensitive Indicators." Gender and Development 15.2 (2007): 217-30. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20461202>.

Hopkins, Peter E. "Thinking Critically and Creatively about Focus Groups." Area 39.4 (2007): 528-35. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40346074>.

http://sjoseph.ucdavis.edu/training-to-transformative-gender-research/CFPOralHistoryinTimesofChange.pdf

http://www.strath.ac.uk/aer/materials/6furtherqualitativeresearchdesignandanalysis/unit4/definingfeministresearchreinharz/

Intemann, Kristen. "25 Years of Feminist Empiricism and Standpoint Theory: Where Are We Now?" Hypatia 25.4 (2010): 778-96. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40928656>

Jack, Jordynn. "Acts of Institution: Embodying Feminist Rhetorical Methodologies in Space and Time." Rhetoric Review 28.3 (2009): 285-303. JSTOR. Web. 1 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25655960>.

Jacobson, Nora, Rebecca Gewurtz, and Emma Haydon. "Ethical Review of Interpretive Research: Problems and Solutions." IRB: Ethics and Human Research 29.5 (2007): 1-8. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30033241>.

Jagosh, Justin, Ann C. Macaulay, Pierre Pluye, Jon Salsberg, Paula L. Bush, Jim Henderson, Erin Sirett, Geoff Wong, Margaret Cargo, Carol P. Herbert, Sarena D. Seifer, Lawrence W. Green, and Trisha Greenhalgh. "Uncovering the Benefits of Participatory Research: Implications of a Realist Review for Health Research and Practice." The Milbank Quarterly 90.2 (2012): 311-46. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23266513>.

Jamal, Amina. "Transnational Feminism as Critical Practice: A Reading of Feminist Discourses in Pakistan." Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism 5.2 (2005): 57-82. Project MUSE. Web. 11 Mar. 2015. <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/mer/summary/v005/5.2jamal.html>.

Keenan, Caroline. "Meeting Youth Where They Live: Participatory Approaches to Research With Marginalized Youth Engaged in Urban Agriculture." Children, Youth and Environments 17.3 (2007): 198-212. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7721/chilyoutenvi.17.3.0198>.

Kesby, Mike. "Participatory Diagramming: Deploying Qualitative Methods through an Action Research Epistemology." Area32.4 (2000): 423-35.JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20004104>

Kindon, Sara. "Participatory Video in Geographic Research: A Feminist Practice of Looking?" Area 35.2 (2003): 142-53. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20004304>.

Kingwell, Rosalie, and Sue Middleton. "Why Gender Research?" Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equality 12 (1992): 21-22.JSTOR. Web. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4065471?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents>.

Kitch, Sally L., and Mary Margaret Fonow. "Analyzing Women's Studies Dissertations: Methodologies, Epistemologies, and Field Formation." Signs 38.1 (2012): 99-126. JSTOR. Web. 1 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/665801>.

Kitzinger, Celia. "Developing Feminist Conversation Analysis: A Response to Wowk." Human Studies 31.2 (2008): 179-208.JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40270649>.

Kitzinger, Jenny. "Introducing Focus Groups." BMJ: British Medical Journal 311.7000 (1995): 299-302. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29728251>.

Knight, Michelle G. "Ethics in Qualitative Research: Multicultural Feminist Activist Research." Theory into Practice 39.3 (2000): 170-76.JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1477549>

Koro-Ljungberg, Mirka, Diane Yendol-Hoppey, Jason Jude Smith, and Sharon B. Hayes. "(E)pistemological Awareness, Instantiation of Methods, and Uninformed Methodological Ambiguity in Qualitative Research Projects." Educational Researcher38.9 (2009): 687-99. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25592192>.

Kourany, Janet A. "The Place of Standpoint Theory in Feminist Science Studies." Hypatia 24.4 (2009): 209-18. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20618191

Krishnaraj, Maithreyi. "Research in Women Studies: Need for a Critical Appraisal." Economic and Political Weekly 40.28 (2005): 3008-017. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4416870>.

Lather, Patti. "Critical Frames in Educational Research: Feminist and Post-Structuralist Perspectives." Theory into Practice 31.2 (1992): 87-99. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1476394>.

L'Eplattenier, Barbara E. "An Argument for Archival Research Methods: Thinking Beyond Methodology."
    College English 72.1 (2009): 67-79. JSTOR. Web. 10 Apr. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25653008>.

Letherby, Gayle, and Dawn Zdrodowski. ""Dear Researcher": The Use of Correspondence as a Method
    within Feminist Qualitative Research." Gender and Society 9.5 (1995): 576-93. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb.
    2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/189897>

Letherby, Gayle. "Quoting and Counting: An Autobiographical Response to Oakley." Sociology 38.1 (2004):
    175-89. JSTOR. Web. 10 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42856601>.

Lewis, Ann. "Group Child Interviews as a Research Tool." British Educational Research Journal 18.4 (1992):
    413-21. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1501300>.

Little, Jo, and Ruth Panelli. "Gender Research in Rural Geography." Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of
    Feminist Geography 10.3 (2003): 281-89. Taylor & Francis Online. Web.
    <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/0966369032000114046>.

Litton Fox, Greer, and Velma McBride Murry. "Gender and Families: Feminist Perspectives and Family
    Research." Journal of Marriage and Family 62.4 (2000): 1160-172. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1566729>.

Llewelyn, Sophie. "A Neutral Feminist Observer? Observation-Based Research and the Politics of Feminist
    Knowledge Making." Gender and Development 15.2 (2007): 299-310. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20461208>.

Luff, Donna. "Dialogue Across the Divides: 'Moments of Rapport' and Power in Feminist Research with Anti-
    Feminist Women."Sociology 33.4 (1999): 687-703. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42857994>.

Lynch, Cecelia. "Reflexivity in Research on Civil Society: Constructivist Perspectives." International Studies
    Review 10.4 (2008): 708-21. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25482018>.

Mason Sutherland, Christine. "Feminist Historiography: Research Methods in Rhetoric." Rhetoric Society
    Quarterly 32.1 (2002): 109-22. JSTOR. Web. 6 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3886309>.

Mauthner, Natasha S., and Andrea Doucet. "Reflexive Accounts and Accounts of Reflexivity in Qualitative
    Data Analysis."Sociology 37.3 (2003): 413-31. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42856540>.

McDowell, Linda. "Doing Gender: Feminism, Feminists and Research Methods in Human Geography."
    Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers 17.4 (1992): 399-416. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/622707>.

McGraw, Lori A., Anisa M. Zvonkovic, and Alexis J. Walker. "Studying Postmodern Families: A Feminist Analysis of Ethical Tensions in Work and Family Research." Journal of Marriage and Family 62.1 (2000): 68-77. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1566688>.

McKenna, Erin. "Pragmatism and Feminism: Engaged Philosophy."American Journal of Theology & Philosophy 24.1 (2003): 3-21. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27944271>.

McKenna, Yvonne. "Sisterhood? Exploring Power Relations in the Collection of Oral History." Oral History 31.1 (2003): 65-72. JSTOR. Web. 1 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40179737>.

McRobbie, Angela. "The Politics of Feminist Research: Between Talk, Text and Action." Feminist Review 12 (1982): 46-57. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1394881>

Meth, Paula. "Entries and Omissions: Using Solicited Diaries in Geographical Research." Area 35.2 (2003): 195-205. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20004309>.

Montell, Frances. "Focus Group Interviews: A New Feminist Method." NWSA Journal 11.1 (1999): 44-71. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4316628>.

Morgan, David L. "Focus Groups." Annual Review of Sociology 22 (1996): 129-52. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2083427>.

Mountz, Alison, and Margaret Walton-Roberts. "Gender, Geography and Policy: The Conundrums of Engagement." GeoJournal65.4 (2006): 263-73. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41148046>.

Mullins, Paul R. "Practicing Anthropology: Practicing Anthropology and the Politics of Engagements." American Anthropologist 113.2 (2011): 235-45. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41407426>.

Munday, Jennie. "Identity in Focus: The Use of Focus Groups to Study the Construction of Collective Identity." Sociology 40.1 (2006): 89-105. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42856823>.

Neitz, Mary Jo. "Introduction to the Special Issue: Sociology and Feminist Scholarship." The American Sociologist 20.1 (1989): 3-13.JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27698445>.

Oakley, Ann. "Gender, Methodology and People's Ways of Knowing: Some Problems with Feminism and the Paradigm Debate in Social Science." Sociology 32.4 (1998): 707-31. Population Studies Center. Institute for Social Research. Web. <http://personal.psc.isr.umich.edu/yuxie-web/files/pubs/Articles/Oakley1988.pdf>.

Oliver, Daniel G., Julianne M. Serovich, and Tina L. Mason. "Constraints and Opportunities with Interview Transcription: Towards Reflection in Qualitative Research." Social Forces 84.2 (2005): 1273-289. Project MUSE. Web. 11 Mar. 2015. <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/social_forces/v084/84.2oliver.pdf>.

O'Shaughnessy, Sara, and Naomi T. Krogman. "A Revolution Reconsidered? Examining the Practice of Qualitative Research in Feminist Scholarship." Signs 37.2 (2012): 493-520. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/661726>.

O'Shaughnessy, Sara, and Naomi T. Krogman. "A Revolution Reconsidered? Examining the Practice of Qualitative Research in Feminist Scholarship." Signs 37.2 (2012): 493-520. JSTOR. Web. 6 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/661726>.

Ozanne, Julie L., and Laurel Anderson. "Community Action Research." Journal of Public Policy & Marketing 29.1 (2010): 123-37. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20798402>.

Payne, Geoff, Malcolm Williams, and Suzanne Chamberlain. "Methodological Pluralism in British Sociology." Sociology 38.1 (2004): 153-63. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42856599>

Pearson, Cynthia R., Myra Parker, Celia B. Fisher, and Claudia Moreno. "Capacity Building from the Inside Out: Development and Evaluation of a CITI Ethics Certification Training Module for American Indian and Alaska Native Community Researchers." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics 9.1 (2014): 46-57. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2014.9.1.46>.

Perumal, Juliet, and Daisy Pillay. "The Bina Gumede Story: Exploring the Ethics of Researching the Other." Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equality 51 (2002): 92-100. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4548042>.

Pillow, Wanda. "Race-Based Methodologies: Multicultural Methods or Epistemological Shifts?" Counterpoints 195 (2003): 181-202. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42978086>.

Porter, Elaine, Sheila M. Neysmith, Marge Reitsma-Street, and Stephanie Baker Collins. "Reciprocal Peer Interviewing." International Review of Qualitative Research 2.2 (2009): 291-312. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/irqr.2009.2.2.291>.

Presser, Lois. "Negotiating Power and Narrative in Research: Implications for Feminist Methodology." Signs 30.4 (2005): 2067-090. JSTOR. Web. 1 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/428424>.

Pryse, Marjorie. "Trans/Feminist Methodology: Bridges to Interdisciplinary Thinking." NWSA Journal 12.2 (2000): 105-18. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4316739>.

Rattine-Flaherty, Elizabeth, and Arvind Singhal. "Analyzing Social-Change Practice in the Peruvian Amazon through a Feminist Reading of Participatory Communication Research." Development in Practice 19.6 (2009): 726-36. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27752113>.

Risman, Barbara J. "Methodological Implications of Feminist Scholarship." The American Sociologist 24.3/4 (1993): 15-25. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27698660>.

Romano, David. "Conducting Research in the Middle East's Conflict Zones." PS: Political Science and Politics 39.3 (2006): 439-41. JSTOR. Web. 6 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20451780>.

Ropers-Huilman, Rebecca, and Kelly T. Winters. "Feminist Research in Higher Education." The Journal of Higher Education 82.6 (2011): 667-90. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41337166>.

Ropers-Huilman, Rebecca, and Kelly T. Winters. "Feminist Research in Higher Education." The Journal of Higher Education 82.6 (2011): 667-90. JSTOR. Web. 6 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41337166>.

Saarinen, Aino. "Feminist Research: In Search of a New Paradigm?" Acta Sociologica 21.1 (1988): 35-51. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4200683>.

Sampson, Helen, Michael Bloor, and Ben Fincham. "A Price Worth Paying? Considering the 'Cost' of Reflexive Research Methods and the Influence of Feminist Ways of 'Doing'" Sociology 42.5 (2008): 919-33. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42857196>

Sampson, Helen, Michael Bloor, and Ben Fincham. "A Price Worth Paying? Considering the 'Cost' of Reflexive Research Methods and the Influence of Feminist Ways of 'Doing'"Sociology 42.5 (2008): 919-33. JSTOR. Web. 10 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42857196>.

Sayigh, Rosemary. "Oral History, Colonist Dispossession, and the State: The Palestinian Case." Taylor & Francis Online (2014): n. pag. Web. <http://www.tandfonline.com/eprint/X54XZn6Z7fU3t6kByrp5/full#.VLbpgSvF9KJ>

Scott, Ellen, and Bindi Shah. "Future Projects/Future Theorizing in Feminist Field Research Methods: Commentary on Panel Discussion."Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies 13.3 (1993): 901-103. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3346745>

Secor-Turner, Molly, Renee Sieving, Ann Garwick, Richard Spratt, and Naomi Duke. "Culturally Sensitive Community Engaged Research With African American Young Women: Lessons Learned." Journal of Community Health Nursing 27.3 (2010): 160-72. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20750838>.

Shore, Nancy. "Community-Based Participatory Research and the Ethics Review Process." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics 2.1 (2007): 31-41. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2007.2.1.31>.

Sieber, Joan E. "Introduction: Points to Consider in Community-Engaged Research." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics 5.1 (2010): 3-4. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2010.5.1.3>.

Silka, Linda, G. Dean Cleghorn, Milagro Grullon, and Trinidad Tellez. "Creating Community-Based Participatory Research in a Diverse Community: A Case Study." Journal of Empirical Research on

Human Research Ethics 3.2 (2008): 5-16.JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2008.3.2.5>.

Skalli, Loubna H. "Communicating Gender in the Public Sphere: Women and Information Technologies in
    the Mena." Journal of Middle East Women's Studies 2.2 (2006): 35-59. JSTOR. Web. 6 Apr. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/MEW.2006.2.2.35>.

Small, Stephen A. "Action-Oriented Research: Models and Methods." Journal of Marriage and Family 57.4
    (1995): 941-55. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/353414>.

Small, Stephen A., and Lynet Uttal. "Action-Oriented Research: Strategies for Engaged Scholarship."Journal
    of Marriage and Family 67.4 (2005): 936-48. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3600248>.

Smith, Valerie J. "Ethical and Effective Ethnographic Research Methods: A Case Study with Afghan Refugees
    in California." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics 4.3 (2009): 59-72. JSTOR.
    Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2009.4.3.59>.

Speed, Shannon. "At the Crossroads of Human Rights and Anthropology: Toward a Critically Engaged
    Activist Research." American Anthropologist108.1 (2006): 66-76. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3804732>.

Spencer-Wood, Suzanne M. "What Difference Does Feminist Theory Make?" International Journal of
    Historical Archaeology 5.1 (2001): 97-114. JSTOR. Web. 10 Apr. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20852967>.

Spongberg, Mary. "Feminist Publishing in a Cold Climate?: "Australian Feminist Studies" and the New Era of
    Research." Feminist Review95 (2010): 99-110. JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40928114>

Stycos, J. Mayone. "A Critique of Focus Group and Survey Research: The Machsimo Case." Studies in Family
    Planning 12.12 (1981): 450-56. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1965657>.

Suleiman, Yasir, and Paul Anderson. "'Conducting Fieldwork in the Middle East': Report of a Workshop Held
    at the University of Edinburgh on 12 February 2007." British Journal of Middle Eastern Studies 35.2
    (2008): 151-71. JSTOR. Web. 3 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20455582>.

Susser, Ida. "The Anthropologist as Social Critic: Working toward a More Engaged Anthropology." Current
    Anthropology 51.S2 (2010): S227-233. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015.
    <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/653127>.

Sutherland, Christine M. "Feminist Historiography: Research Methods in Rhetoric." Rhetoric Society
    Quarterly 32.1 (2002): 109-22.JSTOR. Web. 4 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3886309>

Swigonski, Mary E. "The Logic of Feminist Standpoint Theory for Social Work Research." Social Work 39.4 (1994): 387-93. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23717049>.

Tasker, Elizabeth, and Frances B. Holt-Underwood. "Feminist Research Methodologies in Historic Rhetoric and Composition: An Overview of Scholarship from the 1970s to the Present." Rhetoric Review 27.1 (2008): 54-71. JSOTR. Taylor & Francis, Ltd. Web. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20176823>.

Tasker, Elizabeth, and Frances B. Holt-Underwood. "Feminist Research Methodologies in Historic Rhetoric and Composition: An Overview of Scholarship from the 1970s to the Present." Rhetoric Review 27.1 (2008): 54-71. JSTOR. Web. 6 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20176823>.

Thompson Tetreault, Mary Kay. "Feminist Phase Theory: An Experience-Derived Evaluation Model." The Journal of Higher Education56.4 (1985): 363-384. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1981301>

Thompson, Linda. "Feminist Methodology for Family Studies." Journal of Marriage and Family 54.1 (1992): 3-18. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/353271>.

Tickner, J. A. "What Is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions."International Studies Quarterly 49.1 (2005): 1-21. JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3693622>.

Tobias, Joshua K., Chantelle A.M. Richmond, and Isaac Luginaah. "Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) with Indigenous Communities: Producing Respectful and Reciprocal Research." Journal of Empirical Research on Human Research Ethics 8.2 (2013): 129-40.JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jer.2013.8.2.129>.

Tobin, Theresa W. "Globalizing Feminist Methodology: Building on Schwartzman's 'Challenging Liberalism'" Hypatia 24.4 (2009): 145-64. JSTOR. Web. 1 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20618185>.

Townsend-Bell, Erica. "Being True and Being You: Race, Gender, Class, and the Fieldwork Experience." PS: Political Science and Politics 42.2 (2009): 311-14. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40647532>.

Truesdell, Barbara. "Oral History Techniques: How to Organize and Conduct Oral History Interviews." Center for the Study of History and Memory. Indiana University, n.d. Web. 28 Jan. 2015. <http://www.indiana.edu/~cshm/oral_history_techniques.pdf>.

Tupuola, Anne-Marie. "Participation Research, Culture and Youth Identities: An Exploration of Indigenous, Cross-Cultural and Trans-National Methods." Children, Youth and Environments 16.2 (2006): 291-316.JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7721/chilyoutenvi.16.2.0291>.

Upadhya, Carol. "Ethnographies of the Global Information Economy: Research Strategies and Methods." Economic and Political Weekly43.17 (2008): 64-72. JSTOR. Web. 27 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40277392>.

Van Loon, Antonia M. "Feminist Research." Nursing Research: Designs and Methods. By Debbie Kralik. Edinburgh: Elsevier, 2008. 35-43. Elsevier Health. Web. <https://www.elsevierhealth.co.uk/media/us/samplechapters/9780443102776/9780443102776.pdf>

Wadsworth, Yoland, and Kaye Hargreaves. "What Is Feminist Research?" (1991): n. pag. Action Research Issues Association (Incorporated). Web. <http://ggsc.wnmu.edu/gap/wadsworth.htm>.

Weasel, Lisa H. "Conducting Research from the Ground Up: Using Feminist Participatory Methodologies to Inform the Natural Sciences."International Review of Qualitative Research 4.4 (2011): 417-29. JSTOR. Web. 4 Mar. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/irqr.2011.4.4.417>.

Westmarland, Nicole. "The Quantitative/Qualitative Debate and Feminist Research: A Subjective View of Objectivity." Forum: Qualitative Social Research 2.1 (2001): n. pag. Institute for Qualitative Research. Web. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/974/2124>

Widerberg, Karin. "In the Homes of Others: Exploring New Sites and Methods When Investigating the Doings of Gender, Class and Ethnicity." Sociology 44.6 (2010): 1181-196.JSTOR. Web. 10 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42857498>.

Wilson, Valerie. "Focus Groups: A Useful Qualitative Method for Educational Research?" British Educational Research Journal 23.2 (1997): 209-24. JSTOR. Web. 11 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1501811>.

Wright, Cecile Y., Natalie Darko, P.J. Standen, and Tina G. Patel. "Visual Research Methods: Using Cameras to Empower Socially Excluded Black Youth." Sociology 44.3 (2010): 541-58. JSTOR. Web. 20 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42857419>.

