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PREFACE

A Choral Poem\(^1\) in Four Parts

Part One

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

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

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

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

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

---

\(^1\)I have written a four-part poem (see also pages 120, 157, and 185) based on my interviews with women faculty who participated in the pilot study for this research. Although I have made minor editorial changes in the text in order to transform their narratives into poetry, I have constructed the verses from the participants' exact words.
This study is about feminism, scholarship, and collaboration. Like the poem that winds through these chapters, it draws on the many stories I have heard from women faculty who work in research universities and who have chosen to work collaboratively with other women in their scholarship. My interest in women faculty and how their commitments to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration intersect has deepened and taken shape during the past four years as I have reflected upon my own commitments, values, and aspirations. Like the feminist participants in my research, I have come to appreciate that all scholarship is a reflection of the people who construct it. Thus, this study represents my attempt to understand and describe how feminism, scholarship, and collaboration are woven together in the lives of faculty women; it is also an attempt to understand them as colorful threads in the fabric of my own life.

Denzin (1993) writes that "[i]nterpretive research begins and ends with the biography and the self of the researcher. The events and troubles that are written about are ones the writer has already experienced and witnessed first hand" (p. 25). The events and troubles, and indeed the joys, that I have described in this study are ones that I have experienced as a doctoral student and will experience as a faculty member in the years ahead. My experiences,
however, suggest that interpretive research, experience, and subjectivity are not linked in a linear, cause-effect fashion but are interwoven like cloth or shift into new patterns like the glass shards in a kaleidoscope. I am still experiencing, witnessing, constructing, and becoming.

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

Why was it so difficult to think of myself in new, less-limiting ways? I had returned willingly to the academy as a doctoral student to prepare myself for a faculty position. I knew that career success, even entry into the profession, depended upon my ability to conduct independent research, to write, and to publish. I was anxious to enter the world of scholarship but was also apprehensive. Collaboration was an attractive concept, suggesting a mentoring relationship and a process offering confirmation and empowerment. Moreover, I regarded it as a way to
demystify the academic publishing rituals which seemed remote and intimating despite my seventeen-year career in university administration. As a feminist I was also attracted to collaboration as a political strategy, as a way of challenging the hierarchical power relationships that too often characterize academic work and privilege the individual author. I suspected that there were other women in the academy like me whose aspirations and accomplishments sometimes belie their feelings of fear and insecurity. I hoped that collaboration would reveal those contradictions to me. I felt that I could reconstruct my own identity and begin to think of myself as a scholar-in-process if I could hear other women's private stories and not just the ones we tell in public.

Four years later I am more comfortable with my many selves and my scholarship as processes. I have learned to acknowledge the contradictions that are inherent in human experience. My voice and my standpoints in this work are shifting and ambiguous, sometimes postmodern and constructivist and sometimes modern and positivist. And though my understanding of and commitments to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration are becoming deeper and more complex, I am still struggling to model them in my thinking, my writing, and in my relationships with others. Sometimes I take giant leaps forward and other times I slide back.
It is ironic that I have chosen to investigate scholarly collaboration as a solitary researcher rather than as a member of a research partnership. It has been difficult and at times lonely to think and to write apart from a community of supportive and challenging colleagues. This inquiry has made me particularly sensitive to the value of community and its importance in constructing one's multiple identities. Who I am and who I am able to be are shaped very much by my social interactions and by my community memberships, reminding me of my grandmother's warning, "You are known by the company you keep."

The women whose voices echo in the poetry and prose which follow have convinced me that I desire to be part of a larger feminist community and part of their collective struggle. They have also shown me that women have different ways of being feminists, scholars, mentors, and friends. In spite of our diversity and our differences however, we share a desire to live productive, creative, and ethical lives as scholars. Furthermore we share the belief that we can use our knowledge, our influence, and our values to make the academy a more humane and egalitarian community.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Research universities located within the United States and throughout most of the world are the social institutions which are entrusted with the distinctive mission of constructing and disseminating knowledge. Among the tripartite responsibilities with which faculty are charged--teaching, research, and service--research and its representation in published form is by far the most valued and rewarded academic activity. For women and men to succeed as scholars in higher education--that is, to wield influence in their disciplines and to accrue tenure, promotion, annual salary increases, grants, desirable office space, laboratory space, and other material resources--they must establish a reputation among their peers by conducting original research and publishing in significant, mainstream journals. Although research universities vary in the ways in which they foster research productivity, the particular

---

2 Research universities in category I as classified by the Carnegie Foundation are those graduate institutions which "offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctoral degree and give high priority to research. They receive annually at least $33.5 million in federal support for research and development and award at least 50 Ph.D. degrees each year." The Chronicle of Higher Education (1987, July 8). p. 22.
research specialities they support, and the resources they make available to faculty, they are similar in their valuing of scholarship, the securing of external funding for research, and the public dissemination of research findings through publication.

Also functioning within the research university environment are departmental and disciplinary norms that regulate the specific methodologies and research questions pursued by individual faculty members. These norms reflect the historical as well as the contemporary interests and values of the discipline's most influential members, who are usually men. Through ongoing processes of selection and evaluation conducted by juries of faculty peers, these disciplinary standards are applied to the knowledge constructed by individual women and men and teams of collaborating faculty members. Although norms are constantly challenged, reinforced, and modified in the ongoing discourse of the particular disciplinary community, they remain strongly determinant of the types of scholarship which are supported, published, and prized, and of the character of the faculty as a whole. They determine whether Shakespearean scholarship is more highly valued than research into eighteenth century women novelists or whether work in social stratification theory is more often published
than research into factors promoting welfare dependency among Hispanic or Black mothers.

Supporting and maintaining the various disciplinary communities which coexist in a research university are shared ontological and epistemological beliefs about the nature of reality, what counts as knowledge and truth, and by what authority knowledge is justified. Dominating Euro-American culture since the Enlightenment, the philosophy of liberal humanism in its various forms defines knowledge as essentially a cognitive, internal process. Knowledge or "truth" emanates from a rational, autonomous, and abstract being (usually male) who embodies an essential and distinctly human core. Such a highly individualistic view of knowledge promotes a romantic view of academic science and scholarship as an enterprise ideally practiced by the contemplative individual or "lone scholar" (Hood, 1985). Even in the experimental sciences where research is practiced by teams of researchers, great ideas and significant contributions are commonly attributed to the talent and efforts of a single highly creative leader (Zuckerman, 1967, 1970). The continuing practice of bestowing prestige and recognition on individuals for scientific discoveries, as exemplified by the Nobel Prize, attests to the persistence of liberal humanism in science.
Coexisting with and increasingly challenging liberal humanism in the academy, social constructionism is a competing philosophy which holds that all knowledge is socially constructed, contextual, and historically situated. Rather than being internal and cognitive—a product of the great mind—knowledge is community-generated and community maintained. What we find at the center of knowledge and subjectivity itself is not a human essence but language, constituting and constituted by discourse communities (Bruffee, 1986). Constructionism fundamentally challenges the principle tenets of Enlightenment positivism, liberal humanism, and their continuing influence upon academic science and university culture, raising significant issues about scholarship and research, authority and authorship, and community and collaboration.

Within a context of conflicting epistemological stances in the academy as a whole and among its various departments, disciplines, and subspecialties, academic scholarship continues to be evaluated and faculty careers determined largely by traditional, masculine norms and policies. These norms foster individuality, independence, and competition, often at the expense of mutuality, collaboration, and other relational values that are traditionally associated with women. Except for the natural sciences, the social sciences, and some quantitatively-driven professional
fields, collaboration in research and writing is frequently discouraged and occasionally disregarded. Not only difficult to evaluate, it is considered by many scholars to signify a less significant contribution to knowledge than individually produced and authored scholarship (Brady, 1988; Grant & Ward, 1991).