Wu, Hui. "Historical Studies of Rhetorical Women Here and There: Methodological Challenges to Dominant Interpretive Frameworks."Rhetoric Society Quarterly 32.1 (2002): 81-97. JSTOR. Web. 3 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3886307>.

Wylie, Alison. "Doing Archaeology as a Feminist: Introduction." Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory 14.3 (2007): 209-16.JSTOR. Web. 9 Feb. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25702341>.

Zobl, Elke. "Cultural Production, Transnational Networking, and Critical Reflection in Feminist Zines." Signs 35.1 (2009): 1-12. JSTOR. Web. 6 Apr. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/599256>.

TRAINING TO ENGAGED TRANSFORMATIVE GENDER RESEARCH

September 27, 28, 29, 2015

Amman, Jordan

Video Links

Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie: The Danger of a Single Story
http://www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story?language=en

Dorothy Smith: The Politics & Practice of Feminist Research
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EsJaiz3_PoI

Femininst Psychologists Talk About…Research Methods
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fm14F3vabhw

Fundamentals of Qualitative Research Methods: What is Qualitative Research (Module 1)
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wbdN_sLWl88&list=PLqHnHG5X2PXCsCMyN3_EzugAF7GKN2poQ

Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber on Feminist Research: Parts 1 & 2
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xGtF_C_r1HE
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-Mq0koyZsAw

Performing Feminist Poststructural Research by Patti Lather
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YMUOOGYsCrU

1

FEMINIST RESEARCH

Exploring, Interrogating, and Transforming the Interconnections of Epistemology, Methodology, and Method

SHARLENE NAGY HESSE-BIBER

FEMINIST VOICES AND VISIONS ACROSS THE CENTURIES

This *Handbook* begins with voices, visions, and experiences of feminist activists, scholars, and researchers, speaking to us across the decades of the 19th, 20th, and 21st centuries. They provide a legacy of feminist research, praxis, and activism. There lies within these voices a feminist consciousness that opens up intellectual and emotional spaces for all women to articulate their relations to one another and the wider society—spaces where the personal transforms into the political.

> I do earnestly desire to arouse the women of the North to a realizing sense of the condition of two millions of women at the South, still in bondage, suffering what I suffered, and most of them far worse. I want to add my testimony to that of abler pens to convince the people of the Free States what Slavery really is. Only by experience can anyone realize how deep, and dark, and foul is that pit of abominations. May the blessing of God rest on this imperfect effort in behalf of my persecuted people! (Harriet Jacobs, 1861/1987, pp. 1–2)

Harriet Jacobs calls for the alignment of women across their racial, class, and geographical differences to fight the abomination of slavery. Through her words, Jacobs demonstrates how the concrete lived experience is a key place from which to build knowledge and foment social change.

> It was thus that I found myself walking with extreme rapidity across a grass plot. Instantly a man's figure rose to intercept me. Nor did I at first

understand that the gesticulations of a curious-looking object, in a cut-away coat and evening shirt, were aimed at me. His face expressed horror and indignation. Instinct rather than reason came to my help: he was a Beadle; I was a woman. Thus was the turf; there was the path. Only the Fellows and Scholars are allowed here; the gravel is the place for me. (Virginia Woolf, 1929, p. 258)

Thus humanity is male and man defines woman not in herself but as relative to him; she is not regarded as an autonomous being. . . . For him she is sex—absolute sex, no less. She is defined and differentiated with reference to man and not he with reference to her; she is the incidental, the inessential as opposed to the essential. He is the Subject, he is the Absolute—she is the Other. (Simone de Beauvoir, 1952, pp. xviii, xxiii)

The problem lay buried, unspoken, for many years in the minds of American women. It was a strange stirring, a sense of dissatisfaction, a yearning that women suffered in the middle of the twentieth century in the United States. Each suburban wife struggled with it alone. . . . she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question—"Is this all?" For over fifteen years there was no word of this yearning in the millions of words written about women, for women, in all the columns, books, and articles by experts telling women their role was to seek fulfillment as wives and mothers. . . . We can no longer ignore within women that voice that says: "I want something more than my husband and my children and my home." (Betty Friedan, 1963, pp. 15, 32)

Virginia Woolf, Simone de Beauvoir, and Betty Friedan, speaking many decades later, express their deep feelings of exclusion from the dominant avenues of knowledge building, seeing their own experiences, concerns, and worth diminished and invalidated by the dominant powers of their society.

In some ways, the origins of feminist research's epistemological and methodological focus draws on these insights and struggles; feminist empiricism, standpoint theories, postmodernism, and transnational perspectives all recognize the importance of women's lived experiences to the goal of unearthing subjugated knowledge. Each perspective forges links between feminism, activism, and the academy and women's everyday lives.

Women [were] largely excluded from the work of producing the forms of thought and the images and symbols in which thought is expressed and ordered. . . . The circle of men whose writing and talk was significant to each other extends backwards in time as far as our records reach. What men were doing was relevant to men, was written by men about men for men. Men listened . . . to what one another said. (Dorothy Smith, 1978, p. 281)

Feminist perspectives also carry messages of empowerment that challenge the encircling of knowledge claims by those who occupy privileged positions. Feminist thinking and practice require taking steps from the "margins to the center" while eliminating boundaries that privilege dominant forms of knowledge building, boundaries that mark who can be a knower and what can be known. For Virginia Woolf, it is the demarcation between the "turf" and the "path"; for Simone de Beauvoir, it is the line between the "inessential" and the "essential"; and for Dorothy Smith, it is the path that encircles dominant knowledge, where women's lived experiences lie outside its circumference or huddled at the margins.

Working right at the limits of several categories and approaches means that one is neither entirely inside or outside. One has to push one's work as far as one can go: to the borderlines, where one never stops, walking on the edges, incurring constantly the risk of falling off one side or the other side of the limit while undoing, redoing, modifying this limit. (Trinh T. Minh-ha, 1991, p. 218)

To engage in feminist theory and praxis means to challenge knowledge that excludes, while seeming to include—assuming that when we speak of the generic term *men*, we also mean women, as though what is true for dominant groups must also be true for women and other oppressed groups. Feminists ask "new" questions that place women's lives and those of "other" marginalized groups at the center of social inquiry. Feminist research *disrupts* traditional ways of knowing to create rich new meanings, a process that Trinh (1991) terms becoming "both/and"—insider and outsider—taking on a multitude of different standpoints and negotiating these identities simultaneously.

The history of research from many indigenous perspectives is so deeply embedded in colonization that it has been regarded as a tool only of colonization and not as a potential tool for self-determination and development. For indigenous peoples, research has a significance that is embedded in our history as natives under the gaze of Western science and colonialism. (Linda Tuhiwai Smith, 2005, p. 87)

Feminists bob and weave their threads of understanding, listening to the experiences of "the other/s" as legitimate knowledge. Feminist research is mindful of hierarchies of power and authority in the research process, hierarchies that are so well described by Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2005), including those power differentials that lie within research practices that can reinforce the status quo, creating divisions between colonizer and colonized.

I continue to be amazed that there is so much feminist writing produced and yet so little feminist theory that strives to speak to women, men and children about ways we might transform our lives via a conversion to feminist practice. (bell hooks, 1994, pp. 70–71)

Advocating the mere tolerance of difference between women is the grossest reformism. It is a total denial of the creative function of difference in our lives. Difference must be not merely tolerated, but seen as a fund of necessary polarities between which our creativity can spark like a dialectic. Only then does the necessity for interdependency become unthreatening. Only within that interdependency of different strengths, acknowledged and equal, can the power to seek new ways of being in the world generate, as well as the courage and sustenance to act where there are no charters. (Audre Lorde, 1996, p. 159)

The quotations used in this chapter contain a quality of agency that challenges dominant discourses of knowledge building, urging women to live and invite in differences, to embrace the creativity and knowledge building that lies within the tensions of difference. Difference matters. Author bell hooks (1994) implores feminists to root their scholarship in "transformative politics and practice," pointing out that

"in this capitalist culture, feminism and feminist theory are fast becoming a commodity that only the privileged can afford" (p. 71). Audre Lorde (1996) provides a path to empowerment by urging an embrace of difference through an "interdependency of different strengths, acknowledged and equal" (p. 159).

The tensions between opposing theories and political stances vitalize the feminist dialogue. But it may only be combined with respect, partial understanding, love, and friendship that keeps us together in the long run. So mujeres think about the carnalas you want to be in your space, those whose spaces you want to have overlapping yours. (Gloria Anzaldúa, 1990, p. 229)

Indeed, it is our acknowledgment and appreciation of difference that sustains our ability to navigate uncharted terrain toward meaningful social change. Gloria Anzaldúa (1990) employs a "sandbar" metaphor to capture traversals of the difference divide:

Being a sandbar means getting a breather from being a perpetual bridge without having to withdraw completely. The high tides and low tides of your life are factors which help decide whether or where you're a sandbar today, tomorrow. . . . A sandbar is more fluid and shifts locations, allowing for more mobility and more freedom. Of course there are sandbars called shoals, where boats run amuck. (p. 224)

Although Anzaldúa now envisions herself turning into a sandbar, her own stance on difference fluctuates between a "persistent ridge," a "drawbridge," or even "an island." For Anzaldúa (1990), traversing the difference divide becomes a process—with its own range of connections and disconnections as "each option comes with its own dangers" (p. 224).

Feminist research shares some common angles of vision that are "connected in principle to feminist struggle" (Joey Sprague & Mark Zimmerman, 1993, p. 266), often with the intent to change the basic structures of oppression. But there is no single feminist epistemology or methodology. Instead, multiple feminist lenses wake us up to layers of sexist, racist, homophobic, and colonialist points of view. Some lenses provide radical

insights into knowledge building that upend traditional epistemologies and methodologies, offering more complex understandings and solutions toward reclaiming subjugated knowledge.

Feminists engage both the theory and practice of research—beginning with the formulation of the research question and ending with the reporting of research findings. Feminist research encompasses the full range of knowledge building that includes epistemology, methodology, and method. An *epistemology* is "a theory of knowledge" (Sandra Harding, 1987b, p. 3) that delineates a set of assumptions about the social world—who can be a knower and what can be known. These assumptions influence the decisions a researcher makes, including what to study (based on what *can* be studied) and how to conduct a study. A *methodology* is "a theory of how research is done or should proceed" (p. 3). A *method* is "a technique for (or way of proceeding in) gathering evidence" (p. 2). Very often, the term *method* is used as an umbrella term to refer to these three different components of the research process, which can make the use of the term somewhat confusing.

Feminist research takes many twists and turns as a mode of social inquiry. In this introduction, we provide a brief overview of some of the "critical moments" in the legacy of feminist theory and praxis. We take up the dialogues surrounding issues of epistemology, methodology, and method. Feminist research begins with questioning and critiquing androcentric bias within the disciplines, challenging traditional researchers to include gender as a category of analysis. Subsequently, through this shift in perspective, we can observe the beginnings of an overall challenge to the scientific method itself and the emergence of new paradigms of thinking about basic foundational questions: What is Truth? Who can be a knower? What can be known?

FEMINIST RESEARCHERS CHALLENGE ANDROCENTRIC BIAS ACROSS THE DISCIPLINES

In the 1960s through to the 1980s, feminist scholars and researchers called attention to examples of androcentric bias within the sciences

and social sciences. These feminist scholars and researchers, known as feminist empiricists, embarked on projects to "correct" these biases by adding women into research samples and asking new questions that enabled women's experiences and perspectives to gain a hearing. Margrit Eichler and Jeanne Lapointe's (1985) research primer, *On the Treatment of the Sexes in Research*, provides a critique of empirical research as well as a checklist for the inclusion of gender as a category of analysis in social research. Their work provides many important nuggets of advice concerning what *not* to do (p. 9). These include the following:

- Treating Western sex roles as universal
- Transforming statistical differences into innate differences
- Translating difference as inferiority

Feminist empiricist researchers did much to "deconstruct" what they perceived as errors, or examples of androcentrism, across a range of academic disciplines and professional fields. Feminist empiricists' insights into androcentrism, and their goal of eradicating sexist research, cascaded across the disciplines of psychology, philosophy, history, sociology, education, and anthropology, as well as the fields of law, medicine, language, and communication. The 1970s and 1980s saw the publication of many groundbreaking anthologies critical of androcentric research. In 1975, Marcia Millman and Rosabeth Moss Kanter coedited the volume *Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science*. In their editorial introduction, they compare traditional knowledge building with the story of "The Emperor's New Clothes." They note,

Everyone knows the story about the Emperor and his fine clothes; although the townspeople persuaded themselves that the Emperor was elegantly costumed, a child, possessing an unspoiled vision, showed the citizenry that the Emperor was really naked. . . . The story also reminds us that collective delusions can be undone by introducing fresh perspectives. (p. vii)

Sociologists Millman and Kanter (1975) criticize the androcentric bias of sociology by

noting how sociology uses certain "field-defining models" that prevent the asking of new questions. They note, for example, that the Weberian concept of rationality, used to understand an individual's motivations and social organization, "defines out of existence, from the start, the equally important element of emotion in social life and structure" (p. ix). Their edited volume presents a range of new feminist perspectives on the social reality to "reassess the basic theories, paradigms, substantive concerns, and methodologies of sociology and the social sciences to see what changes are needed to make social theory and research reflect the multitude of both female and male realities and interests" (p. viii). The works in this volume also point out how sociology emphasizes the "public sphere" of society and "leaves out the private, supportive, informal, local social structures in which women participate most frequently" (p. xi). A stark example of this comes from a research article in their volume by Arlie Hochschild (1975), "The Sociology of Feeling and Emotion: Selected Possibilities." Hochschild demonstrates how the frequency of specific emotions is not distributed evenly across social structures. She explores the gendered, raced, and classed aspects of emotional expression. She notes, for example, that anger tends to flow down the social structure, while love flows up the social hierarchy. In effect, those at the bottom of the social ladder become "the complaint clerks of society, and . . . for the dwellers at the top, the world is more often experienced as a benign place" (p. 296). She notes in particular the role of gender in emotional expression whereby women "receive not only their husband's frustration displaced from the office to home, but also the anger of other women who are dissimilarly displaced upon" (p. 296). In a later work, Hochschild (1983), a prime mover in establishing the field known as "the sociology of emotions," demonstrates how emotions are often co-opted for commercial benefit. For example, those women employed in female-dominated clerical, service, and sales occupations often find that "emotional work" is a part of their job in addition to their more formal job description. They are expected to keep things functioning smoothly by managing the emotional climate at work—by smiling and comporting an upbeat and friendly demeanor.

Dale Spender's (1981) anthology *Men's Studies Modified: The Impact of Feminism on the Academic Disciplines* focuses on gender and knowledge building across the disciplines. Spender notes,

> Most of the knowledge produced in our society has been produced by men. . . . They have created men's studies (the academic curriculum), for, by not acknowledging that they are presenting only the explanation of men, they have "passed off" this knowledge as human knowledge. (p. 1)

In writing this volume, Spender hoped to draw attention to cutting-edge research across the disciplines that began to "alter the power configurations in the construction of knowledge in society" (p. 8).

Many anthologies quickly followed, including Sandra Harding's (1987a) edited volume, *Feminism and Methodology*. In the preface to this volume, Harding raises a central issue, namely, "Is there a unique feminist method of inquiry?" She suggests that at the heart of feminist inquiry are the emergent questions and issues that feminists raise about the social reality and the practices of traditional research. She asserts,

> A closer examination of the full range of feminist social analyses reveals that often it is not exactly alternative methods that are responsible for what is significant about this research. Instead, we can see in this work alternative origins of problematics, explanatory hypotheses and evidence, alternative purposes of inquiry, and a new prescription for the appropriate relationship between the inquirer and his/her subject of inquiry. (p. vii)

If we look inside Harding's volume, we find several articles that interrogate the relationship between gender and the social sciences. Carolyn Wood Sherif's (1987) article calls attention to androcentric research being conducted in the field of psychology. Sherif begins her analysis of bias by quoting Naomi Weisstein's thesis of the 1960s that "psychology has nothing to say about what women are really like, what they need and what they want, essentially because psychology does not know" (p. 38). In seeking to raise the status of their discipline, psychologists began to emulate the theories and practices of the more prestigious hard sciences. This

reliance on biological and physical science models of inquiry invariably led to biased theories about women and gender. Bonnie Thornton Dill's (1987) article in this same volume points to the tendency of researchers, including some feminist researchers, to generalize women's social situation, leaving out differences of race, class, and cultural context. She uses the example of "femininity" and explains how the concept has been dominated by images of white middle- and upper-middle-class conceptions of womanhood. She provides alternative frameworks for analyzing the concept by taking women's race, class, and cultural context-bound differences into account. Joan Kelly-Gadol's (1987) article in Harding's edited volume provides a critique of the androcentrism of historical method by illustrating the myriad ways in which feminist research questions historical work. Kelly-Gadol focuses on historians' use of field-defining concepts such as "periodization," a particular set of events historians chose to focus on (usually those activities men were engaged in, such as diplomatic and constitutional history, as well as political, economic, and cultural history). She troubles the concept of periodization by including gender as a category of analysis that opens the possibility of asking new questions: Was the period called *the Renaissance* beneficial for women? Although the Renaissance brought dramatic changes in social and cultural life that benefited many men, a growing division between private and public life meant that most women, even those of the upper class, experienced increasing segregation from men and a loss of power and freedom in the public sphere. Kelly-Gadol's vision of including women in history challenges the fundamental way historians visualize historical periods. In addition, our understanding of social change also shifts when we conceive of women as *agents* of historical change. Kelly-Gadol does not include a specific discussion of other differences such as race, class, and sexual preference in her vision of historical method. However, by decentering white male concerns and activities as the central focal point of historical inquiry and by making sex a category fundamental to historical analysis, she (and others) paved the way for alternative viewpoints to reconfigure the historical landscape. Including sex as a category of analysis also provides historians with a more complex understanding of history's influence on both sexes.

Nancy Tuana's edited volume *Feminism & Science* (1989a) contains a range of readings that critique the gendered nature of the sciences. In the preface to her volume, Tuana notes, "Although feminists were not the first to reject the traditional image of science, we were the first to carefully explore the myriad ways in which sexist biases affected the nature and practice of science" (p. xi). Nancy Tuana's own research article in this volume reveals the extent to which "scientists work within and through the worldview of their time" (1989b, p. 147). Tuana examines theories of reproduction from Aristotle to the preformationists and shows how these theories justify women's inferiority. She notes, "Aristotle set the basic orientation for the next 2000 years of embryological thought . . . the gender/science system is woven tightly into the fabric of science" (p. 169).

Emily Martin's (1987) monograph *The Woman in the Body*, published around the same time as Nancy Tuana's book, also provides a feminist analysis of science, but through an examination of medical discourse. Martin exposes the range of sex-biased assumptions embedded within reproductive medical texts that serve to disempower women and compares these images to women's perceptions of their reproductive lives. She discovers that medical texts employ an image of birth as "production," with the uterus likened to a "machine." Within this framework, menstruation and menopause become "failed production." Martin also finds that white middle-class women are most apt to accept these dominant images. Like Tuana's work, Martin's research underscores the androcentrism embedded in scientific literature and research and demonstrates the extent to which the "hard" sciences exist within value-laden social contexts that affect their practices and findings.

TURN TOWARD FEMINIST EPISTEMOLOGIES AND METHODOLOGIES

Although we have barely touched on the range of contributions of feminist scholarship, it is clear that the decades of the 1970s and 1980s contributed to the deconstruction of traditional

knowledge frameworks—taken-for-granted knowledge across several disciplines. In contrast to this endeavor, the 1980s and 1990s saw feminists launching other important challenges to knowledge building, starting with a basic foundational question:

- What is the nature of the social reality?

Positivism is a traditional research paradigm based on "the scientific method," a form of knowledge building in which "there is only *one* logic of science, to which any intellectual activity aspiring to the title of 'science' should follow" (Russell Keat & John Urry, quoted in Lawrence Neuman, 2000, p. 66). Positivism's model of inquiry is based on logic and empiricism. It holds out a specific epistemology of knowing—that truth lies "out there" in the social reality waiting to be discovered, if only the scientist is "objective" and "value free" in the pursuit of knowledge building. It posits "causal relationships" between variables that depend on the testing of specific hypotheses deduced from a general theory. The goal is to generalize research findings to a wider population and even to find causal laws that predict human behavior. Positivists present their results in the form of quantified patterns of behaviors reported in the form of statistical results. Early on, the social sciences (e.g., sociology and psychology) wanted to establish themselves as "scientific" in consort with the natural sciences (e.g., biology and chemistry). Auguste Comte (1798–1857), known as the father of French positivism, sought to incorporate the primary tenets of positivism into the discipline of sociology. Comte envisioned knowledge building passing through the "law of three stages": the "theological" or "fictitious" stage, characterized by beliefs in the supernatural; the "metaphysical" or "abstract" stage, a transitional state of knowledge building in which nature and its abstract forces are at work; and, finally, the "positivist" or "scientific" stage, the pinnacle of knowledge, through which we seek to uncover the laws that govern social behavior (Comte, 1896/2000, p. 27).