Despite the uneasiness and ambiguity which characterizes collaborative scholarship in academic environments, interest in collaborative and cooperative behavior in such areas as adult education (Johnson & Johnson, 1987), teaching and learning (Lay, 1989; MacGregor, 1990), writing (Bruffee, 1987; Ede & Lunsford, 1985, 1990), professional development (Hunsaker & Johnston, 1992), school-university relations (Hawthorne & Zusman, 1992), and negotiating (Gray, 1991) have increased in recent years. Because it is such a complex and multifaceted phenomenon however, systematic research into collaboration is still relatively scarce. To collaborate in scholarship and research, in the writing of a scholarly paper, or in the creation of an artistic work implies a wide range of activities and consequences depending on one's discipline, specialization, academic role, and status. Collaboration in laboratory science, for example, can mean being part of a large research team whose members rarely have face to face contact. More commonly, however, collaborative teams,
particularly in the social sciences and humanities, will involve only two or three scholars.

In an academic community, the process of collaboration is rarely simple, clear, or well understood. One can collaborate and receive authorship recognition on a published paper by contributing as a team member to a research project without having written any part of the final publication. Conversely one can claim sole authorship for a text which depends upon the collective labor of others--graduate students, editors, and paid technicians, for example--for its existence. Collaboration among scholars is not easily defined; it is a way of working with others or "making meaning in community" (Reither, 1987, p. 5) that varies greatly from one academic discipline to another and from one occurrence to another. Austin and Baldwin (1991), in their recent review of the literature on collaboration in faculty research and teaching, describe academic collaboration as "a cooperative endeavor that involves common goals, coordinated effort, and outcomes or products for which the collaborators share responsibility and credit" (p. 5).
Statement of the Problem

Not unlike other powerful and prestigious social institutions, most American universities historically have employed a relatively homogeneous group of middle and upper class white males who shared similar socioeconomic roots, educational experiences, and values. And despite the affirmative action legislation of 1972 and the subsequent efforts to attract women and minorities to academe, men continue to outnumber women in the American professorate at a ratio of three to one ("New Federal Data," 1993). Women faculty members, working primarily in liberal arts colleges, community colleges, and comprehensive universities, are underrepresented in the more prestigious and well-funded institutions and fields, particularly at the higher professorial ranks. Those women who hold full-time, tenure-track faculty positions in research institutions often work in such traditionally female fields as nursing, home economics, library science, and education, or they are located in departments in which the majority of the faculty are men (Ransom, 1990). In addition to their underrepresentation in positions of power, prestige, and influence, many argue that their specific research interests, experiences, and preferred methodologies receive less recognition and support than the male-defined projects
that characterize mainstream scholarship. And despite the rapid development of women's studies programs and a significant increase in the publication of explicitly feminist research over the last two decades, the status of women scholars, support for their scholarship, and acceptance of feminist research methodologies is uncertain on many campuses and in many fields. Feminism and the status of women's studies faculty remain controversial.

In the face of these contradictions, many women scholars are developing successful careers, strong research programs, and confidence as scholars. The professional relationships and friendships that women faculty form on university campuses may be of particular importance in helping them to overcome feelings of isolation and to construct identities as legitimate scholars. Moreover, these relationships may offer the mutual support that many feminist women either desire or need to pursue their particular research interests with confidence in competitive research institutions.

Often feeling unwelcome, stereotyped, and marginalized in large, bureaucratic research institutions created for and controlled by men, most academic women bring to their academic roles and their scholarship life experiences, social responsibilities, and research interests that are shaped by their gender identities. To work in collaboration
with other scholars with whom they share a gender consciousness as well as research interests would seem to offer a variety of professional and personal advantages, especially to those women who also share feminist political commitments. However, both feminism and collaboration in academic scholarship can have adverse consequences. They may be particularly suspect in male-dominated disciplines and subspecialties where the values of autonomy, independence, mutuality, and cooperation are in open conflict. Research and writing which are viewed by the dominant members of a community as representing political as well as epistemological challenges to the mainstream academic discourses are often criticized as unscientific and biased. Therefore, academic women who openly espouse feminism and eschew the individualistic norms of university scholarship would seem to be putting their careers at risk. In order to build meaningful careers in research institutions, women faculty must successfully manage the conflicts which develop between their commitments and the prevailing norms of the discipline. Women who are able to develop effective research strategies, supportive relationships, and strong scholarly identities would appear to have accumulated important personal and professional resources.
Research into academic collaboration and coauthorship suggests that women are attracted to and benefit from collaboration in distinctive ways (Fox & Fayer, 1984; Wilkie & Allen, 1975), that women experience writing as empowering (Ede, 1985), and that they tend to collaborate in ways which empower others (Hunter and Kuh, 1987). Feminist research also suggests that women "know" (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule, 1986) and make moral judgments (Gilligan, 1982) in ways that express concern for and form connections to others. Missing from the research, however, are studies which document the consequences of choosing to conduct collaborative scholarship in communities where independent scholarship is more highly valued. This is an unfortunate absence given anecdotal evidence which cautions young scholars against coauthoring until their reputations are established.

Interpretive studies of collaboration and coauthorship among faculty members are rare, as Austin and Baldwin (1991, and also Baldwin & Austin, 1992) have documented. Using qualitative methods to describe the relationships which faculty and their collaborating partners develop and to reveal how those relationships influence academic careers, scholarship, and norms may be particularly important to the development of a deeper understanding of faculty lives. As women and members of minority groups increase their presence...
and their influence on university campuses, it is particularly important that they be included in this inquiry. Clearly feminist and critical studies that focus upon race, class, and gender, exploring the political significance of different research and writing strategies, can make an important contribution to the growing body of research on faculty collaboration.

Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

This study focuses on women faculty in research universities who identify themselves as feminists and who have chosen to do research, to write scholarly papers, or to create an artistic work in collaboration with another woman. My goal in this research has been to describe how feminism, collaboration, and scholarship interrelate and, in so doing, to gain a deeper understanding of collaboration as a dynamic process in which faculty form meaningful relationships in the advancement of their scholarship. In order to accomplish this goal, my inquiry has been guided by the following overarching research question: How do the commitments which faculty women bring to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration intersect?

Feminist philosopher Sandra Harding's (1986) theory of gender production and Black feminist sociologist Patricia Hill Collins' (1990) matrix of domination provide useful
models for this inquiry. Harding argues that gendered social life is produced through the interlocking effects of processes which occur on three levels: the individual, the symbolic, and the structural. Corresponding closely to Harding's levels, Collins argues that people both experience and resist oppression on three levels: the level of the personal biography; the group level which is structured by race, class, and gender; and the level of the social institution. Both Collins and Harding see the individual identity as unique to each person and fundamental to her resistance but insufficient to understand the effects of racism and sexism as socially produced and sustained. The group level includes the ideas and experiences that are shared with other members of one's group or community which give meaning to individual biography. The third level focuses attention on the social institutions--schools, churches, the military, media, and others--which are controlled by a dominant group. It is at the institutional level that an individual and her group's opportunities are systematically defined and structured.

The application of Harding's and Collins' analytical models contributes to a richer description of scholarship, feminism, and collaboration as intersecting commitments by similarly focusing on three domains: the individual and her construction of her scholarly identities; her social
relationships with her collaborators; and her work in an institution composed of multiple communities that exert control over the recognition and representation of collaborative scholarship. It is misleading to think that these three domains are more than a heuristic device for helping us to understand how collaboration and other academic practices are sustained and resisted. These domains are more overlapping than clearly distinct, and each domain constitutes and is in turn constituted by the other domains. However, extending this frame to my research on feminism, scholarship, and collaboration allows me to formulate the following research questions:

1. How does working in collaboration with other women encourage and/or inhibit faculty women's construction of scholarly identities?
2. What are the social relationships that develop among feminist women who collaborate in their research?
3. In what ways do these intersecting commitments challenge as well as reinscribe the dominant norms of academic scholarship?

In order to elicit the stories of academic feminists and to probe the meanings which they give to collaborative research, I employed an interpretive research design which permitted me to engage faculty women in conversation about
their scholarship, their feminism, and their relationships with their collaborating partners. My choice of qualitative methods not only reflected my interest in the multiple meanings of experience as they are constructed by other feminist scholars, but also allowed me to capture the richness and variation in the narratives of the individual women who participated in the research.

Feminist research which appeared in the early 1960s recognized that academic women, because of their small numbers and "statistical insignificance," were often excluded from traditional social science research that utilized quantitative methods exclusively. Bernard's (1964) study of faculty women, responding to that absence, included historical vignettes of significant faculty women not only to underscore their existence but to highlight the magnitude and variety of their accomplishments. Similarly, Astin's (1969) study of women holding the doctor of philosophy degree included portraits of six research participants which were added "as it became apparent that many of the findings would be more meaningful if they were supplemented by some autobiographical sketches" (p. 111). Both Bernard and Astin found that traditional survey research methodologies did not allow them to present adequate pictures of faculty women.
That same desire for variation, depth, and meaning has motivated this study and has colored the decisions I have made in regard to research design, sample selection, data gathering, and data analysis techniques. To omit women from research on the scientific community or to present women's lives as statistical averages is to minimize the diversity which characterizes human experience and to perpetuate the myth that significant academic achievement by women conforms to a male model. A goal of this study has been to probe and to illuminate some of the important relationships and the research strategies that have helped to make academic careers productive as well as problematic for faculty women. This goal calls for a form of inquiry which is not only rigorous but sensitive to variation, multiple interpretations, and meaning making in community.

Definition of Key Terms

For the purpose of this research, the terms listed below are defined as follows:

1. **Collaboration** is a range of processes whereby two or more individuals work together in cooperation on an intellectual project or product for which both or all members assume some responsibility for its outcomes. **Scholarly collaboration** refers to collaboration on a research project, conference paper, publication, or creative
work such as a theatrical performance, painting, sculpture, or dance which signifies an original contribution to knowledge and is recognized as such by the academy. I use the phrases "collaborative work" and "work in collaboration" interchangeably.

2. **Feminism** is an ideology and a politics which sees gender as a socially-constructed attribute which is used to justify and maintain the power and privileges which are given to men in a patriarchal society. As Weedon points out (1987), these power relations, which privilege men and masculinity at the expense of women and femininity, structure all areas of life, "the family, education and welfare, the worlds of work and politics, culture and leisure. They determine who does what and for whom, what we are and what we might become" (p. 1). Feminism is directed at eradicating patriarchy and achieving a more equitable distribution of resources and a more just and humane society. **Feminist** is a word describing those individuals, both women and men, who hold these values and who work toward the eradication of patriarchy and privilege based not only on sex, but also race, class, and other ascribed characteristics.

3. **Postmodern** is a term which has been used to describe the historical period in which we are now living with its increasing opposition to modernity. It is characterized by
"heterogeneity, multiplicity, and difference," a loss of faith in the Enlightenment values of rationality and promises of happiness (Flax, 1990, p. 188). Postmodernism also rejects objective concepts of knowledge and truth; grand theories which attempt to represent reality as a unified whole; and "any concept of self or subjectivity in which it is not understood as produced as an effect of discursive practice" (p. 188). I use the term postmodernism in this study more generally to refer to the skepticism and doubt which is characteristic of contemporary thought.

4. Postpositive is used to describe a broad range of research paradigms and methodologies which claim to move beyond the strictures imposed by logical positivism, which is viewed in postpositivist inquiry as a failed project. Lather (1991) sees the postpositive era as "a period of dramatic shift in our understanding of scientific inquiry, an age which has learned much about the nature of science, its inner workings and its limitations" (p. 2).

5. Poststructural/poststructuralism are sometimes used interchangeably with postmodern/postmoderism. In this study, however, I use the terms to imply a concern with language, textuality, and discourse which has developed from the structuralist linguistic theories of Ferdinand de Saussure. Poststructuralism is a philosophical construct
which challenges the liberal humanist belief in a essential human core existing before and apart from human interaction and language. "Poststructuralism assumes that meaning is constituted within language and is not guaranteed by the subject which speaks it" (Weedon, 1987, p. 22).

6. **Scholarship** includes a range of original contributions to an academic discipline or field, such as artistic creations, books, monographs, and journal articles, research projects, and other original contributions which university faculty members make to the creation of new knowledge and for which they are recognized by their peers.

7. **Women's culture** is difficult to define. Van Maanen (1988) describes culture as "...akin to a black hole that allows no light to escape" (p. 3). With this disclaimer, he defines it as "the knowledge members ('natives') of a given group are thought to more or less share; knowledge of the sort that is said to inform, embed, shape, and account for the routine and not-so-routine activities of the members of a culture" (p. 3). As I am using the term "women's culture" in this study, it is a system of beliefs, activities, institutions, symbols, and rituals which is or has been attributed to, performed almost exclusively by, and serves to define women's roles and opportunities as distinct and separate from men's, either historically or currently. In the United States, it is often characterized by an ethic of
intimacy, mutuality, and caring for others. The term is controversial and suffers from ambiguity as well as a lack of agreement as to whether women have a distinct culture or cultures. Although I use the term primarily in reference to a body of literature which focuses on women's shared experiences from a historical perspective, I do not support the notion that all women, regardless of race, class, or ethnicity, participate in a single system of beliefs, activities, institutions, symbols, and so forth.

Theoretical Background

This inquiry, grounded in diverse literatures from several disciplines and fields, draws primarily from the research on collaboration and coauthorship in academic scholarship. It is supported, however, by literatures in two related areas: 1) the feminist literature on women's friendships, values, and culture and 2) the research on faculty women.

Collaboration in Academic Scholarship

Research interest in scientific collaboration, teamwork, and the practice of "big science" began to appear in the social science literature after World War II. It is only in the last decade, however, that scholars in such other fields as English and education have begun to explore
collaboration in research and writing as social and political practices with implications for pedagogy as well as scholarship. Concomitantly, there has been a growing feminist interest in how collaboration and coauthorship have advanced and limited women's scholarship, status, and careers.

Historically, the contributions that women have made to the scientific enterprise have been largely unrecognized (Schiebinger, 1987; Rossiter, 1982). By the mid-1970s however, the unequal status of women in scientific organizations had been well-documented in the social science literature (Graham, 1970; Lewin & Duchan, 1971; Bayer & Astin, 1975, for example), and sex as a variable began to appear with frequency in the studies of collaboration. Chubin (1974), Wilkie and Allen (1975), Mackie (1976) and Reskin (1978a, 1978b) published research which compared the research productivity and coauthorship patterns of men and women sociologists. Both Chubin (1974) and Mackie (1976) found that women as well as men published a significant amount of collaborative research; however, women who published collaboratively tended to receive first author recognition--usually reserved for the author making the most significant contribution--less often than men.
Wilkie and Allen (1975), studied the roles--coequal, principle, and supporting--performed by men and women contributors to coauthored articles in an effort to ascertain the extent to which sociologists are constrained by traditional sex roles. Finding coequal collaborations between women to be more prevalent than expected, they conjectured:

Collaboration between two women appear to be a unique case....two women are much more likely than two men or a man and a woman to collaborate equally. This may reflect a selective factor operating to increase the probability of women collaborators having equal rank, a greater likelihood of their dividing the labor equally, or a greater willingness of them to credit contributions equally. In any case, women collaborating with other women appear much more amenable to co-equal roles than either of the other two sex pairings. This suggests that a real difference exists in the way men and women sociologists define their professional relationships.