Émile Durkheim (1858–1917) also aspired to make sociology more scientific. In *The Rules of Sociological Method*, Durkheim (1895/1938) asserts that the discipline of sociology can create the same objective conditions that exist in the natural sciences. He codifies positivism by providing social scientists with specific rules and guidelines that will enable them to conduct value-free research, to separate facts from values, and to discover what he terms "social facts"—facts that "have an independent existence outside the individual consciousness" (p. 20). According to Durkheim, discarding sensation (feelings, values, and emotion) is an imperative aspect of knowledge building:

> It is a rule in the natural sciences to discard those data of sensation that are too subjective, in order to retain exclusively those presenting a sufficient degree of objectivity. Thus the physicist substitutes, for the vague impressions of temperature and electricity, the visual registrations of the thermometer or the electrometer. The sociologist must take the same precautions. (p. 44)

Feminist researchers do not necessarily embrace or eschew the practice of a positivist mode of inquiry. Some feminist researchers warn that the practice of positivism can lead to "bad science." This idea was the very motivation of *feminist empiricists* who urged scholars and researchers across the disciplines to be mindful of who is *left out* of research models' generalized claims and to tend to issues of difference in the research process (see, e.g., the preceding critique of androcentrism and Hundleby, Chapter 2, this volume). Other feminist scholars and researchers have critiqued positivism's tendency toward dualisms—between quantitative and qualitative research, between the subject and object of research, and between rationality and emotion. Sprague and Zimmerman (1993) argue, for example, that by setting up a subject-object split, whereby the researcher is removed from the research process and placed on a different plane, the practice of positivism promotes a hierarchy between the researcher and the researched that mimics patriarchy. Sprague and Zimmerman also challenge the positivist exclusion of emotions and values from the research process and call for an integration of quantitative and qualitative research.

On the other hand, positivism per se is not the enemy of all feminist inquiry; rather, the

adversary is how positivist principles of practice are deployed in some mainstream research projects. Some feminist researchers see positivism as having merit, especially as it adds validity to feminist research projects. Feminist empiricists continue to draw on positivist traditions (see in this volume Miner, Jayaratne, Pesonen, & Zurbrügg; Rosser; and Cole & Stewart). Additionally, some research questions may call forth a positivistic framework, especially if the goal of the research project requires the testing of a specific research hypothesis across a broad spectrum of data with the aim of generalizing findings to a wider population. Some feminist social policy advocates have also argued for its inclusion. For example, Roberta Spalter-Roth and Heidi Hartmann (1996), in their social policy work on women and welfare, call for the "strategic" use of a quantitative paradigm in conjunction with a qualitative one to "heighten consciousness and to provide credible numbers that can help advocates to mobilize political support" (p. 221).

Finally, sociologist Janet Saltzman Chafetz (1999) objects to the confounding of positivism with such terms as "instrument of social control" and "masculine knowledge building." She attributes these misrepresentations to the confusion surrounding the meaning of the term:

> In part this has happened because of the erroneous confusion of this term with the kind of mindless empiricism that has marked so much sociological research. I believe that theory development and well-crafted, theoretically oriented research go hand-in-hand, and that this is in fact what "positivism" is all about. (p. 327)

According to Saltzman Chafetz (1999), there is "nothing in the view that patterned behaviors and processes exist, can be measured, and can be explained in substantial measure cross-culturally and pan-historically that automatically denigrates or controls people" (pp. 327–328). Instead, Saltzman Chafetz sees the positivistic perspective working for feminist ends.

Feminist empiricism made important contributions toward uncovering androcentric bias in social research by encouraging the practice of "good" science. A more radical set of feminist epistemologies and methodologies was to come,

as feminist researchers began to interrogate, disrupt, modify, and, at times, radically challenge existing ways of knowing within and across their disciplines, creating a shift in the tectonic plates of mainstream knowledge building. Beginning with a critique of positivism's concept of scientific objectivity—and from the idea of a "value-free" science with its stress on the detachment of the researcher from the researched—the feminist movement toward alternative epistemologies began to take shape. Feminists went to the heart of some basic foundational questions, namely, who can know? What can be known?

Instead of working to improve the accuracy, objectivity, and universality of mainstream research by including women, feminists started to challenge the viability and utility of concepts like objectivity and universality altogether. Knowledge is achieved not through "correcting" mainstream research studies by adding women, but through paying attention to the specificity and uniqueness of women's lives and experiences.

Donna Haraway (1988), Sandra Harding (1993), and Kum-Kum Bhavnani (1993) argue, for example, that objectivity needs to be transformed into "feminist objectivity." Donna Haraway defines feminist objectivity as "situated knowledges": *knowledge and truth are partial, situated, subjective, power imbued, and relational.* The denial of values, biases, and politics is seen as unrealistic and undesirable (see also Bhavnani, 1993, p. 96; Harding, 1993, p. 49). Historian Joan Scott (1999) disputes the positivist notion of a one-to-one correspondence between experience and social reality. Instead, she asserts, experience is shaped by one's particular context—by specific circumstances, conditions, values, and relations of power, each influencing how one articulates "experience." Scott ushered in a "linguistic turn" in our understanding of social reality by pointing out how experience is discursively constructed by dominant ideological structures. Tracing the discourse surrounding experience provides a method for examining the underlying mechanisms of oppression within society that, in fact, may provide new avenues of resistance and transformation.

In addition to valuing women's unique and situated experiences as knowledge (Gloria

Bowles & Renate Duelli-Klein, 1983; Smith, 1987, 1990; Liz Stanley & Sue Wise, 1983), some feminists make the case for validating the importance of emotions and values as a critical lens in research endeavors (Alison Jaggar, 1997; Sprague & Zimmerman, 1993). Alison Jaggar recognizes emotion as a central aspect of knowledge building. According to Jaggar (1997), it is unrealistic to assume emotions and values do not surface during the research process. Our emotions, in fact, are an integral part of why a given topic or set of research questions is studied and how it is studied. The positivistic dualism between the rational and the emotional becomes a false dichotomy:

> Values and emotions enter into the science of the past and the present not only on the level of scientific practice but also on the metascientific level, as answers to various questions: What is Science? How should it be practiced? And what is the status of scientific investigation versus nonscientific modes of enquiry? (p. 393)

Sandra Harding's (1993) concept of "*strong objectivity*" is a specific example of how to practice the basic premise of "feminist objectivity." Harding critiques the traditional, or positivist, concept of objectivity because its focus resides only on the "context of justification" in the research process—how the research is carried out and making sure that the researcher's values and attitudes do not enter into this process. What is left out of consideration is the extent to which values and attitudes of the researcher also enter into the "context of discovery," that part of the research process that asks questions and formulates specific research hypotheses. Donna Haraway (1988) characterizes this positivist tendency as the "god trick," and notes that it is "that mode of seeing that pretends to offer a vision that is from everywhere and nowhere, equally and fully" (p. 584). By contrast, Harding (1993) argues that throughout the research process, subjective judgments on the part of the researcher are always made "in the selection of problems, the formation of hypotheses, the design of research (including the organization of research communities), the collection of data, the interpretation and sorting of data, decisions about when to stop research,

the way results of research are reported, and so on." And to practice strong objectivity requires all researchers to self-reflect on what values, attitudes, and agenda they bring to the research process—strong objectivity means that "the subjects of knowledge be placed on the same critical causal plane as the objects of knowledge" (p. 69). How do a researcher's own history and positionality influence, for example, the questions she or he asks? It is in the practice of strong self-reflexivity that the researcher becomes more objective.

Feminist philosopher Lorraine Code (1991), in her book *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and the Construction of Knowledge*, offers yet another viewpoint regarding positivism's "objectivity" claim. She argues for a "mitigated relativism" that avoids charges of "objectivism" and "relativism."

> I prefer to characterize the position I advocate as a *mitigated relativism*, however, or the freedom it offers from the homogenizing effects of traditional objectivism, in which differences, discrepancies, and deviations are smoothed out for the sake of achieving a unified theory. With its commitment to difference, critical relativism is able to resist reductivism and to accommodate divergent perspectives. Mitigated in its constraints by "the facts" of material objects and social/political artifacts, yet ready to account for the mechanisms of power (in a Foucauldian sense) and prejudice (in a Gadamerian sense) that produce knowledge of these facts, and committed to the self-critical stance that its mitigation requires, such relativism is a resourceful epistemological position. (pp. 320–321)

By disclosing their values, attitudes, and biases in their approaches to particular research questions and by engaging in strong reflexivity throughout the research process, feminist researchers can actually improve the objectivity of research. Feminists have forged new epistemologies of knowledge by incorporating women's lived experiences, emotions, and feelings into the knowledge-building process. We now turn to take a more in-depth look at the branch of feminist epistemology that centers on women's experience as a primary source of knowledge.

FEMINIST STANDPOINT EPISTEMOLOGY: FEMINIST RESEARCH GROUNDED IN THE EXPERIENCE OF THE OPPRESSED

Feminist standpoint epistemology borrows from the Marxist and Hegelian idea that individuals' daily activities or material and lived experiences structure their understanding of the social world. Karl Marx viewed knowledge as historically constructed and relative because it is based on a given "mode of production." Elites (owners of the "means of production") shape knowledge and ideology to justify social inequality. For both Marx and Hegel, the master's perspective is partial and distorted, whereas the worker/slave's is more complete because the worker/slave must comprehend his or her own world and that of the master—the worker/slave must know both worlds to survive. Feminist standpoint scholars argue that it is a woman's oppressed location within society that provides fuller insights into society as a whole; women have access to an enhanced and more nuanced understanding of social reality than men do precisely because of their structurally oppressed location vis-à-vis the dominant group, or men. Dorothy Smith (1987), an early proponent of the standpoint perspective, stresses the necessity of starting research from women's lives: taking into account women's everyday experiences through paying particular attention to and finding and analyzing the gaps that occur when women try to fit their lives into the dominant culture's way of conceptualizing women's situation. By looking at the difference between the two perspectives, the researcher gains a more complex and theoretically richer set of explanations of the lives of the oppressors and the oppressed.

Early critics of standpoint epistemology argued that it collapses all women's experiences into a single defining experience and pays little attention to the diversity of women's lives, especially to the varied experiences of those women who differ by race, class, sexual preference, and so on. Still others raised questions such as the following: If knowledge starts out from the oppressed, how does one ascertain who is the most oppressed? Feminist standpoint scholars and researchers have responded to these concerns, and standpoint epistemology has undergone many different iterations over time. The concept of multiple standpoints has been introduced. Later versions of standpoint are open to comparing and understanding the interlocking relationships between racism, sexism, heterosexism, and class oppression as additional starting points into understanding the social reality (see Harding, Chapter 3, this volume; Wylie, Chapter 26, this volume). The current dialogue (Harding, 2004), ongoing development, and diversity of approaches to feminist standpoint epistemology notwithstanding, by calling attention to women's lived experiences of oppression as the starting point for building knowledge, feminist standpoint scholars and researchers provided a new way to answer two epistemological questions: Who can know? and What can be known?

FEMINIST EPISTEMOLOGIES AND METHODOLOGIES: THE CHALLENGE AND POSSIBILITIES OF THE POSTMODERN TURN

We can think of postmodernism as a theoretical paradigm that serves as an "umbrella term" for a variety of perspectives from critical theory to post-structural theory to postmodern theories. What creates unity among these perspectives is their concern for highlighting the importance of researching difference—there is an emphasis on including the "other" in the process of research (Hesse-Biber, Leavy, & Yaiser, 2004, p. 18). The perspectives contained within this umbrella term call for, in a range of degrees, the transformative practices of research that lead toward both challenging dominant forms of knowledge building and empowering subjected understandings. But there is also variation and contestation among and between perspectives within this umbrella term. For example, critical theory is especially cognizant of the role that power plays in producing hegemonic knowledge. Critical theorists seek to expose dominant power relationships and knowledge that oppress with the goal of "critical emancipation"—creating an environment in which oppressed groups "gain the power to control their own lives in solidarity with a justice-oriented community" (see Joe Kincheloe & Peter McLaren, 2000, p. 282). However, some might consider critical theory's emphasis on emancipation to be inconsistent

with the tendency of postmodern and post-structural theories to deconstruct dominant discourse. These variations in postmodern perspectives are compared and contrasted in more detail in Gannon and Davies (Chapter 4, this volume). Gannon and Davies point out how labels such as postmodernism, post-structuralism, and critical theory are often confusing, and how practitioners of these perspectives don't always agree on what these terms mean. They note,

> These frameworks are, however, quite slippery and hard to pin down. . . . There is, then, no orderly, agreed upon, and internally consistent set of ideas that sits obediently under each of these headings. But each of them, along with the disputed ground between them, has produced new ideas that have helped feminists break loose from previously taken-for-granted assumptions. (p. 65)

In *Feminist Perspectives on Social Research* (2004), Patricia Leavy, Michelle Yaiser, and I point out the affinity of postmodernism with feminist research pursuits. We note that postmodernism's emphasis on bringing the "other" into the research process

> meshes well with the general currents within the feminist project itself. Feminists from all traditions have always been concerned with including women in their research in order to rectify the historic reliance on men as research subjects. This is a general feminist concern. (Hesse-Biber et al., 2004, p. 18)

In addition, postmodernism's emphasis on the empowerment of oppressed groups is congruent with feminists' emphasis on social change and social justice. This congruence is also particularly the case with postmodern feminists, including postcolonial feminists who seek to explore "political cultural resistance to hierarchical modes of structuring social life by being attentive to the dynamics of power and knowledge" (Hesse-Biber et al., 2004, p. 18).

Although postmodern and post-structural perspectives invigorate feminist theory and praxis, there is also a tendency for them to destabilize it (Barrett & Phillips, 1992). For example, post-structural theorists have challenged essentialist categories: women, sex, gender, and the body. Michèle Barrett and Ann Phillips (1992), in *Destablizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*, note,

> The fear now expressed by many feminists is that the changing theoretical fashions will lead us towards abdicating the goal of accurate and systematic knowledge; and that in legitimate critique of some of the earlier assumptions, we may stray too far from feminism's original project. (p. 6)

Christina Gilmartin, Robin Lydenberg, and I point out in our book *Feminist Approaches to Theory and Methodology* (Hesse-Biber, Gilmartin, & Lydenberg, 1999) how the destabilizing of these binary categories served to polarize feminist theory:

> French feminists like Hélène Cixous and Catherine Clément (1986), Luce Irigaray (1991), and Julia Kristeva (1986) were accused by social constructionists of biological essentialism, of establishing the female body and maternity as foundational and symbolic sources of woman's psychic and sexual difference. . . . post-structuralist critics, like Judith Butler, expose even the materiality of the body as "already gendered, already constructed." Extending her argument that gender and sex are the result of the "ritualized repetition" of certain behaviors designed to render the body either "intelligible" (normative, heterosexual) or abject (unthinkable, homosexual), Judith Butler asserts that the body itself is "forcibly produced" by power and discourse (Butler, 1993, p. xi). (Hesse-Biber et al., 1999, p. 4)

The challenge for feminism is to dialogue around these tensions and to be open to different points of view. Gannon and Davies (this volume) examine the opportunities that open up for feminist theory and research when the postmodern meets the feminist terrain of theory and praxis.

FEMINIST EPISTEMOLOGIES AND METHODOLOGIES: THE TURN TOWARD DIFFERENCE IN FEMINIST THEORY AND PRACTICE

The positivist paradigm assumes the viability of the *value-neutral and objective* researcher, who can obtain generalized findings or universal

truths. Based on these assumptions, positivism has very specific answers to epistemological questions. Certain types of "knowledge" are not considered scientific knowledge, certain ways of obtaining knowledge are not valid, and certain people may not posses knowledge. Because positivism was the dominant paradigm in social science for many years, certain people, knowledge, and methods have been excluded from social science research. These "others" and the knowledge they possess are not considered valid or valuable.

Feminists initiated their critique of positivism by (1) calling attention to the fact that women had been left out of much mainstream research and (2) valuing the perspectives, feelings, and lived experiences of women as knowledge. In the 1980s and 1990s, however, some feminists warned against the tendency to reduce all women to one category with shared characteristics. Yes, it was important to give voice to women who had been left out of mainstream research models and to recognize women's life stories as knowledge. But which women's stories were being told—whose life experiences were included, and whose were left out? Through feminism's interaction with postcolonialism, post-structuralism, and postmodernism, there occurred a turn toward difference research. Feminists became increasingly conscious of the diversity of women's experiences. They argued against the idea of one essential experience of women and began to recognize a plurality of women's lived experiences.

Feminist research on difference stressed issues of difference regarding race, class, and gender. Feminists of color critiqued the failure of early feminist research to explore the important interconnections among categories of difference in terms of gender, ethnicity, and class (see, e.g., Anzaldúa, 1987; hooks, 1990; Mohanty, 1988). As Hirsch and Keller (1990) observed, "Feminists of color have revealed to white middle-class feminists the extent of their own racism" (p. 379). Sociologist Patricia Hill Collins (1990) stresses the significance of black feminist thought—"the ideas produced by Black women that clarify a standpoint of and for Black women" (p. 37). Listening to the experiences of the "other" leads to a more complete understanding of knowledge. Black women, argues Collins, are "outsiders within." To navigate socially within white society, black women have to cope with the rules of the privileged

white world, but, at the same time, they are constantly aware of their marginalized position in terms of their race and gender. In contrast, sociological insiders, because of their privileged positionality, are "in no position to notice the specific anomalies apparent to Afro-American women, because these same sociological insiders produced them" (p. 53). Along with this epistemology, Patricia Hill Collins develops a "matrix of domination" framework for conceptualizing difference along a range of interlocking inequalities of race, class, and gender. These factors affect each other and are socially constructed. It is only through collectively examining the intricately connected matrix of difference that we can truly understand a given individual's life experience. Feminists of color challenged and changed white feminist scholarly research and the conceptualization of feminist standpoint epistemology by asking this question: Which women? For example, Patricia Hill Collins's conception of "standpoint" as relational, and including multiple systems of oppression, forced white feminists to examine white privilege as an element of oppression (see McIntosh, 1995).

Bonnie Thornton Dill and Marla Kohlman (Chapter 8, this volume) expand and elaborate on the early work of scholars like Hill Collins with a focus on analyzing the interconnections of differences among race, class, and gender. They employ the term *intersectionality* to "[emphasize] the interlocking effects of race, class, gender, and sexuality, highlighting the ways in which categories of identity and structures of inequality are mutually constituted and defy separation into discrete categories of analysis." Their chapter traces the impact of diversity on disciplinary and interdisciplinary scholarship over the past several decades and charts some future directions for knowledge building that embody a vision of intersectionality within academic institutions.

Feminist Epistemologies and Methodologies: The Turn Toward Globalization

Feminist scholars and researchers continue to engage issues of difference across gender, ethnicity, and class. As Bonnie Thornton Dill (1987) reminds us, "Our analysis must include critical

accounts of women's situation in every race, class, and culture—we must work to provide resources so that every woman can define problematics, generate concepts and theories" (Dill, 1987, p. 97). In the first decade of the 21st century, feminists expanded their focus on difference to include issues of sexual preference and disability, as well as nationality and geographical region. There is also a growing awareness among feminist researchers of the importance of women's experiences in a global context with respect to issues of imperialism, colonialism, and national identity (see the chapters in this volume by Bhavnani & Talcott, Mendez & Wolf, and Dill & Kohlman). Frequently, analyses that incorporate race, class, and gender differences ignore the diversity among women with regard to their particular geographical or cultural placement across the globe.

- How do we conceptualize and study difference in a global context?
- What research frameworks serve to empower and promote social change for women?

Feminists doing international research, who attempt to speak for "the other/s" in a global context, should be particularly mindful of the inherent power dynamics in doing so. In what sense does the researcher give voice to the other, and to what extent is that privilege one that is taken for granted by "the other/s"? Postcolonial feminist Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1990) notes:

On the other side of the international division of labor, the subject of exploitation cannot know and speak the text of female exploitation even if the absurdity of the nonrepresenting intellectual making space for them to speak is achieved. The woman is doubly in shadow. (p. 894)

Historian Deniz Kandiyoti (1999) discusses the tendency of some Western feminist researchers to "universalize" disciplinary concepts, ignoring the ethnocentrism that lies deep within constructs such as patriarchy. Kandiyoti also calls for the employment of a historical-comparative lens to strengthen our understanding of the cross-cultural context of conceptual meaning across Western and non-Western societies (Mohanty, 1988).

Feminists working in a global context call for a heightened attention to power and difference. But what about the potential for women to come together across difference and to forge social change? Some feminist researchers call for employing a type of "strategic essentialism" in their research projects (Spivak, 1994). Susan Bordo (1990) encourages the strategic use of essentialism for women to promote their political agenda (see also Spivak, 1990, p. 10). She argues that "too relentless a focus on historical heterogeneity . . . can obscure the transhistorical hierarchical patterns of white, male privilege that have informed the creation of the Western intellectual tradition" (Bordo, 1990, p. 149). Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1999) also employs the strategic use of essentialism, using three case studies of third world women involved in the global division of labor. Mohanty shows how ideologies of domesticity, femininity, and race are employed by capitalists to socially construct the "domesticated woman worker"—the dominant perception of women as "dependent housewives" allows the capitalist to pay them low wages. By having women identify with each other as "women" and through their shared material interests as "workers," they are able to overcome differences of nationality, race, and social class. These identifications across difference provide a rethinking of third world woman as agents rather than victims. Mohanty argues for political solidarity among women workers as a potential "revolutionary basis for struggles against capitalist re-colonization" (see also Hesse-Biber, 2002).

Locating the intersections where women's differences cross is a way that some feminists have begun to research difference in a global context and to empower women's voices. Kum-Kum Bhavnani and Molly Talcott (Chapter 7, this volume) suggest the need to look for *interconnections* between women, and they do not believe that using an "intersecting" metaphor works well to empower women's lives. In fact, the concept of an "intersection" implies the image of a crossroad, whereby those who meet are coming from and going to a given destination, which is defined by the route that these roads take. This metaphor does not provide a way for a new road to be charted. A race-d/gender-ed person

stands at the crossroad (that point where race and gender routes intersect), yet, as Bhavnani and Talcott note,

> A crossroads metaphor . . . directs the gaze to the intersections of the roads and the directions in which they travel and meet. . . . This matters because, if we are not only to analyze the world but to change it, then the easiest way to imagine the shifts in the relationships between race/ethnicity and gender is to imagine the roads being moved to form new intersections.

They suggest that a more empowering metaphor might be to think of these roads as

> *interconnections that configure* [which] connotes more movement and fluidity than lies in the metaphor of intersection, as well as offering a way of thinking about how not only race and gender but also nation, sexuality, and wealth all interconnect, configure, and reshape each other.

Much of the theorizing and many research studies on the concerns of women in a global context, however, remain fragmented. Black feminists, third world feminists, and global, postcolonial, or transnational feminists often remain uninformed about each other's theories, perspectives, and research (see Mendez & Wolf, Chapter 31, this volume). What remains a challenge for feminist research is the creation of links between these strands of knowledge building so as to gather a more complex understanding of the workings of racism, imperialism, and neocolonialism across historical and cultural contexts. What are the models of knowledge building that will allow feminist researchers to study these interconnections? To do this requires an understanding of how feminists carry out their research practices and of what overarching principles guide their work.

The journey we have only briefly outlined thus far opens a window into feminist thinking on issues of epistemology and methodology. Feminists have employed new ways of thinking and have modified our understanding of the nature of the social world—providing new questions and angles of vision by which to understand women's issues and concerns. Feminist epistemology and methodology directly affect feminist praxis.

FEMINIST PRAXIS: A SYNERGISTIC PERSPECTIVE ON THE PRACTICE OF FEMINIST RESEARCH

Feminist praxis refers to the varied ways feminist research proceeds. Feminist perspectives challenge the traditional research paradigm of positivism, which assumes a unified truth with the idea of testing out hypotheses. There is little room for the exploration of personal feelings and experiences, given the strict observance of objectivity as a basic tenet of positivism. Yet, as we have seen, new theoretical contributions from feminist standpoint theory (Harding, Chapter 3, this volume; Wylie, Chapter 26, this volume), postcolonial theory (Bhavnani & Talcott, Chapter 7, this volume; Mohanty, 1999), and postmodernism (Gannon & Davies, Chapter 4, this volume), for example, ask *new* questions that call forth getting at subjugated knowledge, particularly as this relates to issues of difference. Early on, feminists saw the need to make a radical break in positivism's traditional research paradigm. Helen Roberts's (1981) edited volume *Doing Feminist Research* asks the question "What is feminist research?" Roberts's pathbreaking volume puts a feminist sociological lens onto the research process and notes, "The accounts in this collection point to the theoretical, methodological, practical and ethical issues raised in projects where the investigator has adopted, or has at least become aware of, a feminist perspective" (p. 2). Ann Oakley's (1981) now classic article "Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in Terms?" in Roberts's volume, demonstrates the importance of breaking down the hierarchical power relationship between the interviewer and the researched that she views as characteristic of a positivist research paradigm and antithetical to the view of women as agents of social change with their own set of experiences. She argues that interviewing is "not a one-way process where the interviewer elicits and receives, but does not give information" (p. 30).

Liz Stanley and Sue Wise's (1983) visionary volume *Breaking Out: Feminist Consciousness and Feminist Research* calls for feminist researchers to "upgrade the personal as an object of study." They argue for a "naturalist" as opposed to a "positivistic model" of research to study women's experiences, or what they term "feminist

consciousness," in which "feeling and experience" are the primary guideposts for feminist research (p. 178). For Stanley and Wise, there is no demarcation between "doing feminism" and "doing feminist research." Patti Lather's (1991) book *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy Within/In the Postmodern* takes up the issue of power in research and teaching practices. She combines insights from feminism and postmodernism with the goal of "emancipatory" knowledge building, during which the researcher and researched cocreate meaning through "reciprocity and negotiation." She is interested in what research designs, teaching practices, and curricula produce "liberatory knowledge" and "empower" the researched and the pedagogical process.

Other works on the intersection of feminism and methods quickly followed and span the next several decades. Some of the most notable volumes, to name only a few, are Patricia Hill Collins's (1990) *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*; Joyce McCarl Nielson's (1990) *Feminist Research Methods: Exemplary Readings in the Social Science*s; bell hooks's (1990) *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*; Liz Stanley's (1990) *Feminist Praxis: Research, Theory, and Epistemology in Feminist Sociology*; Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook's (1991) *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research*; Sherna Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai's (1991) *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*; Shulamit Reinharz's (1992) *Feminist Methods in Social Research*; Mary Maynard and June Purvis's (1994) *Researching Women's Lives From a Feminist Perspective*; Sandra Burt and Lorraine Code's (1995) *Changing Methods: Feminists Transforming Practice*; Diane L. Wolf's (1996) *Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork*; Louise Lamphere, Helena Ragone, and Patricia Zavella's (1997) *Situated Lives: Gender and Culture in Everyday Life*; Marjorie L. DeVault's (1999) *Liberating Method: Feminism and Social Research*; Linda Tuhiwai Smith's (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*; Elizabeth A. St. Pierre and Wanda S. Pillow's (2000) *Working the Ruins: Feminist Poststructural Theory and Methods in Education*; and Nancy A. Naples's (2003) *Feminism and Method: Ethnography, Discourse Analysis,*

and Activist Research. Each volume highlights how feminist researchers create a tight link between the elements of the research process—epistemology, methodology, and method. We see this linkage unfolding by looking at how feminists engage with the research process—starting with the research questions they devise, how research methods are practiced, and the special attention given to issues of power, authority, reflexivity, ethics, and difference in the practice, writing, and reading of feminist research.

In all these volumes, feminist epistemologies and methodologies inform research practices. A feminist empiricist perspective on knowledge building informs the practice of survey methods by interrogating the male bias of some survey questions as well as the power differentials between the researcher and researched in the survey interview. A feminist standpoint epistemology questions whether the research sample and research questions of a particular method are responsive to issues of difference and whether the findings are interpreted in a way that includes the experiences of marginalized populations. Increasingly, feminists are tweaking old methods and inventing new methods to get at women's experience. We see this most vividly in how feminists practice interview methods. In Marjorie DeVault's (1999) volume as well as in her coauthored chapter with Glenda Gross, "Feminist Qualitative Interviewing: Experience, Talk, and Knowledge" (Chapter 11, this volume), there is an awareness of the importance of listening during the interview process:

> One of feminism's central claims is that women's perspectives have often been silenced or ignored; as a result, feminist researchers have been interested in listening for gaps and absences in women's talk, and in considering what meanings might lie beyond explicit speech. (p. 217)

By listening through the gaps in talking and by attending to what is not stated, but present—such as the hidden meanings of terms like "you know?"—DeVault suggests one can get at "subjugated knowledge." What each of these books also demonstrates is that feminists use a range of methods, and some even employ multiple methods within the same, concurrent, or follow-up research projects, to answer complex and

often novel questions. Feminist research, then, can be qualitative or quantitative or a combination of both.

Shulamit Reinharz (1992), in her classic text *Feminist Methods in Social Research*, notes that "feminism supplies the perspective and the disciplines supply the method. The feminist researcher exists at their intersection" (p. 243). Although feminist research is multiple, complex, quantitative, and qualitative, nevertheless, if we were to examine *inductively* the range of research studies and topics cited in these works and within this volume, which are by no means exhaustive of the population of feminist research, we could discern some common principles of feminist research praxis.

Feminists Ask New Questions That Often Get at Subjugated Knowledge

The women's movement of the 1960s, as well as increasing globalization, forged new feminist theoretical perspectives (see Part I of this *Handbook*). Feminist standpoint theory (Harding, Chapter 3, this volume; Wylie, Chapter 26, this volume), postcolonialism (Bhavnani & Talcott, Chapter 7, this volume; Mendez & Wolf, Chapter 31, this volume), postmodernism, ethnic studies, queer studies, critical theory, and critical race theory (Gannon & Davies, Chapter 4, this volume) serve to upend traditional knowledge by asking new questions that expose the power dynamics of knowledge building. "Subjugated" knowledge is unearthed and issues of race, class, sexuality, nationality, and gender are taken into account. These types of questions are different from those questions feminist empiricists ask in that they go beyond correcting gender bias in dominant research studies. In asking new questions, feminist research maintains a close link between epistemology, methodology, and methods.

Feminist Praxis Takes Up Issues of Power, Authority, Ethics, and Reflexivity

Feminist praxis builds on the understanding of difference and translates these insights by emphasizing the importance of taking issues of power, authority, ethics, and reflexivity into the practice of social research. Feminist researchers

are particularly keen on getting at issues of power and authority in the research process, from question formulation to carrying out and writing up research findings (see Roof, Chapter 25, this volume). Focusing on our positionality within the research process helps to break down the idea that research is the "view from nowhere."

Feminist research practitioners pay attention to reflexivity, a process whereby researchers recognize, examine, and understand how their social background, location, and assumptions affect their research practice. Practicing reflexivity also includes paying attention to the specific ways in which our own agendas affect the research at all points in the research process— from the selection of the research problem to the selection of method and ways in which we analyze and interpret our findings (see Hesse-Biber & Piatelli, Chapter 27, this volume). Hesse-Biber and Leckenby's (2004) work on the importance of self-reflexivity on the part of the researcher notes,

> Feminist researchers are continually and cyclically interrogating their locations as both researcher and as feminist. They engage the boundaries of their multiple identities and multiple research aims through conscientious reflection. This engagement with their identities and roles impacts the earliest stages of research design. Much of feminist research design is marked by an openness to the shifting contexts and fluid intentions of the research questions. (p. 211)

Ethical discussions usually remain detached from a discussion of the research process; some researchers consider this aspect of research an afterthought. Yet, the ethical standpoint or *moral integrity* of the researcher is a critically important aspect of ensuring that the research process and a researcher's findings are "trustworthy" and valid. The term "ethics" derives from the Greek word "ethos," which means "character." A feminist ethical perspective provides insights into how ethical issues enter into the selection of a research problem, how one conducts research, the design of one's study, one's sampling procedure, and the responsibility toward research participants. Feminist ethical issues also come into play in deciding what research findings get published (see Preissle & Han, Chapter 28, this volume).

Feminist Researchers Often Work at the Margins of Their Disciplines

Feminist research, while breaking out of the traditional circle of knowledge building, remains on the margins of discussion within mainstream methods texts. In 1962, Thomas Kuhn published *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, in which he argued that science is enmeshed in a particular mode of thinking—a paradigm or worldview—that tends to dominate a given field of science. Those insiders who practice within a reigning paradigm do get recognition and gain legitimacy for their work through a range of institutional structures—from promotions and tenure committees within the academy and mainstream journals within their field to monetary rewards from granting agencies and foundations. For feminist epistemologies and methodologies to gain greater recognition and rewards in and outside the academy and to harness these gains into social policy changes for women, feminists must work at multiple levels. Work must be done within and outside the circle to ensure that women's scholarship is recognized and rewarded as legitimate scholarship within their disciplines and within the social policy initiatives of funding agencies:

> Feminist researchers may need to be strategic about their mission and goals concerning how to organize as a research movement toward social change for women. Issues of difference in the research process need to be carefully addressed as this discussion proceeds. Issues dealing with power and control both within the research process and discussions of differences and similarities among different/competing feminist epistemologies and methodologies would be productive and energetic beginnings toward raising the consciousness of the feminist research communities. (Hesse-Biber & Leckenby, 2004, p. 225)

Feminist Research Seeks Social Change and Social Transformation

Sandra Harding (1991) speaks of "emancipation" as one important goal of feminist research; knowledge building in pursuit of this goal does not lean in the direction of the dominant groups but instead toward democratic ends (Hesse-Biber and Leckenby, 2004, p. 221). As the articles in this *Handbook* demonstrate, most feminist researchers seek to connect their research to social transformation and social change on behalf of women and other oppressed groups. Patti Lather (1991) notes that feminist researchers "consciously use . . . research to help participants understand and change their situations" (p. 226).

We begin the *Handbook* with a historical grounding in the diverse range of theoretical and epistemic perspectives that make up the history of feminist engagement with research. We provide an overview of historical contributions of feminists to the knowledge-building process.

Part I. Feminist Perspectives on Knowledge Building

This section traces the historical rise of feminist research and begins with the early links between feminist theory and research practice. We trace the contours of early feminist inquiry and introduce the reader to the history of, and historical debates within, feminist scholarship. This section also explores the political process of knowledge building by introducing the reader to the links between knowledge and power relations. Several questions guide our selection of theoretical and research articles for this section:

- How have feminist scholars redefined traditional paradigms in the social sciences and humanities?
- What new theoretical and research models guide their work?

In this section, we will explore the nature of methodologies, frameworks, and presumptions dominant within the social sciences and humanities. We will point out what we think are the critical turning points in feminist research: "adding women and stirring," feminist standpoint theory, the inclusion of difference, and the debates surrounding method, methodology, and epistemology. Feminist research endeavors often began by pointing out the androcentrism in the sciences. This research approach is often referred to as feminist empiricism, as we shall see in philosopher Catherine Hundleby's chapter "Feminist Empiricism." Here, she explores the specific challenges feminists pose for traditional

models of knowledge building. She investigates the concept of "objectivity" in the research process and how some feminist researchers have developed alternatives to traditional objectivity. Feminist empiricists work within a positivistic model of knowledge building with the goal of creating "better" science. This better and more objective science is achieved through the application of more rigorous practices, incorporating difference into the research process, and more strictly following the basic tenets of positivism.

Sandra Harding's article, "Feminist Standpoints," looks at the origins of standpoint theories, which grew out of feminist activism of the 1960s and 1970s, and examines the antipositivist "histories, sociologies, and philosophies of science" emerging in Europe and the United States. Harding provides us with a history of the development of the standpoint perspective, which begins with research questions (methodologies) rooted in women's lives—their everyday existence. Drawing on the Marxist theory of the master-slave relationship, Nancy Hartsock (1983), for example, argues that, because of women's location within the sexual division of labor and because of their experience of oppression, women have greater insights as researchers into the lives of other women. Dorothy Smith (1987) stresses the importance of creating knowledge based upon the standpoint and experience of women. In this volume, Harding also takes up the critiques against a standpoint perspective. Some critics are uncomfortable with giving up positivism's claim of universal truth. If, as standpoint theory suggests, there are multiple subjectivities, won't this perspective lead to chaos? Others charge that standpoint theory is too essentialist and Eurocentric in that it distills all women's experience into a single vision (Western, white women's).

The following five chapters address a range of issues, including understanding the diversity of women's experiences and the feminist commitment to the empowerment of women and other oppressed groups. Susanne Gannon and Bronwyn Davies (Chapter 4, this volume) discuss postmodern, post-structural, and critical perspectives regarding cultural theory. They look at how some feminist theorists, such as Butler, Grosz, and Briadotti (as cited in Gannon & Davies, this volume) incorporate the insights

of these perspectives into their own theoretical work and research. Gannon and Davies also illuminate several feminist critiques of these perspectives, such as relativism, a lack of a political vision, and a tendency to reinforce the status quo.

Aiding Mary Hawkesworth's exploration of feminist epistemology (Chapter 5, this volume) are analyses of feminist methodology. Working through notions of objectivity and truth in terms of the feminist critiques that have been raised against them, Hawkesworth considers their implications for feminist research. Feminist empiricists, standpoint theorists, postmodernists, science studies scholars, and those who are interested in the "posthuman" have all thought through objectivity and truth and developed their possibilities within feminist research projects.

Kum-Kum Bhavnani and Molly Talcott (Chapter 7, this volume) are specifically concerned with the emergence of the visibility and audibility of women's experience in feminist research. Using a global feminist ethnographic approach, Bhavnani and Talcott ask, "Which women's lives are being analyzed, interrogated, and even evaluated?" Accounts of difference, this chapter argues, should be reconceptualized and broadened within a global context. By pointing to studies on women and development, Bhavnani and Talcott emphasize the importance of transnationality and the utility of a global perspective in examinations of oppression. Feminist researchers are better able to approach the full range of women's experience by widening their field of inquiry to include global perspectives.

Elizabeth Anderson's and other feminist researchers' and scholars' claim that "gender . . . ought to influence our conceptions of knowledge" is controversial (2011; cited in Koertge, Chapter 6, this volume), and Noretta Koertge (Chapter 6, this volume) argues that gendering epistemology may not always be beneficial to feminist research. Taking into account the influence of gender on inquiry and challenging the works of Andrea Nye, Sandra Harding, and Helen Longino, all of whom conclude that a feminist epistemology is necessary, Koertge warns against gendered epistemology.

Bonnie Thornton Dill and Marla Kohlman (Chapter 8, this volume) offer an account of intersectionality as a conceptual tool within feminist theory and practice. For research that

sets out to look at, for example, intersections of race, class, gender, and sexuality within identity, intersectionality is particularly appropriate because it assumes difference and recognizes that such concepts are mutually constitutive and inseparable. Intersectionality as a conceptual model has provoked debates about its theory and practice, and this chapter seeks to both trace the development of intersectionality and speak to its future in feminist research.

Feminist perspectives on knowledge building have pushed against the dominant circles of knowledge, cautious about re-creating hegemonic knowledge of the past, sometimes stumbling, but committed to pushing past the boundaries of traditional knowledge. Feminists do not always agree on the specific paths to travel, and there remain significant tensions among feminists concerning how best to research and represent women's issues and concerns, as well as how to confront the power dynamics that continue to reinforce hegemonic forces that serve the status quo. What is clearly needed from examining the range of perspectives feminists offer onto the landscape of knowledge building is a dialogue among feminists. Where are the points of agreement? Disagreement? How can we foster a more transdisciplinary approach to knowledge building? How do we construct a climate where feminist theorists and researchers listen to each other? How tolerant are feminists of each other's points of view? These are the issues that we address in Part I of this *Handbook*.

Part II. Feminist Research Praxis

Part II of this *Handbook* debates the issue of whether or not there is a unique feminist method. What makes a method feminist? What are the unique characteristics feminists bring to the practice of this method? What are the strengths and challenges in practicing feminist research? What is gained and what is risked? This section looks at how feminists use a range of research methods in both conventional and unconventional research studies. Many feminist research projects have used survey methods and quantitative data analysis—two traditionally androcentric methods—to produce very women-centered results. Methods such as intensive interviewing, the collection of oral histories, and qualitative data analysis are often labeled feminist methods

by traditional sociologists; however, these methods have been tweaked and modified in various ways to uncover women's issues and concerns. The labeling of certain methods as traditional or feminist by social scientists and the use of specific methods by feminist researchers are the focus of Part II.