Research into academic collaboration continued in a number of social science fields throughout the next two decades. In education, several collaborating teams of higher education scholars, such as Fox And Faver and Bayer and Smart, have focused on faculty collaboration and coauthorship patterns. More recently, Austin and Baldwin (1991) have compiled and reviewed the literature on collaboration in faculty scholarship and teaching with the purpose of encouraging theory-driven research and encouraging policy development.
Scholarly interest in collaboration and collaborative writing did not appear with any frequency in English composition and rhetoric until the 1980s. Bruffee (1983, 1986, 1987) and Reither (1987), both scholars in composition pedagogy, began to argue for a social or collaborative view of writing which challenged the traditional views of writing as a romantic and solitary act. Increasingly women faculty in composition and rhetoric (Ede & Lunsford, 1985, 1990), technical writing (Lay, 1989, 1991) and literature (Kaplan & Rose, 1993; Brady, 1988) are bringing a feminist perspective, often based upon their personal and professional experiences, to bear on collaboration. Kaplan and Rose (1993, p. 549) confess:

Our intellectual, ideological, and political convictions dovetail as smoothly as our writing styles....We are both feminists and the same kind of feminists. We share distrust of entrenched hegemonies; we believe profoundly that marginalized voices need to be heard; we know that education can be and ought to be transformative. In short, the collaborative "we" is unified, yet we have agreed to deconstruct that unity for the purpose of this essay--although this self-reflexive project threatens to render us speechless.

Faculty Women and Their Status in the Academy

Women have held faculty positions in American colleges and universities since the nineteenth century. Because of their relatively small numbers, low status, and exclusion from prestigious institutions and disciplines however, they
received little scholarly attention until the early 1960s. Thus, it was not their increasing numbers and influence in the academy which brought them to the attention of researchers but their conspicuous absence from university classrooms during a period in the nation's history when campuses were swelling in size and increasing in number. In 1964 Bernard published her landmark study, \textit{Academic Women}, in which she argued persuasively for bringing more women into higher education to address the shortage of qualified instructional faculty.

By the late 1960s and early '70s, faculty women in the social sciences were focusing attention on doctoral-trained women and comparing their academic careers with men along such dimensions as field, marital status, children, productivity, income, and other professional and personal characteristics. Simon, Clark, and Galway (1967, p. 236) concluded from their study that the differences between men and women were relatively small and decreasing but that women continued to feel like less than full members of the academic "club." Lewin and Duchan (1971) documented evidence of discrimination in the hiring process, and Bayer and Astin (1975) documented sex bias in the reward system. Throughout the 1970s and particularly after passage of affirmative action legislation, the careers, status, and productivity of women faculty members were carefully
scrutinized, and efforts were made to explain the continuing evidence of discrimination against women despite their gains on a number of traditional productivity measures (Astin, 1978).

Due in large part to the influence of the women's movement and the growth of feminist scholarship, research on academic women turned from tracking the careers of faculty women and documenting discrimination on quantitative measures to attempting to theorize and describe women's experiences in more complex ways. Jensen (1982), for example, interviewed 42 women who were completing their Ph.D. degrees or were employed as junior faculty members. She identified three modal styles of behavior and values that characterized her participants' adaptation to academic culture: reorientation, reflecting the effort of women to exemplify the norms of male academic culture; reaffirmation, requiring women to become "superwomen" who excell as professionals while also fulfilling the traditional wife and mother roles; and reconstitution, revealing an effort to reformulate professional participation into a lifestyle more compatible with women's cultural norms. Intrigued with the mix of goals, achievements, and attitudes expressed by women in the reconstituted group, Jensen (1982) concluded that the reconstituted women faculty were directing their energies "toward integration of life activities in the two cultures"
of academia and womanhood and toward a wholeness which we may come to recognize as women's culture" (p. 82).

By the 1980s, much of the research on academic women acknowledged women's disadvantage and frequent isolation in an institutional culture long dominated by men. Clark and Corcoran (1986), focusing upon the socialization experiences of faculty women, suggested that women's experiences are qualitatively different from men's and contribute to accumulative career disadvantage. Fox (1984) posited that women's depressed status was due to a wide variety of factors, including socialization, constraints of family roles, restrictive political and economic opportunity structures, and a male culture with its powerful informal networks which often excluded women. Significantly, Fox noted that the dominant academic culture is not only male but also white, compounding the problems which women of color must face.

More recent studies of women faculty frequently acknowledge women's strength and agency as well as their isolation and exclusion from informal male networks and positions of power to theorize women's relationships to the academy. Moore and Sagaria (1991) used the concepts of numbers, opportunity, and power to look at coalitions in elite research universities and editorial boards. They documented the underrepresentation of women from positions
of power and challenged the idea of the university as a neutral concept.

Women's Networks, Friendships, and Culture

Our knowledge of the lives of American women—particularly white, middle class women—has been enriched by the work of feminist scholars in recent decades. Looking particularly at women's diaries, letters, and personal records in order to gain insight into the ways in which eighteenth and nineteenth century women lived their lives, feminist historians, such as Smith-Rosenberg, Cott, Freedman, and Rosenberg, have demonstrated the importance and significance of women's associations with other women. Smith-Rosenberg (1975) described American society as characterized by a rigid gender-role differentiation which led to the development of supportive networks of women. Cott (1977) asserted that women's friendships were particularly attractive because they represented peer relationships, allowing women to escape the subordination and disparagement of their capabilities which they often suffered in their relationships with men. By developing peer relationships based upon their acceptance of their subordinate gender status, women ironically were able to enter into relationships bases on their individuality. Cott (1977, p. 194) suggests further that women's reliance on
each other to confirm their values "embodied a new kind of
group consciousness, one which could develop into a
political consciousness." She further asserts, "The 'woman
question' and the women's rights movement of the nineteenth
century were predicated on the appearance of women as a
discrete class and on the concomitant group-consciousness of
sisterhood" (p. 194).

Freedman (1979) argues that the rise in women's
societies and organizations, or "female institution
building," although not necessarily representing a political
strategy, nevertheless provided nineteenth century middle
class women with resources which were integral to the
emergence of feminist politics. Freedman suggests that the
integrationist strategies which replaced separatism after
the success of the suffrage movement may explain the erosion
of the women's culture and the decline of feminism after
1920. Applying her theses to women in universities, she
observes:

Examples of this integrationist approach can be
found in the universities, the workplace, and
politics....In the universities, the success of
the first generation of female academics did not
survive past the 1920s, not only because of men's
resistance, but as Rosalind Rosenberg has
explained, "Success isolated women from their
culture and placed them in an alien and often
hostile community." Many academics who cut off
their ties to other women 'lost the old feminine
supports but had no other supports to replace
them."
Rosenberg's (1979) research into the feminization of the curriculum at the University of Chicago at the turn of the century reveals the extent of women's gains and losses as a result of their integration into male-dominated universities. She concludes, "The triumph of higher education in America had a major impact on feminism" (p. 338).