This section also stresses the idea that feminist researchers come from a variety of epistemological positions. Feminist researchers use multiple tools to gain access to and understanding of the world around them and may use multiple methods within the same study. The selections chosen for this section are not exhaustive of all feminist research or all the methods feminists use. These selections do, however, provide a broad context within which to examine feminist research. Deborah Piatelli and I provide a detailed introduction and theoretical and research context for Part II in our chapter, "The Synergistic Praxis of Theory and Method."

Part II starts off with a look at ethnographic methods, as Wanda S. Pillow and Cris Mayo (Chapter 10, this volume) put forth the history and development of feminist ethnography in order to locate their examples of feminist ethnographic research. Issues of definition and method in terms of women's lives remain at the forefront of Pillow and Mayo's presentation of feminist ethnographic research. In addition to promoting the challenging practice of feminist ethnography, this chapter accounts for its current status and its future in research endeavors.

The interview has been used frequently by feminist research as a way for researchers and participants to work together to illuminate experience. Marjorie L. DeVault and Glenda Gross (Chapter 11, this volume) discuss the complexity of the interview encounter and how the interview has been implemented in feminist research projects. Specifically paying attention to how identity, social location, reflexivity, and active listening operate in the interview, DeVault and Gross suggest ways of engaging in ethical, collaborative interviews. Ethicality is significant in this chapter, as DeVault and Gross emphasize the accountability and responsibility of the interviewer to the participants and to social change.

Structurally different from the interview, the survey can play an important role in feminist research projects. In their chapter regarding quantitative data, Kathi Miner, Toby Epstein

Jayaratne, Amanda Pesonen, and Lauren Zurbrügg (Chapter 12, this volume) point to the survey as offering useful applications to feminist research. The history and criticisms of survey research are presented, as are the influences of feminism on survey practices. Miner et al. flesh out the survey method and how feminist perspectives may be best applied to survey research.

The fact that the scientific community has come to accept that its practices are biased by values (gender being only one) is evidence, for Sue Rosser (Chapter 13, this volume), of feminism's contribution to the areas of science, technology, and medicine. Rosser explores the impact of feminist theories on different stages of the scientific method. To illustrate feminism's effects on scientific practice, she highlights theories that have incorporated feminist viewpoints to modify their experimental methods.

According to Sharon Brisolara and Denise Seigart (Chapter 14, this volume), feminist evaluation is still an emerging and developing model within feminist research. In order to understand feminist evaluation fully, these authors single out and highlight contributions to research projects that use multiple theoretical models. Among its possibilities for feminist research projects, evaluation research can allow for new questions to arise regarding its aims, methods, and results by paying attention to, for example, its ethics and possible biases.

Deboleena Roy (Chapter 15, this volume) delves into the development of feminist research practices within the natural sciences as influenced by feminist engagements with ontological and ethical questions. The feminist researcher should, as this chapter argues, consider questions of ethics and ontology while practicing the scientific method. Proposing the inclusions of "playfulness" and "feeling around" in feminist research, Roy suggests that the feminist laboratory researcher may work to connect himself or herself with the research at hand and with other researchers.

Not only looking at participatory action research (PAR) in terms of feminist usage in recent research, Brinton Lykes and Rachel Hershberg (Chapter 16, this volume) also summarize the origins of this research method, which is a resource for critical inquiry in working toward improving social systems and ameliorating social inequalities. PAR is deeply bound up with issues of relationships between coresearchers, processes of reflection, and change for communities and policy. PAR is manifested in many different ways, and Lykes and Hershberg analyze work that is characteristic of feminist PAR while identifying its limitations and possibilities.

The combination of qualitative and quantitative methods has emerged in research praxis, and Elizabeth Cole and Abigail Stewart (Chapter 17, this volume) discuss how such combinations contribute to feminist research. They identify various ways of mixing methods in order to demonstrate the many possibilities of combining qualitative and quantitative methods and to emphasize how widely such combinations may be applied. Cole and Stewart propose that feminist research may benefit from the use of both qualitative and quantitative approaches.

Situational analysis, an extension of grounded theory, brings notions of post-structuralism to feminist theories in order to highlight difference and power. Adele Clarke (Chapter 18, this volume) expands upon the definition of grounded theory and emphasizes its intrinsic links to feminist theory. Clarke shows how grounded theory's ties to feminism have been transformed from implicit to explicit by feminist research projects, and then she shows how situational analysis, similarly, is feminist.

Social movement research, Sarah Maddison and Frances Shaw (Chapter 19, this volume) believe, can benefit from further connections to feminist epistemology and methodology. While feminist social movement scholars have brought a gendered focus to social movement scholarship and theory, research on collective identity can further incorporate feminist standpoints in order to reconfigure its analytic method, and Maddison and Shaw use a case study to show the intersection of feminism and social movement research.

Lynn Weber and Jenn Castellow (Chapter 20, this volume) present, first, feminist research bent on working against health disparities and then, strategies for better locating feminist intersectional health research in dialogues around health science and public policy. Looking at recent scholarship that refines feminist critiques of health science research and policy and at developments in feminist health theory and practice, Weber and Castellow examine the contributions and influences of feminist research on health

science practices and policies. Studies relating to recent health developments (e.g., the HPV vaccine and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010) help to show how feminist engagement with health-related policies and practices are able to draw attention to power hierarchies within social relationships.

Dialogues about feminist research within the social sciences have also failed to include social work, argue Stéphanie Wahab, Ben Anderson-Nathe, and Christina Gringeri (Chapter 21, this volume). Drawing attention to examples of feminist research within the realm of social work, Wahab et al. suggest that social work praxis may beneficially influence feminist research projects in the social sciences generally. Further, a social work engagement with feminist theory may help to disrupt the assumptions of knowledge that social work often makes.

By closely looking at writing practices within feminist research reports, Kathy Charmaz (Chapter 22, this volume) is able to answer questions about the construction of feminist research writings and about the strategies that feminist researchers employ in their written reports. Carefully reading feminist research reports is significant, Charmaz argues, because the writing strategies employed contain the researchers' views and values. Certain writing patterns, used consciously or not on the part of the writers, contain specific meanings and judgments, and so the process of writing itself becomes central to the conveying of research data. Charmaz reinforces the importance of written method and concludes by offering advice on the writing process.

Specifically using climate change research as an example, Kristen Intemann (Chapter 23, this volume) argues that research principles praised by feminist science scholarship can benefit scientific research. Intemann proposes that scientific communities should include diverse researchers (in terms of experiences, social positions, and values), allow for critical reflection on the chosen methodology and methods, assume the perspective of the marginalized, and work toward a multiplicity of conceptual models.

Part III. Feminist Issues and Insights in Practice and Pedagogy

Judith Roof's chapter, "Authority and Representation in Feminist Research," provides a historical context for looking at how feminist researchers have framed issues of power and authority and argues that feminists are "trading between the authority of science and the power of experience." In particular, she notes the tensions between "the impersonal practices of generalization and the more problematic questions of rhetoric and representation" (Roof, Chapter 25, this volume).

Alison Wylie (Chapter 26, this volume) is concerned with how scientific practices are carried out by feminists. Carefully noting the fact that the credibility of a scientific research project may be damaged or compromised by an explicit feminist approach, Wylie believes that a reconfiguration of standpoint theory may offer a way out of this problem. Wylie provides an overview of specific practices that will combat this challenge to credibility and affirms that feminist theory and scientific research can coexist to produce generative research projects.

Judith Preissle and Yuri Han's chapter, "Feminist Research Ethics," examines feminist challenges to traditional Western approaches to ethics. They conceptualize feminist ethics as an "ethics of care" and discuss the implications of a feminist ethical approach for the practice of social research. What are the specific ethical practices feminist researchers employ across the research process? Preissle and Han note that a feminist perspective on ethics is a double-edged endeavor, which will "likely generate as many issues as they may help either avoid or address. This is particularly evident in trading a detached, distant, and hierarchical stance for an intimate, close, and equitable position. Distance and intimacy create their own problems" (Preissle & Han, Chapter 28, this volume).

The relationship between feminism and transgender, transsexual, and queer studies is elucidated in Katherine Johnson's chapter (Chapter 29, this volume). Central debates within queer studies are set forth in order to identify theoretical points that have particular relevance to feminist researchers. Feminist research, Johnson argues, should adopt practices that take into account a variety of identity positions. Exploring definitions, terminology, and areas for coalitions to emerge across identity borders, for example, Johnson looks both at the dialogues between feminism and transgender, transsexual, and queer studies and at how the fields may work together to produce better research.

Deborah Piatelli and my chapter (Chapter 27, this volume) stresses the need for a holistic approach to the process of reflexivity that runs "from the formulation of the research problem, to the shifting positionalities of the researcher and participants, through interpretation and writing." We provide specific research examples and strategies for implementing "holistic reflexivity" in the research process.

Attention to difference is often found in feminist research. Diane Reay (Chapter 30, this volume) looks at how feminist research addresses difference and how difference affects research praxis. Reay provides examples of how differences are navigated and handled by drawing on research that accounts for differences such as social class, ethnicity, political commitment, sexuality, and age. This chapter also puts forth research practices that may be successful at incorporating feminist theory.

Jennifer Bickham Mendez and Diane Wolf (Chapter 31, this volume) question how feminist research can better account for globalization. Mendez and Wolf suggest that global considerations may allow for the reconfiguration of analytical categories and models and may also allow for productive change in research practice. Awareness of the global community may enable researchers to better understand certain forms of women's oppression in globalized power structures and, furthermore, provides the opportunity for feminist researchers to forge transnational research bonds. Feminist dialogue and research, Mendez and Wolf believe, will be expanded and enriched by a consideration of globalization.

An experiential account of feminist pedagogy is offered by Debra Kaufman and Rachel Lewis (Chapter 32, this volume), who analyze the ways in which their feminist perspectives have influenced their methods of teaching in the classroom. Kaufman and Lewis demonstrate how classroom learning may benefit from the use of feminist theory, as they view the classroom as a space in which knowledge across disciplines can be decentered and reworked. Approaching questions of knowledge production within the classroom illuminates the hierarchical structures that position knowledge. Kaufman and Lewis conclude with the possibilities for incorporating feminist perspectives in academia as well as the possible dangers of doing so.

With similar interests in the role of feminism in teaching, Daphne Patai (Chapter 33, this volume) asks what it means to apply the term "feminism" to research and pedagogical practices. She views feminist politics as possibly incongruous with teaching and research. Teaching, for Patai, requires a perspective different than that offered by feminism, which introduces a political project. Patai's chapter troubles the links between knowledge and politics.

The intersection of feminism and teaching again arises in Debjani Chakravarty, Judith A. Cook, and Mary Margaret Fonow's chapter (Chapter 34, this volume). In order to develop and distribute feminist methodology, it must be taught. Training in feminist research methodology should teach a feminist researcher to create and execute a research project while considering its multiple and varied effects (e.g., ethical, social, transnational, political). Feminist research, this chapter argues, has always held the workings of power structures as a central focus, but new to feminist research are trends of technological development and the expansion of feminist methodology into other realms.

Abigail Brooks and I provide a fuller context and discussion of these articles in the introductory chapter to Part III, "Challenges and Strategies in Feminist Knowledge Building, Pedagogy, and Praxis."

Conclusion

It is my hope that this *Handbook* provides you with a set of unique knowledge frameworks to enhance your understanding of the social world, especially the range of women's lived experiences. The *Handbook* contributors explore a range of feminist issues, themes, and questions including a commitment to the empowerment of women and other oppressed groups. Although the *Handbook* is by no means exhaustive, its authors take an in-depth look at a broad spectrum of some of the most important feminist perspectives on how a given methodology intersects with epistemology and method to produce a set of research practices. Our thesis is that any given feminist perspective does not preclude the use of specific methods but serves to guide how a given method is practiced. Whereas each perspective is distinct, they sometimes share elements with other perspectives.

The ground underneath the theory and practice of feminist research is ever evolving, and it is the shifting of these tectonic plates of knowledge that provides an opportunity for what Teresa de Lauretis (1988) suggests as "not merely an expansion or reconfiguration of boundaries, but a qualitative shift in political and historical consciousness" (pp. 138–139).

References

Anzaldúa, Gloria. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza.* San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. (1990). *Bridge, drawbridge, sandbar or island.* In Lisa Albrecht & Rose M. Brewer (Eds.), *Bridges of power: Women's multicultural alliances* (pp. 216–231). Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Barrett, Michèle, & Phillips, Anne. (1992). *Destabilizing theory: Contemporary feminist debates.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Bhavnani, Kum-Kum. (1993). Tracing the contours: Feminist research and feminist objectivity. *Women's Studies International Forum, 16,* 95–104.

Bordo, Susan. (1990). Feminism, postmodernism, and gender-skepticism. In Linda Nicholson (Ed.), *Feminism/postmodernism* (pp. 133–156). London: Routledge.

Bowles, Gloria, & Duelli-Klein, Renate D. (Eds.). (1983). *Theories of women's studies.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Burt, Sandra, & Code, Lorraine. (Eds.). (1995). *Changing methods: Feminists transforming practice.* Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.

Butler, Judith. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex."* New York: Routledge.

Chafetz, Janet Saltzman. (1999). Some thoughts by an unrepentant "positivist" who considers herself a feminist nonetheless. In Sharlene Hesse-Biber, Christine Gilmartin, & Robin Lydenberg (Eds.), *Feminist approaches to theory and methodology* (pp. 320–329). New York: Oxford University Press.

Cixous, Hélène, & Clément, Catherine. (1986). *The newly born woman*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Code, Lorraine. (1991). *What can she know? Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. (1990). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment.* New York: Routledge.

Comte, Auguste. (2000). *The positive philosophy of Auguste Comte* (Vol. 1, Harriet Martineau, Trans.). Kitchener, ON: Batoche Books. (Original work published 1896)

de Beauvoir, Simone. (1952). *The second sex.* New York: Vintage Books.

de Lauretis, Teresa. (1988). Displacing hegemonic discourses: Reflections on feminist theory in the 1980s. *Inscriptions, 3*(4), 127–145.

DeVault, Marjorie L. (1999). *Liberating method: Feminism and social research.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Dill, Bonnie Thornton. (1987). The dialectics of black womanhood. In Sandra Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and methodology* (pp. 97–108). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Durkheim, Émile. (1938). *The rules of sociological method.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press. (Original work published 1895)

Eichler, Margrit, & Lapointe, Jeanne. (1985). *On the treatment of the sexes in research.* Ottawa, ON: Social Sciences and Humanities Council.

Fonow, Mary Margaret, & Cook, Judith A. (Eds.). (1991). *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Friedan, Betty. (1963). *The feminine mystique.* New York: W. W. Norton.

Gluck, Sherna Berger, & Patai, Daphne. (Eds.). (1991). *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history.* New York: Routledge.

Haraway, Donna. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies, 14*(13), 575–599.

Harding, Sandra. (Ed.). (1987a). *Feminism and methodology.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, Sandra. (1987b). Introduction. In Sandra Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and methodology* (pp. 1–14). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, Sandra. (1991). *Whose science, whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Harding, Sandra. (1993). Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is "strong objectivity"? In Linda Alcoff & Elizabeth Potter (Eds.), *Feminist epistemologies* (pp. 49–82). New York: Routledge.

Harding, Sandra. (Ed.). (2004). *The feminist stand-point theory reader: Intellectual and political controversies.* New York: Routledge.

Hartsock, Nancy. (1983). The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. In Sandra Harding & Merrill Hintikka (Eds.), *Discovering reality* (pp. 283–310). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene. (2002). Feminism and interdis-ciplinarity. In JoAnn DiGeorgio-Lutz (Ed.), *Women in higher education* (pp. 57–66). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene, Gilmartin, Christina, & Lydenberg, Robin. (Eds.). (1999). *Feminist approaches to theory and methodology: An interdisciplinary reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy, Leavy, Patricia, & Yaiser, Michelle L. (2004). Feminist approaches to research as a process: Reconceptualizing epis-temology, methodology, and method. In Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber & Michelle L. Yaiser (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on social research* (pp. 3–26). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene Nagy, & Leckenby, Denise. (2004). How feminists practice social research. In Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber & Michelle L. Yaiser (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on social research* (pp. 209–226). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hirsch, Marianna, & Keller, Evelyn Fox. (1990). Practicing conflict in feminist theory. In Marianne Hirsch & Evelyn Fox Keller (Eds.), *Conflicts in feminism* (pp. 370–385). New York: Routledge.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. (1975). The sociology of feeling and emotion: Selected possibilities. In Marcia Millman & Rosabeth Moss Kanter (Eds.), *Another voice: Feminist perspectives on social life and social science* (pp. 280–307). New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

hooks, bell. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cul-tural politics.* Boston: South End Press.

hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York: Routledge.

Irigaray, Luce. (1991). In M. Whitford (Ed.), *The Irigaray reader.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Jacobs, Harriet A. (1987). *Incidents in the life of a slave girl, written by herself.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1861)

Jaggar, Alison. (1997). Love and knowledge: Emotion in feminist epistemology. In Diana Tietjens Meyers (Ed.), *Feminist social thought: A reader* (pp. 385–405). New York: Routledge.

Kandiyoti, Deniz. (1999). Islam and patriarchy: A comparative perspective. In Sharlene Hesse-Biber, Christina Gilmartin, & Robin Lydenberg (Eds.), *Feminist approaches to theory and methodology: An interdisciplinary reader* (pp. 236–256). New York: Oxford University Press.

Kelly-Gadol, Joan. (1987). The social relation of the sexes: Methodological implications of women's history. In Sandra Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and methodology* (pp. 15–28). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Kincheloe, Joe L., & McLaren, Peter. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 279–313). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kuhn, Thomas. (1962). *The structure of scientific revo-lutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamphere, Louise, Ragone, Helena, & Zavella, Patricia. (Eds.). (1997). *Situated lives: Gender and culture in everyday life.* New York: Routledge.

Lather, Patty. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within/in the postmodern.* New York: Routledge.

Lorde, Audre. (1996). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In Audre Lorde (Ed.), *The Audre Lorde compendium: Essays, speeches and journals* (pp. 158–171). London: Harper Collins.

Martin, Emily. (1987). *The woman in the body: A cul-tural analysis of reproduction.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Maynard, Mary, & Purvis, June. (Eds.). (1994). *Researching women's lives from a feminist per-spective.* London: Taylor & Francis.

McIntosh, Patricia. (1995). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in wom-en's studies. In Margaret Andersen & Patricia Hill Collins (Eds.), *Race, class, and gender: An anthology* (pp. 76–86). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Millman, Marcia, & Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. (Eds.). (1975). *Another voice: Feminist perspectives on social life and social science.* New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Mohanty, Chandra. (1988). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review, 30,* 61–88.

Mohanty, Chandra. (1999). Women workers and capitalist scripts: Ideologies of domination, common interests, and the politics of solidarity. In Sharlene Hesse-Biber, Christine Gilmartin, & Robin Lydenberg (Eds.), *Feminist approaches to theory and methodology* (pp. 362–388). New York: Oxford University Press.

Naples, Nancy A. (2003). *Feminism and method: Ethnography, discourse analysis, and activist research.* New York: Routledge.

Neuman, W. Lawrence. (2000). *Social research methods.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Nielson, Joyce McCarl. (Ed.). (1990). *Feminist research methods: Exemplary readings in the social sciences.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Oakley, Ann. (1981). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), *Doing feminist research* (pp. 30–61). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Reinharz, Shulamit. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Helen. (Ed.). (1981). *Doing feminist research.* London: Routeledge & Kegan Paul.

Scott, Joan. (1999). The evidence of experience. In Christine Gilmartin & Robin Lydenberg (Eds.), *Feminist approaches to theory and methodology* (pp. 79–99). New York: Oxford University Press.

Sherif, Carolyn Wood. (1987). Bias in psychology. In Sandra Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and methodology* (pp. 37–56). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Smith, Dorothy E. (1978). A peculiar eclipsing: Women's exclusion from man's culture. *Women's Studies International Quarterly, 1*(4), 281–296.

Smith, Dorothy E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Smith, Dorothy E. (1990). *The conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples.* London: Zed Books.

Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (2005). On tricky ground: Researching the native in the age of uncertainty. In Norman K. Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 85–107). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Spalter-Roth, Roberta, & Hartmann, Heidi. (1996). Small happiness: The feminist struggle to integrate social research with social activism. In Heidi Gottfried (Ed.), *Feminism and social change: Bridging theory and practice* (pp. 206–224). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Spender, Dale. (Ed.). (1981). *Men's studies modified: The impact of feminism on the academic disciplines.* Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. (1990). *The postcolonial critic: Interviews, strategies, dialogue.* New York: Routledge.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravoty. (1994). Can the subaltern speak? In Patrick Williams & Laura Chrismen (Eds.), *Colonial discourse and post-colonial theory: A reader* (pp. 66–111). New York: Columbia University Press.

Sprague, Joey, & Zimmerman, Mark. (1993). Overcoming dualisms: A feminist agenda for sociological methodology. In Paula England (Ed.), *Theory on gender/feminism on theory* (pp. 255–280). New York: Aldine DeGruyter.

St. Pierre, Elizabeth, & Pillow, Wanda S. (Eds.). (2000). *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education.* New York: Routledge.

Stanley, Liz. (Ed) (1990). *Feminist praxis: Research, theory, and epistemology in feminist sociology*. London: Routledge.

Stanley, Liz, & Wise, Sue. (1983). *Breaking out: Feminist consciousness and feminist research.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Trinh, T. Minh-ha. (1991). *Framer framed.* New York: Routledge.

Tuana, Nancy. (Ed.). (1989a). *Feminism & science.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Tuana, Nancy. (1989b). The weaker seed: The sexist bias of reproductive theory. In Nancy Tuana (Ed.), *Feminism & Science* (pp. 147–171). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Wolf, Diane L. (Ed.). (1996). *Feminist dilemmas in fieldwork.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Woolf, Virginia. (1929). *A room of one's own.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

ORAL HISTORY TECHNIQUES:
How to Organize and Conduct
Oral History Interviews

Barbara Truesdell, Ph.D.
Assistant Director
Center for the Study of History and Memory
400 North Sunrise Drive
Weatherly Hall North, Room 122
Indiana University
Office: 812/855-2856
Email: ohrc@indiana.edu
URL: http://www.indiana.edu/~cshm

Introduction

Oral history interviewing is one more tool in the larger repertoire of methodologies used for research in history, anthropology, and folklore. Oral history collects information about the past from observers and participants in that past. It gathers data not available in written records about events, people, decisions, and processes. Oral history interviews are grounded in memory, and memory is a subjective instrument for recording the past, always shaped by the present moment and the individual psyche. Oral history can reveal how individual values and actions shaped the past, and how the past shapes present-day values and actions.

Every interviewing experience is unique; this is part of the charm of fieldwork. So while there is some validity in the adage, "The only way to learn how to do it is to do it," there are things you can do before, during, and after your interview to make every interview more successful.

Before the Interview

Set goals for your project before you begin.   First: what are you trying to learn? You might want to come up with a sentence or two that summarizes your research goals, so that you can easily explain to your interviewees what you are researching and why it is important. Second: what kinds of information already exist about your research topic, and in what form? For example, if you wanted to do a biography of a politician, you would want to look at campaign literature, political documents, other biographies that already exist—all the sources you could find that would tell you more about this person. If you were studying an event—for example, a strike in a factory—you would want to consult newspaper accounts, factory records, union records, perhaps even economic data that would indicate the effects of the strike. If you were studying a family member, the data you consult may be in different forms—scrapbooks, photographs, family heirlooms, diaries, etc. Third: you need to consider who you will need to interview to learn about your topic. Make a list of potential interviewees; this list will grow as you are referred to additional interviewees. It may not even be a list of names at first. For the

factory strike, for example, your list might include strikers, management, union representatives, police on the picket line, counter-demonstrators, etc. Fourth: what product(s) do you want to create from this study, and who is the audience for the product(s)? The answer to these questions will help you decide what kinds of information you'll need and in what medium to record it. For example, if you were planning to create a website, you would need to create digital audio or video files of your interviews. You would need digital scans of any photos or documents you wanted to upload as part of the history you are presenting. You would want to be sure that the people you interview know that their interview will be available to the whole world at the click of a mouse, and you will want to keep that in mind as you decide what to post on the website and what to leave out.

　　　　Prepare for each interview by knowing as much as you can about the person you'll be interviewing. Remember what information you want to gain from the interview, and design a list of questions with that focus in mind. Remain open-minded, however; data can take you in new directions as the research and the interviews progress. If you are going to be interviewing someone about whom few or no written record exists, learn more about the times and circumstances of their lives. For example, if you were studying a woman who was an Army nurse in World War II, you might have access to some records of her service, but you should also learn about that time in history and the role of an Army nurse so you can shape your questions to better capture the history she lived. Such knowledge will also assist you in establishing rapport with the interviewee by laying a groundwork of shared knowledge and confirming your interest in him/her.

　　　　Set up the appointment for the interview, confirm the appointment, and keep the appointment. Arrange to conduct the interview in a place and time most comfortable for the interviewee, away from noise and distractions.

　　　　Buy the best recording equipment you can afford. Know your equipment thoroughly, be it audio or video, and make sure it is in working order before you arrive at the interview. Test it again on site, with the interviewee and you both speaking on the recording to be sure you are both clearly audible. Use an adaptor in preference to batteries (so an extension cord is a good idea). If you use batteries, carry extra. Use high quality equipment and supplies; you get what you pay for. Use an external microphone that is stereo and omnidirectional in preference to the recorder's built-in microphone. Record at the highest quality level on your digital equipment— do not compress the files as you record. This means you may need to have extra memory sticks or digital tapes or CDs—whatever your particular machine uses—so be sure to bring them along with you. If your digital recording equipment (audio or video) has an ear bud that allows you to hear the recording as it is being made, get accustomed to using it and wear it during the interview to be sure there is no audio dropout or microphone failure.

　　　　Prepare a list of questions for the interview. You need not follow this list exactly; other questions will arise during the interview, but they will give a solid organization and cohesiveness to your interview. They also make it easier, if you do multiple interviews on a topic, to be sure you cover the same information with all your interviewees. Put the simplest questions, like biographical data, at the beginning, and the most complex or sensitive questions at the end. Group the questions logically, so you and your interview subject can easily follow the progression of ideas or chronology in the interview. If you are not sure of the wording of a

question you've constructed, try it out on another person. Another good way to check the focus of individual questions is to ask yourself, "What am I trying to learn with this question?"

Ask simply structured, single-topic questions. Compound questions (strings of questions linked together with "and"), multiple rephrasing, and false starts are harder to answer, and harder to transcribe. This is another good reason to prepare a list of questions in advance. Take your time. If you have more than one point to pursue on a given topic, compose follow-up questions. And if a point that hasn't occurred to you in composing your questionnaire flies by in the midst of an interviewee's answer, you can always go back to it later in the interview. Keep a pen handy to jot down a word or two during the interviewee's response to remind yourself to follow up on that point when the interviewee is done speaking.

Ask open-ended questions rather than questions that can be answered by yes or no. You want to encourage the fullest response possible to each question. Especially do not ask leading questions. You want people to feel free to tell their own stories and express their own opinions. For example, if you were interviewing a factory worker, you would not ask, "Don't you feel that management was hostile to your concerns?" but "What was the attitude of management to your concerns?"

Questions should be not only open-ended but concrete, avoiding as much as possible jargon or theoretical concepts (unless the jargon and concepts are part of the interviewee's experience). Remember that people's memories hang on substantial hooks. Asking for a description of a typical day or a family gathering, or breaking a subject down into its component elements (for a study of a factory, for example, asking about coworkers, work processes, job training, etc.) will give the interviewee points of reference from which to reminisce.

Interviews are generally improved by sending the interviewee a list of your questions or a summary of the topics you'll be asking about—in the latter case be sure that your summary is written in neutral terms that won't prejudice the interviewee toward a certain perspective. The point is to give the interviewee time before the interview to think about people and events that may not have occurred to him/her in a long time. Be sure to explain that the questionnaire or summary is only a framework, that other points may occur to both of you that could be included during the interview, and any question the interviewee does not want to answer can be skipped.

Be aware of your personal appearance before you go to the interview. The tone you set nonverbally can be as important to the interview's success as what you say. Your attire tells the interviewee something about how you view him/her and the interview itself. Casual clothes can suggest a more informal atmosphere, but they can also suggest a lack of care or respect to some interviewees; businesslike clothes can suggest a more formal, purposeful atmosphere, but can intimidate some interviewees. Try to match your appearance to what will best put the interviewee at ease with you and the interview process.

Be aware that there can be subject areas or data out of your reach because of some inhibiting factor in your relationship to the interviewee: sex, age, class, etc. Be sensitive to these factors, and try to work past them, but do not alienate the interviewee by pressing too hard for information he/she doesn't want to share. The single best strategy for bridging these kinds of obstacles is for the interviewer to show respect and courtesy to the interviewee, and to make the interview itself a "safe place" where the interviewee feels heard and understood. Part of that atmosphere comes from the interviewee understanding the goals of the interview, his/her role in

the research, his/her freedom to answer a question or not, and how the interview will be used. Part of that atmosphere comes from the interviewer being a friendly, non-judgmental, interested listener to the life experiences and opinions of the interviewee.

Unexpected barriers to full disclosure can also arise from your level of familiarity with the interviewee. Sharing a lot of history in common with the interviewee can be as challenging to work past as meeting the interviewee for the first time. This can be a particular challenge when interviewing family members. Things you both know can be taken for granted, and things taken for granted are generally unspoken. Try to stay alert for this kind of data, and do not be shy about stating what is (for both of you) obvious. Remember you are speaking for a third person, the audience for the interview or its product(s), who may not know either of you.

Know your ethical responsibilities as an interviewer. Be prepared to answer any questions the interviewee may have about the interview or the research project. Our Center uses an "informed consent" form that explains the interview process and the rights and responsibilities of both parties. You and the interviewee sign the informed consent form before beginning the interview, and the interviewee is given a copy. Have a "deed of gift"—a permission form—that summarizes what will be done with the interview, grants you (or the organization/institution you work for) permission to use the interview, and has room on it for the interviewee to state any restrictions or conditions on the interview's use. Both of you should sign this form at the close of the interview. The interviewee can wait to sign the deed of gift until after having reviewed the recording or transcript. The permission forms used by the Center for the Study of History and Memory can give you examples of the information they communicate. These forms can be modified according to your plans for the interviews gathered in your own project. Templates of our forms are available on our Center's website at http://www.indiana.edu/~cshm/forms.html. Be sure the interviewee reads and understands all forms before you begin the interview.

If you do not use a written informed consent, it is still a good idea to have an information sheet to give the interviewee which includes your contact information, or a checklist of information to go over with him/her before the interview begins so that he/she has a clear understanding of the interview process, the research goals, and his/her rights as a participant in the interview.

At the Interview

It is best to have a one-on-one interview so that the interviewee's attention is focused on you, and yours on him/her. If you can't avoid it, or choose to interview a couple or a group, be sure to identify on the recording all the people who take part in the interview. Note: you need signed forms from each participant in the interview. For people who may wander in once you've begun, use your judgment on getting signed forms depending on the person's contribution to the interview. Also note: if you do an interview with more than one person—a married couple, for example—it is generally the case that one is the conversation leader and one tends to be more quiet. It is up to you as interviewer to be sure that both people have the opportunity to answer the questions fully and without interruption or contradiction by the other spouse (which is why it is generally easier to do each person's interview separately!).

Let the interviewee suggest the interview location, whether that is their home or office or another location. Make sure the place chosen is quiet and away from outside distractions; if it is

not, have an alternative location to suggest that will provide a quiet, comfortable setting. Background noise can destroy an interview by making the recording unintelligible. Air conditioners, traffic noises, typewriters, clock chimes, ringing telephones, etc. should all be avoided if possible. It is important to examine the area around you before you begin the interview and choose the quietest location you have available to you.

Place the audio recorder and microphone between you and your subject on a solid surface (or attach the microphone to him/her if it is the clip-on type). Do not hold the microphone in your hand; use a microphone stand. Be aware that moving objects on the table, shuffling papers, or fidgeting (if the microphone is on the person) can cause noises that obscure the conversation. Know your microphone's strengths and weaknesses so you can plan around these kinds of disruptions as you set up the equipment. If you are using a video recorder, decide if you want yourself to appear on the recording, or if you will be speaking off camera. Test the video you are getting on site. You want to be sure the image is well lit, and the audio is clear. Set the camera so that if the interviewee leans or changes position, he/she won't be cut off or out of frame.

Some people are nervous about being recorded, and some people who might allow an audio recording might balk at a video recording. Be sure the interviewee understands before the meeting that you wish to record the interview and in what format. If he/she does not want to be videotaped, for example, but you are working on a video project, one possible compromise is an audio recording and a photo of the interviewee. Let your interviewee hear or see the playback when you test the equipment. Never start recording until the interviewee is ready to begin, and never record without that person's knowledge.

Start your recorded interview with a statement of the names of yourself and your interviewee(s), the date, and the location. This is very helpful when you have multiple recordings to sort through later. Then begin by collecting simple biographical information from the interviewee, such as full name, date of birth, and place of birth (which should also be at the beginning of your questionnaire). This helps put the interviewee at ease with being recorded and gets the basic information about your subject up front in the interview.

Once the recorder is running, focus on the interviewee, and give the machine only the minimum attention necessary to be sure it is recording smoothly. This will also help the interviewee focus on you instead of the machine. Do not turn off the recording during an interview unless the interviewee asks you to, or the interviewee is called away (by a phone call, for example). The only other time to turn off the recorder would be if the interviewee becomes upset (for example, becomes tearful remembering the death of a close family member) and needs a moment to regain composure. It is your responsibility to monitor the well being of your interviewee. If you are doing a long interview, creating regular breaks give you time to check the equipment as well as a chance for your interview subject (and you) to stretch or get a drink. This alleviates fatigue and is beneficial to both of you. Be sure to turn the equipment on again when the interviewee is ready to resume talking "on the record."

Speak at a sedate pace, and speak clearly. The tone you set will generally be echoed by the interviewee.

After you ask a question, stop...and wait for the answer, even if you have to sit in silence for several seconds. Subjects often need several moments to think about the questions you ask.

Give them quiet time; do not feel you need to leap in right away with a rephrased question or a different question. The silence is not really as long as it feels!

Once the answer comes, do not cut off or talk over an interviewee. Some people do like to go on and on, but let them talk to the end of their strand of thought and wait for an opening patiently. Cutting them off gives the impression that what they're saying isn't important to you, or that you are hurrying through the interview.

Verify verbally when people make gestures or point out something. The audio recorder can't see; this won't be as much of an issue if you are videotaping the interview. For example: "The fish was this big." Interviewer: "About eighteen inches." Or "The bandstand was over there." Interviewer: "Across the street by the pond."

Keep alert for cues from the interviewee that he/she will expand on a topic you bring up provided you let them know you want to hear it. For example, if an interviewee says, "Oh, that wasn't much of a problem, although I can think of several times where it was," it is a cue to say, "Would you like to tell me about those times?" This not only shows you are listening and enhances rapport with the interviewee; it can also give you good material the interviewee won't volunteer otherwise.

By the same token, keep alert for clues that the interviewee is uncomfortable with a question or line of questioning. This is more often clued in by body language than verbally, although some interviewees won't hesitate to tell you how they feel about a question! Remember you can prevent this rapport-damaging eventuality by letting the interviewee know before the interview begins that he/she has the right at any time to refuse to answer a question, and that will not offend you.

Be alert to your own responses to an interviewee's remarks, taking care not to sound judgmental, impatient, or disrespectful. An interview is not the place to show off how much you know, or to take issue with an interviewee's memories, beliefs, or opinions. It is not about you! Remember: you are that "safe place" in which the interviewee can be heard and understood. All interviewees are to be treated with unfailing courtesy, respect, and gratitude for the privilege of sharing a part of their lives with you. Even if you come away with nothing that you feel is of material benefit to your project, you can consider any interview a success if you have maintained a positive, polite, professional stance throughout the interview.

One last element of interviewee behavior to keep an eye on, especially with older subjects, is fatigue. Interviewing is a tiring process; it is emotionally and intellectually challenging for both you and the interviewee. If the person is showing signs of weariness, it is better to adjourn and take up the interview another time than to press on with an interviewee who's too tired to think clearly any longer but too polite to tell you enough is enough. You can always reschedule and continue the interview another time.

After the Interview

Unless the interviewee is pressed for time, do not run right out after an interview. Once the recorder is turned off, there is always time to say thank you, to chat about the process you've just undergone together, and often to hear the best stories or most important data the interviewee has said during your entire meeting. That's why it is a good idea not to put the machine away at once; you can always turn it on again (with the interviewee's permission) to get one more story

down. This is also where keeping field notes on each interview experience comes in handy. Field notes can remind you of the major topics of the interview, your impressions of how the interview questions worked or didn't work as you expected, and any special requests you need to follow up for the interviewee. These notes are for the your own use. They can be very helpful in providing a quick reference point for the interview context and the data gathered.

Be sure that the interviewee signs the deed of gift, or that you both understand clearly what the interviewee wants to do (hear the recording or edit the transcript, for example) before signing it. If you intend to submit your interviews to an established archive, use their forms and know what information they will need to accompany the interview when you deposit it. Be sure the interviewee knows where the interview will be deposited, and that this arrangement is acceptable to both the interviewee and the archive. If you intend to archive the materials yourself, be sure you have made plans for what will happen to the interviews after your death, and be sure the interviewee is aware of that plan as well.

It is very important to label recordings completely and carefully. In digital terms, that means labeling the physical medium--the CD or digital tape, for example--but it also means creating good identifying data for the digital files stored on your computer, such as a file name that is the interviewee's full name and the date of the interview. Having a good file naming system and applying it consistently will save you time when you're looking for a particular interview later.

Collateral materials are documents or photos or material artifacts that accompany or supplement an interview. If these are loaned to you, be sure to copy or scan them, and return them promptly. If they are given to you to keep or to pass on to an archive, be sure to label them as carefully as the recordings, and to store with them whatever explanatory notes may be needed to explain the significance of the artifact and to easily link it back to the interview recording.

Transcription can be full, partial, or a list of keywords or short descriptions accompanied by times to approximate their location in the interview. Depending on the software you are using, digital files can also be marked so a listener can move from one section to the next. Choose the transcription format that best suits your needs. Archives prefer verbatim transcripts, of course; a transcript is simply easier to use than an audio recording. Be aware it can take four to five hours to do a verbatim transcript of one hour of an audio recording. While there are software programs that can take the place of a transcribing machine for your digital files, and even have a foot pedal that can plug into a USB port, at this writing voice recognition software is still not able to fully replace transcribing oral history interviews. If you are submitting your interviews to an archive, find out their stylistic requirements for transcripts. Be sure that whatever style you use, you put the names of all participants, the date of the interview, and distinguish the speakers from each other (for example, our Center uses the initials of the last names to identify speakers). Number the pages of your transcript, and use a header with the last name of the interviewee so pages from different interviews cannot easily be mixed up.

Send a thank-you note to your interviewee. If any special arrangements were made between you—for example, for copies of the interview, a follow-up interview, or a copy of the final product(s)—reiterate these promises in the note, and follow up on your promises.

Bibliography

I have listed below a few excellent resources that discuss interview topics, techniques, and ethics in more detail. Additional citations can be found on our Center's website. If you have particular questions about doing oral history, please feel free to contact our Center.

DUNAWAY, David, and BAUM, Willa K. *Oral History: An Interdisciplinary Anthology*. Second Edition. AltaMira Press, 1996. ISBN 0-7619-9188-3.

MACKAY, Nancy. *Curating Oral Histories: From Interview to Archive*. Left Coast Press Inc., 2007. ISBN 978-1-59874-058-5.

ORAL HISTORY ASSOCIATION. *Principles and Best Practices: Principles for Oral History and Best Practices for Oral History*. Adopted October 2009. http://www.oralhistory.org/do-oral-history/principles-and-practices/

PERKS, Robert, and THOMSON, Alistair, editors. *The Oral History Reader*. Routledge, 1998. ISBN 0-415-13351-1.

RITCHIE, Donald A. *Doing Oral History*. Twayne Publishers, 1995. ISBN 0-8057-9128-0.

SOMMER, Barbara W., and QUINLAN, Mary Kay. *The Oral History Manual*. AltaMira Press, 2002. ISBN 0-7591-0101-9.

YOW, Valerie Raleigh. *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*. Sage Publications, 1994. ISBN 0-8039-5579-0.

Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations

Brooke Ackerly
Vanderbilt University

AND

Jacqui True
University of Auckland

How can we study power and identify ways to mitigate its abuse in the real world when we, as researchers, also participate in the projection of power through knowledge claims? Informing epistemological perspective, theoretical choices, research design, data collection, data analysis, exposition of findings, and venues for sharing findings, feminism offers many answers. We argue that the most important feminist tool for guiding international relations scholarship is *the research ethic*. This research ethic is the research practice associated with a critical feminist theory that is reflective of the normative concerns of constructivist, critical, post-modern, and post-colonial theories. It offers International Relations researchers feminist standards for assessing research despite feminism's multiplicity and its defiance of attempts to delimit its practice. This article sets out a feminist research ethic for improving international relations (IR) scholarship, regardless of whether it is feminist or not. We then show that this research practice can also help the researcher resolve ethical dilemmas in research in ethical ways that enhance the quality of the research.

International relations (IR) scholarship is situated in a theoretical, academic, and global context in which power is both visible and invisible, often concealed by the structures that normalize potentially oppressive practices and values (see Ackerly and True 2008). In this article, we offer a practical device for the international relations researcher to attend to that power and we outline what that means for the actual research process. We use the theoretical insights of a critical feminist perspective to set out a research ethic (a set of questioning practices) that has implications for the research process and that can function as a compass when any international studies researcher, feminist or not, faces dilemmas in research. These dilemmas are numerous and range from how to transcend binary thinking about war/peace, order/anarchy, man/woman in studying the impact of a war on women and men to how to confront the inability of a research subject to offer "data" from her standpoint because of her marginalization. What does feminist-informed empirical research look like and what impact can feminist reflection have on IR research?[1]

---

[1] We have chosen the term "feminist-informed" to refer to research that draws on theoretical, methodological and empirical insights from a diverse body of feminist theories and feminist research.

How can we study power and identify ways to mitigate its abuse in the real world when we, as international relations researchers, also participate in the powerful projection of knowledge in this world? How do our subjectivities, research subjects, and the power relations between us affect the research process? How can we avoid introducing biases and exclusions through unexamined assumptions? In this article, we draw on key insights from a broad spectrum of feminist theories to show how these theories inform empirical inquiry. Feminism does not tell us what to research. It does not tell us to use one theoretical perspective over another. It does not tell us to use qualitative or quantitative methods. Rather, we argue, it can improve our scholarship at every stage by guiding our reflection about our question, theoretical conceptualization, research design, or methods in specified (though not specific) ways regardless of our theoretical, methodological, or other orientation.

Who needs feminism? Scholars who want to reflect carefully on the power exercised through their knowledge claims (which post-modern and post-colonial theories encourage), but who do not wish to abandon international relations as a social science able to make some knowledge claims about international politics. At any phase of research any researcher can reflect about her or his work using the research ethic we outline. A series of research considerations that do not map narrowly onto questions of research design, the feminist research ethic is an essential heuristic device for non-feminist and feminist IR researchers.

In the first part of this article, we discuss four commitments that undergird a feminist research ethic: attentiveness to the power of epistemology, boundaries, relationships and the situatedness of the researcher. The research ethic we provide enables scholars who wish to engage in feminist-informed inquiry to do so without themselves having to become feminist theorists. In the second part of this article, we discuss two examples from recent critical feminist-informed scholarship to highlight dilemmas of ethics and power in the research process. Through these examples, we illustrate how paying attention to epistemology, boundaries, relationships and the researcher's own situatedness within the research process leads us to decisions about research questions, methodologies, methods for data collection, and even choice of data. Using such a feminist-informed research ethic, which is a set of questions not decisive answers, scholars of international relations can assess the methodological choices of others and make their own decisions. Whereas the guiding considerations of the research ethic are specific; the researcher's answers to them are her or his own.

In an article on research *ethics* we would also argue that the feminist research ethic is an *ethical* practice. In this article, we focus on the merits of the feminist research ethic as a *research* practice for improving the quality (the knowledge claims) of our scholarship.

Part I: Feminist Theory as a Research Ethic

Feminist theory has made empirical work particularly challenging because feminist theories reveal the politics in every aspect of the research process.[2] Feminist theories commit feminist researchers to exploring absence, silence, difference, oppression and the power of epistemology. For example, criticisms of the sexism of science compel feminist empirical researchers to be attentive to, and indeed consciously to look and listen for silences and absences in the research process,

---

[2]Feminist scholars in the 1970s began by analyzing the everyday contexts in which knowledge was generated. On the basis of that detailed analysis, they developed a methodological perspective that views the research process as central to any account of feminist research and as itself part of the research findings that should be subject to critical evaluation. See Harding (1987); Hartsock (1983); Hesse-Biber and Yaiser (2004); Lather (1986); Sandoval (2000); Mohanty (2003); Millen (1997).

and not only those relating to women's subjectivity (see Ackerly and True forth-coming, Chapter 1; Benhabib 1986). These commitments have generated aspira-tions to do empirical work that, if fully practiced, would leave many scholars forever researching, always listening for new voices, always (respectfully) hearing cacophony, always suspicious of certain harmonies or recurring themes. IR schol-ars with empirical questions have to wrestle with this irony, allowing it to affect their research without allowing it to derail their research; for, not to do feminist-informed research would be to perpetuate the invisibility of gendered absences, silences, differences, and oppressions and the violations of human rights they conceal.[3]

The *feminist research ethic* is a commitment to inquiry about how we inquire. The research ethic involves being attentive to (1) the power of knowledge, and more profoundly, of epistemology (defined below), (2) boundaries, marginaliza-tion, and silences, (3) relationships and their power differentials, and (4) our own situatedness as researchers. We need to be aware of how our own basket of privileges and experiences conditions our knowledge and research. However, the feminist-informed researcher's commitment to self-reflection is not merely a commitment to reflecting on his identity as a researcher but rather, to noticing and thinking through silences in epistemology, boundaries, and power dynamics (of the research process itself) from a range of theoretical perspectives *as he does his research.*

Attentiveness to Epistemology

Feminism is a critical research process that has the potential to transform the IR discipline *and* the world that we study (cf. Sprague and Zimmerman 1993; Hesse-Biber and Yaiser 2004; Hawkesworth 2006). As Harding and Norberg (2005) note "research processes themselves [re]produce power differences" (2005:2012), including power differences between different ways of knowing. An epistemology is the system of thought that we use to distinguish fact from belief. An epistemol-ogy is itself a belief system about what constitutes knowledge, evidence, and con-vincing argument, and how scholarship contributes to these. Our epistemology has significant authority in our research. The insight from feminist theoretical reflection on epistemology is that it is possible, and indeed essential, to reflect on the epistemologies that inform our own work. Disciplines, colleagues, researcher subjects, co-authors, research assistants, and coders may be working from related or different epistemologies. Feminists are known for having chal-lenged scientific research and how scientific method is used, particularly in social science, as a way of masking the researcher's subjectivity (Bowles and Klein 1983).[4] Recognizing that there are many epistemological perspectives each open-ing and foreclosing certain understandings of what it means to know and to con-tribute to shared knowledge enhances our study. In part II, we show that such reflection can happen at all stages of the research process.

The feminist research ethic is above all a commitment to *destabilizing our episte-mology,* but it is also a commitment to deciding when it is time to move on from reflecting on one problem in order to reflect on another (Dever 2004; Ackerly

---

[3]Feminist scholars make similar arguments about the political context and engagement of all scholarship, and the importance within feminist scholarship of recognizing the constitutive effects of our scholarship on the world we study. See Enloe (1993); Enloe (2000); Gluck and Patai (1991); Pettman (1992); Stacey (1999); Staeheli and Nagar (2002); Sylvester (2002); D.L. Wolf (1996); M. Wolf (1992).

[4]For example, reflecting on epistemology has encouraged some feminist researchers to adopt deconstructionist strategies to address the power of knowing, including their own subjectivity. Such an approach has inspired feminist research that involves critical readings of texts—where gender symbolism is produced and reproduced—and of gen-der as a text or script rather than a material or bodily truth. See Stern (2006); Pin-Fat and Stern (2005); Hansen (2001); Berman (2003).

2008b). A de-stabilizing epistemology should not prevent us from doing research; it should enable us to do it better. We have an ethical commitment to noticing the power of epistemology, particularly the power of privileged epistemologies (including our own). We can recognize this dynamic in our own scholarship (Ackerly and True forthcoming), in feminist-informed IR (Ackerly and True 2006), and in the IR discipline as a whole (Ackerly and True 2008). A destabilizing epistemology enables us to practice the feminist research ethic, to ask important questions about context, change, interrelatedness, relationships of power, boundaries, and embedded epistemology in ways that empower the researcher to break new ground.

Noticing the challenge of working within gendered forces in order to study, deconstruct, and contribute to a movement for transforming or reconstructing these forces is one ethical inspiration the IR empiricist gets from feminist reflection about epistemology. The feminist researcher must be attentive to the constraints on his or her imagination coming from all global social processes including research processes. The purpose is not to privilege the epistemological standpoint of the most marginalized, but rather to adopt an epistemological perspective that requires the scholar to inform her inquiry with a range of perspectives throughout the research process (see Ackerly 2008b).

Experience in the field, conversing with research subjects, led Maria Stern (2005) to destabilize her feminist standpoint epistemology and to shift her theoretical perspective (2005, 2006). Stern started out collecting life histories to consider how women define their security based on a politicized feminist standpoint that takes seriously women's experiences and the neglect of these experiences in international relations theories. During the research process, she discovered that both her subjects' and her own epistemologies were shifting in part because of the research which involved the narration and mutual construction of identities. Should a scholar of international security pay attention to her subjects' *feelings* of security and political identity? What does that even mean? What would be silenced or marginalized by continuing with a methodology that treated security and political identity as fixed when the research revealed that these were fluid? Should the relative privileges of researcher and research informant affect the epistemology from which research begins as well as the research question, design, or methods that follow from it?

As Stern's example illustrates destabilizing disciplinary and one's own epistemologies may reveal epistemological biases that come from feminist theory itself. Destabilizing one's epistemology may also reveal other dynamics of power to which a researcher needs to attend—particularly boundaries and relations—and it lays bare the need for the researcher to notice her own situatedness. These are the other three elements of the feminist research ethic.

Attentiveness to Boundaries

A feminist research ethic entails a commitment to a research process that requires being attentive to boundaries and their power to marginalize. It may involve interrogating forms of inclusion and exclusion and breaking down boundaries. Likewise it may involve listening for silences and/or responsibly sustaining those silences depending on the context. There are many boundaries that can inhere in the research process, for instance between disciplines, the researcher and the researched, among research subjects and researchers with different epistemologies or who use different theoretical perspective and methods. Not all boundaries are unjust or unnecessary, but we must be attentive to their power to exclude and marginalize both human subjects and possible research phenomena (see also Devetak 2005). We should, therefore, examine the

function of boundaries and consider their effects on what is important for us to study and how we can study it.

The research ethic alerts us to the implications of disciplinary boundaries for accurate knowledge across a range of different fields. Research is often impoverished by accepting the conventional boundaries that separate disciplines. In particular, the study of women and women's lives has often been neglected precisely because of these disciplinary boundaries and the desire to maintain them even in the face of new and relevant data. Feminist attentiveness to disciplinary boundaries reveals how the political boundaries of the state system shape our knowledge about IR and continue to render women invisible as international subjects and actors (see Peterson 1992; Tickner 2001; True, 2005).

In setting up our inquiry, we reflect upon the IR disciplinary boundaries that might incline one researcher to be more attentive to a certain body of literature and another to other literature even though, in an interdisciplinary context, they would appreciate the insights of both disciplinary literatures. Guided by the feminist research ethic, attentiveness to disciplinary boundaries should encourage us to become more interdisciplinary in our search for knowledge and inspiration.

With respect to boundaries among research subjects, the feminist research ethic guides our consideration of the possible research populations or subjects. Have we considered all possible research subjects or have we overlooked potentially important informants? What is our rationale for including some subjects and not others? How is the potential for selection bias addressed? Will some research subjects be silenced or excluded by our research questions, our method of data collection, or our choice of other informants? In reflecting on our selection of interview or survey respondents, we might deliberately choose an anti-snowball sampling technique in order to find informants who are not part of the same network in one research project and who do not merely confirm or consent to shared understandings and analyses (Ackerly 2008a,b), and use snowball sampling in another where we need to generate informants through networks (True 2003).

A feminist research ethic helps us to put into practice our awareness of the way humanly-constructed boundaries (or lack thereof) can lead to marginalization, exclusion and silencing in our research process involving real world subjects. It reminds us that boundaries are an inevitable part of knowledge-creation but that, as feminist-informed scholars, we need to be conscious of and take responsibility for their intended and unintended effects.

Attentiveness to Relationships

A feminist research ethic is concerned with the ways in which social, political, and economic actions are interrelated with others' actions and lives, including the actions and lives of our research subjects. Attentiveness to interconnections may lead us to reflect on identities, but these epistemological dilemmas are not concluded by identity questions, which may be multiple (Fraser 1995; Worell and Johnson 1997).

For some feminist IR scholars, the recognition of human embeddedness in relationships to others leads us to an ethic of care or moral responsibility that is not confined to women's experience (for example, Robinson 2006; Tronto 2006). This anti-essentialist interpretation of the importance of relationships provides an important counter hypothesis to a gender identity politics that can be read as giving women's social and political positions the status of nature (Elshtain 1987; Ruddick 1989). For other feminist-informed scholars recognition of human interconnections requires empirically mapping those interconnections. For instance, some feminist scholars critically analyze the linkages between women consumers and producers in the global market to forge a global political

movement that could advance women's economic rights and well-being more universally (see Barrientos 2001; Carr 2004).

Without a feminist research ethic that *requires* us to be attentive to these relationships we may easily overlook the power dynamics within and across the subject organizations we research among our informants, and between translators and interview subjects. All good researchers want to attend to these things but the feminist research ethic compels and guides our doing so. Other relations that inform feminist inquiry include relations of production and reproduction, signification and representation, power and subjection.

Situating the Researcher

The final element of the feminist research ethic asks the researcher to situate herself within the three preceding power dynamics—of epistemology, boundaries, and human relations—and to attend to these as a matter of methodology.

Self-reflection is good practice for all researchers. But the feminist research ethic invites the researcher to be particularly reflective about her situatedness as a researcher. For example, all feminism is global, because of *globalization*. We define globalization as a set of fundamentally constitutive social, cultural, economic and political processes (and not merely economic transactions across borders) that "promote competing models of gendered social relations on a global scale" (True 2003:165). How does a researcher's particular situatedness in globalization affect her epistemology, her belief system about how to study global politics?

The researcher also needs to situate herself with respect to the ways in which being a researcher is itself a boundary that affects research. Boundaries between the researcher and the researched inhere in the research process with often negative implications given the purpose or conceptualization of our research. For example, a boundary between the research subject and the researcher in ethnographic research conventionally determines the authenticity of field knowledge. However, if we are attentive to the boundary between the researcher and the research subject as an exercise of disciplinary power, then to transgress that boundary may be an important methodological move for destabilizing disciplinary power and rethinking community knowledge claims. Yet this same move might also undermine the research's disciplinary legitimacy if she does not replace the methodological purpose of the boundary between researcher and research subject with another methodological device.

Being attentive to relationships in our research means recognizing not only the power dynamics among research subjects (organizations or individuals) and the relationships of power in which they are embedded, but also between the researcher and their research subjects or between researchers. These dynamics may have important consequences for our research process and findings, as well as resource and reputational implications for our research subjects.

For a feminist-informed researcher interested in engaging in the academic study of the political projects of feminists and women's movements, the researcher's own identity as a scholar, policy analyst, or advocate may be multiple. The ethical challenges posed by this multiplicity may be less obvious for the scholar whose research question is not specifically connected to feminist political action, but it is no less imperative.

The feminist research ethic asks us to be attentive to these connections in order to do *responsible* IR scholarship (Tickner 2006). Feminist-informed scholarship is responsible scholarship as measured by the standards of the IR field and by our critical standards which may demand more ethical reflection than other perspectives in the IR discipline.

Committed to reflection on her research process, the researcher can attend to her own epistemological myopia and those of the IR discipline without rendering herself unable to research given the prospect of on-going self-reflection. That is, a feminist-informed research ethic entails a commitment to revisiting epistemological choices, boundaries, and relationships throughout the research process. Most importantly, committed to the politics of every stage of the research process, the feminist researcher guides her work with a research ethic. In the next part of this article we show how it is possible to attend to each of the four aspects of the research ethic by working through two examples of feminist-informed research projects at particular points in the research process.

Conclusion

Although these four ways of interrogating IR research can slow the research process, they ultimately provide scholars of international relations and others who study power ways of revealing and attending to power. When we attend to power dynamics using the feminist research, power is the researcher's subject and not the researcher power's agent.

Part II: Applying the Feminist Research Ethic for Ethical and Good Research

In the first part of this essay we argued that a feminist research ethic is not an ethical practice but a research practice. In this second part, we illustrate that this good research practice can also help the researcher through ethical puzzles that occur during research. Further, we show that working through these puzzles guided by the research ethic yields *better research*: better practice, better ethics, and ultimately compelling findings.

What are the practical implications of the four elements of the feminist-informed research ethic for each phase of the research process? From certain epistemological perspectives, for example, those of the human subjects' research review committees of academic institutions, ethical questions are understood as questions of method: identifying a subject pool, choosing the research subject from the pool, and collecting data from a research subject. From this epistemological perspective, the ethics of research are a function of the humanity (and indigeneity in contexts such as Canada and New Zealand) and potential vulnerability of the research subject. However, from a feminist perspective, at every stage of the research process the researcher needs to reflect continually on epistemological and other forms of inclusion and exclusion (Smith [1998], 1999). In this study, we suggest the kind of questions that attentiveness to the power of epistemology, boundaries, relationships, and the situatedness of the researcher provoke at each stage of the IR research process.

Throughout the research process, ethical questions are bound to emerge. Many of these relate to the revelation of previously masked forms of power and privilege.[5] However, a feminist research ethic is attentive to the researchers' social, political, and economic relationships to research subjects, and not just their academic connections to their research subject. This means being attentive to the ways in which social, political, and economic processes make many people and social processes themselves invisible or silent and it means being committed to self-reflection to guide researchers so they anticipate ethical issues that may occur throughout the research process (even if they cannot anticipate the exact form of them).

---

[5]For an account of the way power and privilege can hide behind certain approaches and methods of research that present themselves as "objective" or impartial. See Gluck and Patai (1991); Stacey (1999); Staeheli and Nagar (2002); D. Wolf (1996); M. Wolf (1992).

The feminist research ethic can build into our research design, from the beginning, deliberative moments where we consciously pause to consider the ethical questions of each aspect of the research process. For instance, when the researcher understands her project at the outset in relation to the advocacy agenda of her informants or the lives of her informants as connected to her own (Staeheli and Nagar 2002), she might be inclined to interpret her ethical obligation to require supporting the advocacy of her informants through her research question. Such an obligation may also be worked into the research design. A researcher might work in collaboration with her research subjects to design her project as service research (Taylor 1999), perhaps attentive to developing the skills of the researched community (Sampaio and En La Lucha 2004), perhaps the skills of evaluating and documenting the work of an organization (Ackerly 1995; True 2008). Such an obligation might also be realized by sharing findings in a certain format or with a certain audience (in addition to how they might be published for academic purposes) (Ackerly 2007). Attentive to the research ethic the researcher can make choices that fulfill these ethical commitments and prepare her to deal with some of the unintended ethical challenges of research.

In what follows we offer two examples of how a research ethic can be applied at different points in IR research to improve the quality of research. For illustrative purposes we chose *the defining a research question* and *the theory and conceptualization process*, rather than the more familiar sites of ethical reflection around method. Our examples are not definitive of methodological choice guided by a feminist-informed research ethic, but they do illustrate some commonalities, one of which is that the research process is not linear, but rather requires the researcher to note points of decision, often to return to them for further reflection. The *raison d'être* of the research ethic is that by being attentive to the power of epistemology, boundaries, and relationships, and one's own research process, the researcher has a research ethic that can guide him to make sound decisions throughout the research process and to revisit those decisions with an eye toward revealing power dynamics that were invisible to him earlier in the research process.

Question-Driven Research: What is the Puzzle?