Summary

To succeed as faculty members in research universities, women, like their male colleagues, must make significant scholarly contributions to the knowledge base of their academic discipline or field. Unlike their male colleagues, however, women faculty are significantly outnumbered in most universities and disciplines and bring qualitatively different life experiences to an academic culture that has been shaped largely by the values, interests, and experiences of men. In order to build meaningful careers in these environments, women faculty must successfully manage the conflicts which develop between their personal and professional commitments and the prevailing norms of the research university and their chosen disciplinary specialities. To work in collaboration with other women might appear attractive and advantageous to scholars who share commitments to feminism and the values of equality,
mutuality, and empowerment. Collaborative scholarship, however, is not universally valued in the academy. As feminist sociologist and frequent collaborator Mary Frank Fox (1985a, p. 271) notes:

> Freedom and independence are certainly strong precepts in science and scholarship...and scholarship tends to attract the "solitary mind." Yet the solitary dispositions and independent norms of science and scholarship are contravened by the communalism of the work....The communalism and exchange of research engenders cooperation and interdependence...we need to know much more about the way in which collegiality operates.

This study attempts to add to our knowledge of "collegiality" and how it operates. It focuses upon faculty women who have chosen to pursue careers in large research universities and who have worked in collaboration with one or more women on a research project, conference paper, publication, or a creative work. These women identify themselves as feminists as evidenced by their formal affiliation with the women's studies department on their campuses. Central to my inquiry is a concern with their commitments to scholarship, feminism, and collaboration and understanding how these commitments intersect. To understand these commitments, however, it is important to look closely at their university and disciplinary environments, at the relationships which women faculty form in the conduct of their scholarship, and at the individual women faculty themselves. This type of inquiry calls for
qualitative methods that allow the researcher and participants to become mutually engaged in conversation so that the meaning of events can be explored and interpreted.

This study draws together the diverse literatures on collaboration and coauthorship in scholarly research, on academic women, and on women's friendships, values, and culture. It contributes to our understanding of collaboration among women as a dynamic process and sheds light on the relationships which women collaborators form, the values they bring to their scholarship, and the ways in which collaborative relationships help to shape their identities as scholars.
CHAPTER II
A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction and Overview

The study of universities and their constituent intellectual communities, their supporting ideologies, and characteristic processes has been enriched by a wide variety of literatures and disciplinary approaches. This study focuses on feminism, scholarship, and collaboration as three complex and interrelated phenomena and looks at their occurrence within research university cultures. More specifically, the study seeks to describe how women faculty's commitments to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration intersect. Theoretical support for this line of inquiry is drawn from three sources: the literature on collaboration and coauthorship in the social sciences and humanities; the educational and sociological research on faculty women; and feminist research on women's friendships, values, and culture.

Collaboration and Coauthorship in Academic Scholarship

Conducting research and presenting new ideas or information in written form--the construction and dissemination of knowledge--are complex processes which have
been given increasing attention in the last two decades. Scholars in such diverse disciplines and fields as philosophy, history, sociology, anthropology, English, administrative science, and education have contributed to growing bodies of literature. Despite the increased interest among faculty, administrators, and others in the academic community in how science is practiced, research on collaborative research and writing, particularly in the context of higher education, is diffuse, relatively scarce, and frequently atheoretical. This discussion of literature highlights studies in rhetoric/composition and the social sciences that have a particular relevance to my inquiry into feminism, scholarship, and collaboration. Beyond organizing the research by its disciplinary roots, I focus upon its theoretical frameworks and methodologies and their capabilities to explain the experiences of academic women.

**Humanism and Constructionism in Literary Theory**

Recognition of multiple authors in the creation of a creative work or scholarly text is problematic in the humanities. The "link between individual genius, 'originality,' authorship, and authority for a text," as Ede and Lunsford (1985, p. 3) point out, continues to be a dominant and powerful assumption. The archetypal writer, musician, or artist is represented as a solitary figure,
usually a man (sic) of unusual talent and sensitivity, who must withdraw from society and turn inward for creative inspiration. In contrast to this image, the realities of manuscript production and information dissemination in a technology-based, advanced capitalistic economy require that large numbers of skilled people and sophisticated communications equipment (computers and facsimile machines, for example) be utilized in the creation of a book, monograph, or journal (Brady, 1988).

Scholars in technical writing and composition studies are raising fundamental questions about the development of language, the process of writing and teaching writing, and the creation—even the definition—of texts. Central to this discourse is a challenge to cognitive humanistic theory by those who argue for a constructionist view of knowledge. The works of Ede (1985), Ede and Lunsford (1985, 1990), Reither (1987), Lay (1989, 1991) and Maimon (1983) which focus on collaborative writing groups and composition pedagogy are helping to articulate this challenge. All draw on the theoretical work of Kenneth Bruffee (1983, 1986, 1987) in defining writing as a social act which takes place within discourse communities. Bruffee (1986) explains:

A social constructionist position in any discipline assumes that entities we normally call reality, knowledge, thought, facts, texts, selves, and so are constructs generated by communities of like-minded peers. Social construction understands reality, knowledge...and so on as community-
generated and community-maintained linguistic entities—or, more broadly speaking, symbolic entities—that define or "constitute" the communities that generate them... (p. 774).

All writing and language are socially created according to this philosophy which traces it roots to Kuhn, Rorty, Geertz, and before them to Wittgenstein, Heidegger, and Dewey (Bruffee, 1986). Reither (1987), expanding on Bruffee, explains, "Whenever we write we are collaborating with past and present participants in the ongoing conversation....Language and ways of making meaning are, in this view, community "property' out of which, together, we construct texts, meaning, knowing" (p. 4).

Ede and Lunsford's (1985) study of "real-life" writing practices developed from their recognition of the "dichotomy between current models of the composing process and methods of teaching writing, almost all of which assume single authorship, and the actual situations students will face upon graduation, many of which may well require co- or group authorship" (p. 4). Results of their initial survey of members of six professional associations reveal that collaborative writing is in fact the norm within the professions represented in the study: 87% of their 530 respondents reported that they sometimes wrote as part of a team or group. The attitudes of the respondents, however, testify to the power and persistence of the cognitive model. "To our surprise, respondents clung to the notion of writing
as a solitary activity in spite of overwhelming evidence to the contrary" (Ede & Lunsford, 1985, p. 4).

Also endorsing a collaborative approach to writing, Reither (1987) criticizes Ede and Lunsford for failing to make a clear distinction between collaboration and coauthorship. He presents some of the implications of such a distinction for teaching writing:

We are dealing with a fundamental difference—that between...collaboratively making meaning in community and...coauthoring a unitary text. Because the one is clearly foundational to the other, providing contingencies and motives, we need to do more than lay on assignments requiring students to write together as coauthors. We need to revise pedagogy to immerse students in the kinds of language communities that make written language--including coauthorship and other kinds of group work--fitting responses to real communicative needs (p. 5).

This distinction echoes a thesis presented by Maimon (1983) in her article "Graduate Education and Cooperative Scholarship." Focusing upon graduate education in the humanities, an oft-forgotten student population in the composition literature, Maimon argues the benefits of a social view of academic writing:

The reason that so few graduate students actually become productive scholars may be that they are not socialized to join this larger conversation...[T]here is an essential disjunction between what educators believe and what they teach through the methodology of graduate classrooms" (p. 58).
"To publish," she concludes, "implies that one strives to hold up one's end of the conversation" (Maimon, 1983, p. 61).