Where does a feminist research question come from? A feminist research ethic typically generates research questions not from scholarship, but from surprising real world observations and experiences (Enloe 2004). The ethical scholar seeks a research agenda broadly informed by the experiences of un-included people and organizations. The researcher guided by a feminist ethic seeks to be attentive to questions raised outside of the university and dominant institutional cultures, and to read texts produced by grassroots activists and informants as well as scholars or experts. The feminist ethic guides the researcher to identify some knowledge as worth pursuing and other knowledge as not worth pursuing using an epistemological standard derived, not from traditional academic disciplines and interdisciplines, but from engagement with the world in myriad ways.[6]

Bina D'Costa's (2003, 2006) research about rape in the India-Pakistan and India-Bangladesh wars of separation illustrates one way of identifying a feminist-informed research question. Guided by feminist ethical commitments, D'Costa reconsidered her research question even after beginning qualitative data collection with research subjects in the field. Although she was expecting to learn about the way in which rape was used during war, because of the concerns that

---

[6]For accounts of research that consider the incorporation of non-scholarly perspectives an important criteria for evaluating empirical scholarship see Ehrenreich (2001) Pettman (1992); Pettman (1996); Tsing (2005).

her research subjects raised about the ways in which their stories of rape had been used by political actors *after* the rapes, she reconsidered her original research question about rape in international war. Ethically and theoretically reflecting on what her research subjects said was important to them she realized that the *important* puzzle to study was the role of *narratives* about gendered violence in nationalism and nation-building. D'Costa's methodological challenge was an ethical challenge that led to a deliberative moment and ultimately to a decision to change her research question from a question about war to a question about nationalism. Her shift illustrates the use of the feminist research ethic.

Power of Epistemology

As Ann Tickner (2006) has argued, questions that treat non-elite people as knowers and subjects of research have typically not been asked or considered central to international relations. A particular epistemological perspective that values the world seen from above as a macro international system populated only by states, which some reduce to rational actors or like units, has been privileged in the IR field. This way of knowing accords more with the perspectives of elite policymakers and big N studies of states than with the perspectives of non-elites and social constituencies who are not visible in state-centric analyses. Even before she shifted her question, D'Costa's work challenged the power of this epistemology in IR by seeking to research the experiences of excluded and marginalized subjects of international conflict, and in so doing to make their agency and victimization in war visible.

Already attentive to the political importance of the experiences of people marginalized by states in their international relations and war, her ethical reflections on the relative power of the women not only as rape survivors but as informants with politically and theoretically interesting insights, D'Costa evaluated the concerns of the respondents and shifted her research question. Attentive to the power of epistemology, feminist and non-feminist researchers can find questions that are important to academe and their research subjects.

Attentiveness to Boundaries

The IR field has been constructed on the assumption that state boundaries are given rather than contested and humanly made. Guided by an ethical commitment to interrogate the political import of marginalization, exclusion and silencing, it is incumbent upon IR scholars to analyze the making and effects of such boundaries. For example, D'Costa shows that nation-building is a process of boundary-making that not only constrained women's agency in part by ensuring women's silence. She writes: "The subjects of my study were written out of that history, but that history was drafted on and with their bodies and families" (2006:129). Attentive to the boundaries that constrain women *and* to the politics of state boundary-making and identity-formation, D'Costa used the study of rape in international war to contribute to our understanding of international relations, war and nation-building as gendered processes that manipulate gender norms and through that manipulation, conceal their exercise of power.

Attentiveness to Relationships

A feminist-informed ethical perspective makes us attentive to the privilege of being able to do research and to the power relationships that are a part of the research process. D'Costa began interviewing survivors of rape, but stopped doing so when her subjects conveyed their feelings of insecurity in disclosing experiences that if publicized might result in their further social marginalization and their own anger at how their previous experience of telling their stories had been used by governments. As a result of her

reflection on her relationship to her research subjects and the impact of her research on them, D'Costa altered her research question so that personal interviews with vulnerable women were no longer her major form of data. In her revised research design agents of the state became more important subjects of study (2003).

Situating the Researcher
A feminist research ethic reminds us to reconsider various aspects of our process throughout our research, from choosing a question to publicizing our findings. We have to be self-reflective about when to reexamine our process. Generally, we would critically consider possible research questions using ethical as well as other scholarly criteria at the outset of research. However, we may gain relevant ethical knowledge only later in the research process once we already have a research question, design and method for data collection, as did D'Costa. Therefore, guided by a feminist research ethic we must be willing to revisit and reframe our research question should we come to realize through critical self-reflection that *a question itself* may reinforce or exacerbate existing power relations, forms of marginalization, exploitation or silencing. Feminist-informed research responds to anticipated and unanticipated ethical considerations.

Theory and Conceptualization

Feminist research shares with all academic inquiry the requirement that we situate our scholarship in an existing body of literature, reviewing the theoretical perspectives others have used to explore related puzzles. For feminists, this is (perhaps unexpectedly) an ethical moment. If theory is historically the project of elites, when the research question comes out of engagement with the real world experience of non-elites, what theoretical perspectives are appropriate to consider? When the conventional ways of using theory to guide the conceptualization of a research problem do not recognize our research problems as potentially contributing to IRs, what are the ethical implications of leaving the field unchallenged by the lived experience of those whose concerns inspired our research question? How can a researcher situate her question within the theoretical frameworks of her discipline without losing sight of the concerns that motivated the question?

Stern confronted this problem in a way that is particularly interesting for our understanding of feminist-informed IRs. By choosing to study the insecurity of Mayan women, Stern was choosing a question that came from the experience of marginalized women and did not fit easily within IR's conventional theoretical perspectives (realism, neoliberal institutionalism constructivism, critical theory). Initially, she drew on one form of feminist inquiry—standpoint—to shape her theoretical approach, hypotheses and research design. However, in the field she discovered the need to broaden her theoretical perspectives to include feminist post-structuralism which allowed her to theorize about the multiple perspectives any individual might have on her own security, the shifting in perspective that could take place over time, and the co-creation of the perspective that Stern would take home with her to analyze. Stern's feminist research ethic led her to draw more richly on the intellectual resources of a range of feminist perspectives.

Power of Epistemology
When confronted with the theoretical boundaries of her field, Stern first interrogated the conventional IR perspectives in favor of a feminist standpoint approach. Attentive to the power of epistemology, when she discovered that her

data did not and would not conform to the theoretical expectations of that per-spective, she sought an epistemological approach that would more adequately inform her inquiry. The post-structural approach she used allowed her to gener-ate hypotheses about the shifting meaning of security to women *and* to develop the methods necessary to study those shifts when by necessity research requires us to stop researching and start analyzing even when the phenomenon we study is not likewise time-bound.

Attentiveness to Boundaries
Stern was attentive to the exclusions and marginalizations of Mayan women, which made their sense of security of critical interest to her. Attention to bound-aries also led her to interrogate the theoretical boundaries of International Rela-tions and later *of feminism too.*

Attentiveness to Relationships
Stern drew theoretical importance from her discovery that in interviewing Mayan women about their security, she was becoming a co-creator of their narrative. Women told her things in certain ways because *she* was the audience for their sto-ries. Stern reflected on this co-creation not only as a methodological challenge (which it could have been) but moreover, *as a theoretical challenge.* She understood the fact of women's creating their narrative for her as an audience as theoretically important for what it said about what *security* was. The prospect of co-creation with a researcher put in stark relief the need for a theoretical understanding of security inseparable from personal and community identity politics.

Situating the Researcher
Let us consider the deliberative moment Maria Stern faced when realizing that her standpoint epistemology was constraining her ability to answer her research question (2006:180–181). She shows us why standpoint, while a good starting point, excluded the possibility that the identity and security of her research sub-jects were not fixed but rather co-produced with the researcher. Their political identities as (self-defined) Mayan women informed how they expressed their insecurities; that is, their naming of particular dangers could not be separated from their representation of their (political) identities to a researcher. Had they been representing themselves to someone else, they might have represented other aspects of their identity as politically salient (cf. Appiah 2005). For Stern, only a poststructuralist epistemological perspective illuminated this crucial theo-retical insight.

As Stern's project shows, a scholar of international security pays attention to her subjects' *feelings* of security and political identity not only for reasons of per-sonal ethics (cf. Jacoby 2006), but also as we have seen now in two examples, *for the theoretical and methodological insights such attention lays bare.* Ignoring feelings of insecurity because they shifted would be to ignore some data. Upon reflection it was clear that non-conforming data was not a problem of research design or methods, but rather revealed a problem of theory and conceptualization. Contin-uing with a theoretical perspective that treated security and political identity as fixed when the research process itself suggested these were fluid would have been bad scholarship. Once security was theorized as relational, fluid, and embedded in identity politics, attention to the relative privileges of researcher and research informant needed to be an essential consideration of the project. Given the importance of these insights for the framing of her project, the author then needed to be explicit about the deliberative moment in which the infor-mants' data becomes the researchers' "text" or property to manipulate, share, or exclude (Stern 2006).

Conclusion

In sum, D'Costa and Stern's published research offer us illustrations of the kinds of concerns raised by a feminist research ethic that is attentive to power, marginalization, relationships and self-reflection. In this study, we have demonstrated how the feminist-informed research ethic can be applied in developing a research question or in conceptualizing research. We also showed that such reflection influences aspects of the research process. Further, this research ethic can directly improve other stages of the research process, including, the choice of data, data collection and analysis of methods, and writing or presenting research for multiple audiences.

Interestingly, many of the instances of attending to the questions of feminist research ethic result in rethinking the relationship between researcher and research subject. While not all feminist theory focuses on the relationships among us, we can see that feminist inquiry expects us to attend to these. It is important to notice, however, that the need to pay attention to the relationship between researcher and research subject (and to the many relationships the researcher sustains), derives not from feminist theory, but from feminist research practice.

Conclusion

Feminist theory helps us identify a demanding research ethic for International Relations inquiry. A feminist research ethic includes attentiveness to power especially the power of epistemology (including the ways in which exercises of power can conceal themselves), it expects on-going concern about boundaries, silencing, absences, marginalization and attentiveness to the relational context in which we research. Moreover, the research ethic requires that we situate ourselves in our research and cultivate a habit of self-reflection about the research process and the power of epistemology at work even in our ability to conceive of our research. With these expectations, a feminist research ethic can be used to explore a full range of IR questions informed by a full range of theoretical and empirical theories and puzzles.

The feminist-informed research ethic is appropriate for all social science inquiry because it makes visible the power of research epistemology to structure what we know. It is particularly important for international relations scholarship because power is its subject. Feminist inquiry reveals that power can function to render some internationalized power dynamics invisible. If D'Costa had not wrestled with her ethical dilemma we would never know the theoretical and political import of the silences of women raped during post-war nation-building. If Stern had not interrogated the role the researcher as audience, she would not have been able to interpret the meaning of Mayan women's security after experiences of ethnic genocide. Feminist inquiry critiques the power of disciplines to define the field of knowledge inquiry. As a result, feminism is often directly engaged in reflecting on or pushing the boundaries of established disciplines. Feminist perspectives redirect our attention from the kinds of questions that are being asked in International Relations to ask questions that have not fallen within the purview of IR as the discipline has traditionally defined knowledge.

There is a feminist answer to the important question with which we began this article: How can we study power and identify ways to mitigate its abuse in the real world when we, as IR researchers, also participate in the powerful projection of knowledge in this world? The answer is that a feminist research ethic can give us limited confidence that our epistemological perspective, theoretical choices, research design, data collection, data analysis, exposition of findings, and venues for sharing findings are *attentive to power*. Yet, the tools of research informed by a

feminist ethic can guide us in always developing and improving our commitment as researchers to keep this the most important question IR researchers share. It is our collective responsibility as ethical researchers to put our commitment to self-reflexivity, our attentiveness to the power of epistemology, of boundaries and relationships into the practice of our research. It is also our collective responsibility to evaluate international relations research in terms of ethical criteria such as the guidelines we have offered here. As we have seen these ethical criteria can substantively improve scholarship as measured against the theoretical and methodological criteria more conventionally discussed and debated in the discipline.

References

ACKERLY, BROOKE A. (1995) Testing the Tools of Development: Credit Programs, Loan Involvement, and Women's Empowerment. *IDS Bulletin* 26:3.

ACKERLY, BROOKE A. (2007) Sustainable Networking: Collaboration for Women's Human Rights Activists, Scholars, and Donors. In *Sustainable Feminisms: Enacting Theories, Envisioning Action,* edited by S. Sarker. Oxford: Advances in Gender Research, Elsevier, 143–158.

ACKERLY, BROOKE A. (2008a) Feminism and Methodological Reflection. In *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide (Research Methods),* edited by A. Klotz and D. Prakash, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 28–42.

ACKERLY, BROOKE A. (2008b) *Universal Human Rights in a World of Difference.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ACKERLY, BROOKE A., AND JACQUI TRUE. (2006) Studying the Struggles and Wishes of the Age: Feminist Theoretical Methodology and Feminist Theoretical Methods. In *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations,* edited by B. A. Ackerly, M. Stern and J. True. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 241–260.

ACKERLY, BROOKE A., AND JACQUI TRUE. (2008) An Intersectional Analysis of International Relations: Recasting the Discipline. *Politics & Gender* 4(01):156–173.

ACKERLY, BROOKE A., AND JACQUI TRUE. (forthcoming) *Doing Feminist Research in Social and Political Science,* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

APPIAH, K. ANTHONY. (2005) *The Ethics of Identity.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

BARRIENTOS, STEPHANIE. (2001) Gender, Flexibility, and Global Value Chains. *IDS Bulletin* 32(3): 83–93.

BENHABIB, SEYLA. (1986) The Generalized and the Concrete Other: The Kohlberg-Gilligan Controversy and Feminist Theory. *Praxis International* 5(4):402–424.

BERMAN, JACQUELINE. (2003) (Un)Popular Strangers and Crises (Un)Bounded: Discourses of Sex Trafficking, the European Political Community and the Panicked State of the Modern State. *European Journal of International Relations* 9(1):37–86.

BOWLES, GLORIA, AND RENATE KLEIN, EDS. (1983) *Theories of Women's Studies.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

CARR, MARILYN, ED. (2004) *Chains of Fortune: Linking Women Producers and Workers with Global Markets.* London: Zed Books.

D'COSTA, BINA. (2003) *The Gendered Construction of Nationalism: From Partition to Creation.* Canberra: Australian National University.

D'COSTA, BINA. (2006) Marginalized Identity: New Frontiers of Research for Ir? In *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations,* edited by B. Ackerly, M. Stern and J. True. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 129–152.

DEVER, CAROLYN. (2004) *Skeptical Feminism: Activist Theory, Activist Practice.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

DEVETAK, RICHARD. (2005) Postmodernism. In *Theories of International Relations,* edited by S. Burchill, A. Linklater, R. Devetak, J. Donnelly, M. Paterson, C. Reus-Smit and J. True. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 162–187.

EHRENREICH, BARBARA. (2001) *Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting by in America.* New York: Metropolitan Books.

ELSHTAIN, JEAN BETHKE. (1987) *Women and War.* New York: Basic Books.

ENLOE, CYNTHIA H. (1993) *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of Cold War.* Berkley, CA: University of California Press.

ENLOE, CYNTHIA H. (2000) *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

ENLOE, CYNTHIA H. (2004) *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

FRASER, NANCY. (1995) From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a "Post-Socialist" Age. *New Left Review* 212:68–93.

GLUCK, SHERNA BERGER, AND DAPHNE PATAI, EDS. (1991) *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History.* New York: Routledge.

HANSEN, LENE. (2001) "Gender, Nation, Rape: Bosnia and the Construction of Security." *International Feminist Journal of Politics 3,* 1: 55–75.

HARDING, SANDRA G. (1987) *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

HARDING, SANDRA, AND KATHRYN NORBERG. (2005) New Feminist Approached to Social Science Methodologies: An Introduction. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30(4):2009–2015.

HARTSOCK, NANCY. (1983) The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism. In *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science,* edited by S.G. Harding and M.B. Hintikka. Boston Hingham, MA: Kluwer Boston.

HAWKESWORTH, MARY E. (2006) *Feminist Inquiry: From Political Conviction to Methodological Innovation.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

HESSE-BIBER, SHARLENE NAGY, AND MICHELLE L. YAISER. (2004) *Feminist Perspectives on Social Research.* New York: Oxford University Press.

JACOBY, TAMI. (2006) From the Trenches: Dilemmas of Feminist Ir Fieldwork. In *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations,* edited by B. Ackerly, M. Stern and J. True. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 153–173.

LATHER, PATTI. (1986) Research as Praxis. *Harvard Educational Review* 56(3):257–276.

MILLEN, DIANNE. (1997) Some Methodological and Epistemological Issues Raised by Doing Feminist Research on Non-Feminist Women. *Sociological Research Online* 2(3).

MOHANTY, CHANDRA TALPADE. (2003) *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

PETERSON, V. SPIKE. (1992) "Transgressing Boundaries: Theories of Knowledge, Gender and International Relations." *Millenium* 21:183–206.

PETTMAN, JAN. (1992) *Living in the Margins: Racism, Sexism, and Feminism in Australia.* North Sydney, NSW, Australia: Allen & Unwin.

PETTMAN, JAN. (1996) *Worlding Women: A Feminist International Politics.* London: Routledge.

PIN-FAT, VERONIQUE, AND MARIA STERN. (2005) The Scripting of Private Jessica Lynch: Biopolitics, Gender, and The "Feminization" Of the U.S. Military. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 30(1):25–53.

ROBINSON, F. (2006) *Methods of Feminist Normative Theory: A Political Ethic of Care for International Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

RUDDICK, SARA. (1989) *Maternal Thinking: Towards a Politics of Peace.* Boston: Beacon Press.

SAMPAIO, ANNA, AND HERMANAS EN LA LUCHA. (2004) Transnational Feminisms in a New Global Matrix. *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 6(2):181–206.

SANDOVAL, CHELA. (2000) *Methodology of the Oppressed.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

SMITH, LINDA TUHIWAI. ([1998] 1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples.* London: Zed Books.

SPRAGUE, JOEY, AND MARY ZIMMERMAN. (1993) Overcoming Dualisms: A Feminist Agenda for Sociological Methodology. In *Theory on Gender/Feminism on Theory,* edited by P. England. New York: Aldine de Gruyter, 255–280.

STACEY, JUDITH. (1999) Ethnography Confronts the Global Village. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 28(6):687–697.

STAEHELI, LYNN A., AND RICHA NAGAR. (2002) Feminists Talking across Worlds. *Gender, Place and Culture* 9(2):167–172.

STERN, MARIA. (2005) *Naming Security – Constructing Identity: 'Mayan Women' in Guatemala on the Eve of 'Peace'.* Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

STERN, MARIA. (2006) Racism, Sexism, Classism and Much More: Reading Security-Identity in Marginalized Sites. In *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations,* edited by B. Ackerly, M. Stern and J. True. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 174–197.

SYLVESTER, CHRISTINE. (2002) *Feminist International Relations: An Unfinished Journey.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

TAYLOR, VERTA. (1999) Gender and Social Movements: Gender Processes in Women's Self-Help Movements. *Gender & Society* 13(1):8–33.

TICKNER, T. ANN. (2001) *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approches in the Post Cold War.* New York: Columbia University Press.

TICKNER, J. ANN. (2006) On the Frontlines or Sidelines of Knowledge and Power? Feminist Practices of Responsible Scholarship. *International Studies Review* 8(3):383–395.

TRONTO, JOAN. (2006) Is Peace Keeping Care Work? Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Philadelphia, PA, August 31, 2006.

TRUE, JACQUI. (2003) *Gender, Globalization, and Postsocialism: The Czech Republic after Communism.* New York: Columbia University Press.

TRUE, JACQUI. (2005) Feminism. In *Theories of International Relations*, third edition, by Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit, and Jacqui True, London and New York: Palgrave, pp. 213–243.

TRUE, JACQUI. (2008) Global Accountability and Transnational Networks: The Women Leaders Network and Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation. *Pacific Review* 21(1):1–26.

TSING, ANNA LOWENHAUPT. (2005) *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

WOLF, MARGERY. (1992) *A Thrice-Told Tale: Feminism, Postmodernism, and Ethnographic Responsibility.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

WOLF, DIANE L. (1996) Situating Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork. In *Feminist Dilemmas in Fieldwork*, edited by D.L. Wolf. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1–55.

WORELL, JUDITH, AND NORINE G. JOHNSON. (1997) Introduction: Creating the Future: Process and Promise in Feminist Practice. In *Shaping the Future of Feminist Psychology : Education, Research, and Practice*, edited by J. Worell and N.G. Johnson. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 1–14.