Ede's (1985) examination of the historical roots of the individual author/text relationship provides some insight into the persistence and valorization of this linkage. Tracing its roots to the early eighteenth century when the word "authorship" first appears in the Oxford English Dictionary, she argues that our constructed concept of authorship is neither commonsensical nor inevitable but is a complex reflection of our culture. Tracing its development to the appearance of the printing press, the ability to claim ownership, and hence to profit economically from the distribution and sale of books, Ede provides a Marxist interpretation that clearly links a modern concept of authorship to western capitalism. Other significant western cultural traditions which influence our privileging of the individual author are Cartesianism with its insistence that the foundation for belief can only be found by turning inward, a political system which values the individual over the social, and an escapist Romantic literary tradition. Ede (1985) continues, "...the most important of these [traditions] for our understanding of authorship involves the recognition that in western culture the concept of authorship, especially literary or humanistic authorship,
has been almost exclusively limited to individuals writing alone" (p. 6). Quoting Foucault's "What Is an Author?" she adds:

The coming into being of the notion of 'author' constitutes the privileged moment of individualization in the history of ideas, knowledge, literature, philosophy, and the sciences. Even today, when we construct the history of a concept, literary genre, or school of philosophy, such categories seem relatively weak, secondary, and superimposed scansion in comparison with the solid and fundamental unit of the author and the work (quoted in Ede, 1985, p. 6).

Ede's (1985) conclusion is fundamental to my own feminist research stance: our concepts of authorship are naive and limited, failing to recognize the alienating emphasis on the text as property and the politics of a tradition which privileges the individual at the expense of the social; however "the act of creating meaning through language can empower writers" (p. 10) and can be a powerful tool of emancipation and social change. Brady (1988, p. 213) develops similar conclusions in her critical study of collaborative literary writing and argues:

Collaborative writing is generally considered "nonliterary," and is typically associated with "business," technical" or "scientific" writing--well outside belletristic traditions. The institutional position of collaborative writing within the humanities is symptomatic of its marginal status: it is rarely taught outside of "service" composition classes and is rarely practiced by professors. To grant to collaboratively written texts the value currently reserved for the productions of "individual" writers would be to re-distribute the social
relations of production within the humanities and to challenge the hierarchical structures advocated by the paradigm of individual authorship. Cases of collaborative writing introduce alternative, flexible models of organization, in which authority is shared and negotiated among the participants, and conventions serve as guides rather than as ideal standards of conformity.

As the "new" scholarship in literature, rhetoric, and composition show, processes which were defined for centuries as individual, internal, and cognitive are being vigorously challenged. One significant effect of this challenge is to create space for other ways of thinking and writing about knowledge-making. An outgrowth of social constructionist thought in the humanities is research into collaborative writing and coauthorship. Not limited to the humanities, however, inquiry into the social aspects of research and writing has influenced scholarly research and writing practices in other disciplines and created controversy throughout the academy.

The Social Sciences and the Study of Scientific Work

Research interest in scientific collaboration and teamwork began to appear with some frequency in the social science literature after World War II. One of the earliest examples, Eaton's "Social Processes of Professional Teamwork" appeared in American Sociological Review in 1951. More theoretical than empirical, Eaton's article distinguished between hierarchical and democratic
collaboration and cautioned against science performed according to an industrial model. Smith (1958), attributing an increase in group research to the availability of governmental funding during World War II and the "cold war" era, conducted a bibliometric analysis of papers published in psychological journals from 1946 through 1957 and found a significant increase in the mean number of authors per paper. His concluding observation motivated several later studies into the frequency of the appearance of multiple authorship in the natural and social sciences:

More and more psychologists may be expected to become accustomed to work as members of research teams and to have the assistance of large research organizations in bringing their efforts to successful conclusion. The trend toward multiple authorship in psychology and in the totality of the sciences may also accelerate as more and more funds become available to conduct research on the larger and more difficult problems that now demand attention and as group research extends in nonpsychological as well as psychological fields (Smith, 1958, p. 599).

Many of the studies of collaboration and coauthorship that followed in the 1960s and early 1970s (Clark, 1964; Price & Beaver, 1966; Patel, 1973; Over & Smallman, 1973) also used bibliometric methods and focused on the practice of "big science" in the natural and social sciences. "Big science" not only refers to the large number of scientists, post-doctoral fellows, and technicians required to carry out a large project but also to the highly technological and mathematical sophistication of the problem and methodology.
The trend toward large research teams was attributed to a variety of factors, including massive increases in funding, (Heffner, 1979), increases in quantification (McCarthy, 1970), maturity of the discipline, demands of complex equipment, and the professionalization of science (Beaver & Rosen, 1979).

Contributing significantly to the research during this period, Hagstrom (1964, 1965) and Zuckerman (1967, 1968, 1970) published classic studies on the organization and practice of science. Hagstrom (1964) differentiated between two forms of teamwork: a traditional pattern characterized by free-collaboration among colleagues or among professor and students or technicians, and a modern, bureaucratic form typified by industry-based science. In his 1965 book, The Scientific Community, Hagstrom discussed the norms of independence and individualism in science as leading to conflict and competition and standing "in tension with the fact of interdependence and the desire to overcome isolation" (p. 111). Hagstrom's explanation of the adherence of scientists to scientific norms is a theory whereby social control is derived from information/recognition transfer. "Multiple authorship," he observed, "weakens the social control exercised by the scientific community through the award of recognition for published contributions" (Hagstrom, 1965, p. 140). Similarly,
Zuckerman (1968) in a study of name ordering patterns among the authors of scientific papers, suggested that multiple authorship introduces ambiguity about the respective contributions of joint authors and interferes with the operation of the reward system in science: "Evaluation is both a component of social control which curbs excessive departures from institution norms and a component of the reward system....Evaluation, however, requires that role-performance should be visible in some degree" (p. 276). Perhaps it is not surprising then that eminent scientists, such as Nobel laureates who have already gained visibility and have received the highest rewards which the scientific community has to offer, are more likely than less eminent scientists to collaborate with others and to forego first name author position in collaboratively published works (Zuckerman, 1967).

Spiegel and Keith-Spiegel (1970), in a study that continues to influence and clarify the awarding of publication credit in psychology even today, assessed the opinions of academic and industrial psychologists concerning assignment of publication credit in a wide range of collaborative situations where power or status differences among contributors was a variable. The sex of the respondents was not considered in the study. However, the study is unusual in depicting, although with great subtlety,
women in science. Men were portrayed as lead scientists, researchers, and graduate students in the majority of the sample cases (as indicated by first names or masculine pronouns). In one vignette, however, a woman is depicted in the position of technical assistant.

Over and Smallman (1973), building on Spiegel and Keith-Spiegel's work and Zuckerman's study of Nobel scientists, concluded that psychologists follow rules for determining name order in their publications that serve to maintain maximal visibility for individual contributors. However, distinguished psychologists, like the Nobel laureates in Zuckerman's study, not only publish multiple-authored papers at a higher rate than psychologists in general but also exhibit noblesse oblige, a practice of giving first author position to team members who are less well known.

Approaching collaboration from a broader perspective than much of the psychological literature which focused on coauthorship and name ordering patterns, Appley and Winder (1977) argued that collaboration is a value system which promises to provide an alternative to an outdated world view based on competition and hierarchy. Drawing on the work of social-psychologists and organizational theorists such as Emery, Trist, and Argyris and focusing on solving complex
problems in modern work settings, they define collaboration as:

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

Particularly significant to my inquiry into the intersections of feminism, scholarship, and collaboration, Appley and Winder's theory acknowledges the values upon which collaborative working relationships are based and foreshadows the themes of caring, commitment, and consciousness (or reflexivity) which are central in feminist inquiry.

By the mid-seventies, the unequal status of women in scientific organizations had been well-documented (Graham, 1970; Lewin & Duchan, 1971; Bayer & Astin, 1975, for example), and sex as a variable began to appear with some frequency in the studies of academic collaboration. Both Chubin (1974) and Mackie (1976) found that women as well as men published a significant amount of collaborative research; however women who published collaboratively tended to receive first author recognition--usually reserved for the author making the most significant contribution--less
often than men. Wilkie and Allen (1975) found that two women were much more likely to collaborate equally than two men or a man and a woman.

Kaufman's (1978) study of the collegial-friend relationships among academicians lends some support to the Wilkie/Allen hypothesis. Kaufman found that women, particularly unmarried women, had larger, more integrated networks than their male colleagues. However, she cautioned that a tendency for women to associate with academicians of similar or unequal rank and with those whose research interests are different "is likely to further diminish their chances for occupational ascent" (p. 19).

The picture which began to emerge by the late '70s was unclear. Faculty women appeared to be improving their visibility as measured by the frequency with which they published and, in sociology at least, were collaborating with other scholars with greater frequency. However, their visibility and status were limited by the second or junior author position. To collaborate with other women appeared to offer only a partial solution. Women were under-represented in most departments, making opportunities for fruitful collaboration limited. Furthermore, working collaboratively with another woman limited one's access to "invisible colleges" (Crane, 1972; Price & Beaver, 1966) comprised almost exclusively of men. As Reskin (1978a, p.
observed, "[A]ny marginality in women's position in informal communication systems is self-perpetuating: women receive less information and hence lack information to exchange, and so on." And, as Heffner (1979) discovered in his study of author recognition of subordinates, not only do women and non-Ph.D. subordinates have fewer opportunities in collaborative research to contribute to the same extent as males, but when they do, they are frequently excluded from authorship.

Mainstream social science research into collaboration and coauthorship in the next decade showed little change in its focus and methodology from the bibliometric studies of the 1970s. However a greater interest in sex as a variable is apparent, and women appear as authors more frequently. In the psychological literature Bridgewater, Bornstein, and Walkenbach (1980, 1981) replicated Spiegel and Keith-Spiegel's 1970 ground-breaking study with a methodology allowing for a more controlled look at the sex of the researcher. They found that the gender of the major character did not influence appropriate authorship assignment. In his 1982 study, Over documented the continued trend toward coauthored papers in psychology in word-type as well as data-type journals. Moreover he argued for methodological changes in the study of the roles and behavior of scientists, observing that collaborating
scientists "offer an ecologically valid setting for investigation of small group processes such as affiliation, trust, cooperation, competition, and conflict" (p. 1000).

In 1985 Mackie published a follow-up study of her 1976 research into the research productivity and collaborative styles of women sociologists. Using Bernard's typology of male "agentic" and female "communal" research styles, Mackie's findings supported the sex difference in predicted research styles. She also found an increase in the productivity of female sociologists as measured by numbers of journal articles published. Furthermore, she found that their publishing performance exceeded their representation as full-time members of graduate departments.

In the last decade, research into coauthorship and scholarly collaboration appearing in mainstream sociological and higher education literature has been conducted by collaborative partners such as Fox and Faver (1982, 1984 and Fox, 1984, 1985a and 1985b); Smart and Bayer (1986 and Bayer & Smart, 1991); Long (1990 and Long & McGinnis, 1981); and Austin and Baldwin (1991). Fox and Faver's scholarship and experience as collaborative research partners reveal a long-standing interest in the careers of academic women (1981), in the process of managing collaborative work successfully (1982), and in the negative consequences of collaborative work for the advancement of science and scholarship.
Linking recent cases of plagiarism and the falsification of data in large team research to the practice of nominal collaboration, "...the sharing of authorship out of friendship, deference, or the requirement of a lab or project director for credit in all publications coming out of 'his or her' lab" (Fox & Faver, 1984, p. 356), they urge further research into the potential for collaboration to lead to collusion, group isolation, and fraud.

Bayer and Smart's (1991, and earlier Bayer & Astin, 1975) research focuses on the careers of men and women academicians and styles of collaborative scholarship within various disciplines. In their 1991 longitudinal study of academic male chemists however, seven career authorship profiles, ranging from "burnouts" and "low-producers" to highly productive "team leaders," are identified. Among their findings, for all career university chemists, the proportion of single-authored and dual authored papers declines over the career, but the proportion of published team research papers increases over time. By mid-career more than one-half of published papers are multi-authored. Although these findings cannot be generalized to other disciplines, they may have implications for the careers of women who, because of their particular research interests or desires to foster the development of other emerging scholars, may prefer to work collaboratively but feel that
they must establish visibility as independent researchers in the early years of their careers.

In their study of scientific productivity, Long and McGinnis (1981) looked specifically at organizational context in the careers of male biochemists. Their analysis, which has significant implications for the study of faculty working in research settings, revealed that institutional characteristics are stronger determinants of research productivity than the faculty member's previous level of productivity. By adding women biochemists to his sample in a follow up study, Long (1990) provides important insight into the productivity of women in science, finding collaboration with mentors to be the most important factor affecting productivity. He also found that processes leading to collaboration (such as selectivity of their baccalaureate institution or productivity of their mentors) as well as the nature of collaboration differ for men and women with females consistently receiving smaller return than males. Interestingly, Long's analysis reveals that for women, being married doubles the odds of collaborating; however having children has a nearly equal but opposite effect, leading him to hypothesize that the effects of marriage and children on productivity may operate indirectly through the process of collaboration. Long's conclusion
provides support for Clark and Corcoran's (1986) theory of cumulative disadvantage:

Part of the sex difference in predoctoral productivity can be explained by processes that are fundamentally different for males and females. The most important differences involve the effect of young children. In many other respects, the processes... are remarkably similar. Nonetheless, throughout these processes there is a concentration of small advantages and disadvantages... that consistently work against the achievement of females and for the achievement of males.... To understand sex differences in science, it is a mistake to concentrate on large differences to the neglect of many small differences (Long, 1990, pp. 1313-1314).

Educational Research on Faculty Collaboration and Authorship

Austin and Baldwin (1991) have published a review of the research on faculty collaboration in scholarship and teaching in order to direct attention to the practical and ethical issues which higher education policy makers must face. In their discussion of the impact of collaboration on publication acceptance rates, Austin and Baldwin identify a factor that has particularly strong implications for research on women faculty who are frequently located in less prestigious and well-funded universities and departments:

The relationship between collaboration and the acceptance rate of publications is somewhat stronger in masters-granting than in doctoral-granting departments, suggesting that collaboration is particularly helpful to academics in minor departments that might lack the number of
specialists needed to conduct scholarship on the cutting edge in many fields today (p. 31).

Austin and Baldwin note, as I have stated earlier, that much of the research on collaboration lacks a grounding in theory; however, they find Barbara Gray's (1991) articulation of negotiated order theory from the organizational behavior literature to be the most useful framework for understanding and analyzing faculty team efforts. Quoting Gray, they explain,

...negotiated order refers to a social context in which relationships are negotiated and renegotiated. The social order is shaped through the self-conscious interactions of participants.... The negotiated order emerges through the team's search for a jointly agreed-upon perspective and approach (Austin & Baldwin, 1991, p. 48).

Whether or not this theory is useful in explaining the experiences of women faculty is not explored in this or their later work (see Baldwin & Austin, 1992 below). However, Austin and Baldwin acknowledge that differences do exist in patterns of men's and women's collaboration and the rewards which they receive. They cite Kanter's (1977) research on women as token members of organizations and Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule's (1986) themes of connectedness and community as offering further theoretical support for inquiry into women's collaboration experiences.

In a later work, Baldwin and Austin (1992) analyze the language participants use to describe long term collaborative partnerships. They suggest that faculty
members in the field of higher education use a variety of metaphors to describe their collaborative relationships and conclude that "[a] good collaborative relationship has many of the qualities of a good marriage, a successful creative alliance, or a winning sports team" (Baldwin & Austin, 1992, p. 8). Their effort to identify an emerging theory of collaboration also suggests that motivation and expected outcome play a significant role in the decision to collaborate and to continue in a relationship. They conclude:

[F]aculty engage in collaboration if they perceive that their collaborative work will achieve a goal or a set of goals—a project that each individually could not produce at all, a more creative product than each could produce alone, or an opportunity to be in a collegial and less isolating intellectual situation....they are likely to enter or continue such a relationship if they believe that the collaboration has a strong likelihood to succeed in producing good work (Baldwin & Austin, 1992, 12-13).

Isenberg, Jalongo, and Bromley (1987) approached the study of collaboration and coauthorship in education using a research design which combined bibliometric analysis of educational journal articles with a survey of collaborating authors. Their stated purpose was to better understand collaborative writing and to construct a model of the process. Their survey findings show that collaboration is a work style preferred by a significant number of faculty in education. Furthermore, it is perceived as improving the
quality of scholarship, broadening the participation of faculty in professional publication, and promoting personal and professional growth.

Also employing bibliometric methods, Rentz (1986) analyzed student affairs literature to ascertain the publication patterns of women authors. Comparing her findings to Tryon's study in the early 1980s, she found that women continue to represent the minority of authors in the selected journals and that the rapid increase in articles authored by women noted in the earlier study (17% to 32%) has not continued but has remained relatively stable. Supporting Tryon's findings, Rentz also found that women continued to publish significantly more often with men as co-authors, with the percentages increasing from 36% in 1980 to 47% in 1984.

Nicoloff and Forrest (1988), also focusing their research on the publication patterns of women in student affairs, surveyed members of the American College Personnel Association regarding a number of variables, including their research and publication experience, their attitudes about research, job responsibilities, perceptions of abilities and barriers, collegial and administrative support, and quality of life. Significant sex differences occurred for several variables. For example, fewer women reported that they had published scholarly articles or books (34% compared to 53%
for men). Women were less confident that they had collegial and administrative support for doing research and reported less encouragement than men in their graduate programs for continuing research during their professional careers. Furthermore, women reported having fewer mentors who worked with them on research or professional writing and fewer mentors who were actively involved in research. There were no sex differences in expressed interest in research and professional writing.

Hunter and Kuh (1987) report findings from an investigation into the characteristics of prolific contributors to the higher education literature. Among their significant findings, almost half (46%) of the respondents indicated that a mentor was of critical importance to their acquisition of research interests and skills. Sponsors were particularly helpful in securing the initial and subsequent positions, serving as role models, becoming established in professional associations and networks, and offering advice or collaborating on research and publication activities. Women scholars (42%) were more likely than their male counterparts (18%) to collaborate with students in publication activities and, interestingly, to expect that their publication activities would increase during the next five years (31% and 6%).
Much of the literature in education which promises to shed light onto women as collaborators is diverse and difficult to integrate. MacGregor (1990), writing primarily on collaborative learning and pedagogy, links collaborative learning theory to cognitive psychology (through Dewey, Piaget, and Vygotsky), social psychology (through Lewin and Deutsch), social constructionism, and feminist epistemology (especially Belenky et al). In a different vein, Johnson and Johnson (1987), focusing on collegial support groups working within school settings, find evidence to show that cooperation among adults promotes achievement, positive interpersonal relationships, social support, and self-esteem. And, finally, in an essay published in a mathematics education journal, Carry (1980) discusses ethical issues surrounding faculty-student collaboration and coauthorship of dissertation research.

**Collaborative Writing as a Feminist Strategy**

Feminist scholarship adds an openly political and experiential dimension to the study of collaboration. Many of the journal articles and books that explore women as scholars and writers are coauthored by women working in pairs and in larger collaborative writing teams. Although this is seen increasingly in the mainstream literature in sociology and psychology (Fox & Faver, 1981, 1982, 1984;
Boice, Shaughnessy, & Pecker, 1985) and to a more limited extent in the rhetoric and composition literature (Ede & Lunsford, 1985, 1990; Kaplan & Rose, 1993), it is presented consciously in feminist writing as a part of scholarship that is overtly reflexive and historically situated. Several examples of feminist scholars writing collaboratively about feminist scholarship are available to us. DuBois, Kelly, Kennedy, Korsmeyer, and Robinson (1987), for example, discuss the advantages and the challenges they faced in attempting to overcome the practical problems of a five-year collaborative writing project: "Our method of writing attempted to take into account the vitality of our individual contributions as well as the need to create a text which went beyond those....The end result is a book [Feminist Scholarship: Kindling in the Groves of Academe] in which all of us can recognize some of our ideas or our contributions to the development of ideas, but the individual voices have been submerged into the collective" (p. ix). Their discussion of the book's development provides insight as well as practical suggestions into the management of a collaborative research and writing project.

Approaching collaboration in composition as a scholarly practice which combines feminist politics and theory with women's embodied experience, Kaplan and Rose (1993) analyze their long-term collaborative writing partnership in terms
of dance, jazz, and lesbian metaphors. In describing their collaborative style, they note:

The jazz metaphor, with its sexual elaboration, is the most accurate model we have found because our ideas and words—like sounds—meet, mingle, harmonize, and emerge conjoined, saying more than either of us would have said alone. Our collaboration presupposes and insists on integrity....The magic of jazz...arises from the total attentiveness and receptivity of each player to the other. (Kaplan & Rose, 1993, p. 550.)

Name ordering with its implications for unequal contributions and rewards is a concern of many feminist authors. As the examples above illustrate, a common—even if unsatisfying—solution to the dilemma is to list names alphabetically. Other frequent coauthors, such as Lisa Ede and Andrea Lunsford and Linda Grant and Kathryn Ward alternate first-author position and indicate by footnote that their publications represent equal contributions. Symbolizing a more radical challenge to the norms of authorship and name position, there are feminist academicians, such as the Nebraska Feminist Writers Project and the Personal Narratives Group, who publish their collaborative scholarship under the group's collective name without including the names of the individual contributors except by authors' note. The decisions of these scholars to forego individual visibility and recognition for the advancement of the group's collective goals represents
political activism as well as a reflection of feminist epistemology.

An important strand in feminist criticism since Spender's (1981) critique of academic publishing is an exploration of the ways that male-dominated and often invisible processes involved in the publication and dissemination of information impact upon women's scholarship. Grant and Ward (1991) extend this line of inquiry to the politics of the prepublication process and to reputation after publication by looking at such indicators as acknowledged funding support in a sample of articles published in major sociology journals. Among their findings, articles authored by men on topics other than gender were significantly more likely to note funding support than articles on gender written by men or any articles written by women. Their review of the literature further leads them to conclude:

Gender politics in sociological research affects studies by and about women, publication in sociological journals, and eventually, visibility within the discipline. After publication, gender biases affect dissemination and visibility of research and allocation of institutional rewards: Women get less payoff from publishing. (p. 218)

In a related study, Ward and Grant (1991) analyzed authorship patterns in ten sociology journals for a ten year period looking at the sex of the authors, content of article (specifically gender, sex roles, or sexuality), and
classification of the journal as mainstream, regional, or speciality. Their analysis shows that coauthorship is more common than solo-authorship for both women and men, although women coauthor more frequently than men. They found that scholars writing on gender coauthor more frequently than scholars writing on other topics, that rates of coauthorship are lower in national mainstream journals than other sources, and that women are less likely to occupy dominant-author position in mainstream journal articles than elsewhere. Ward and Grant (1991, p. 260) conclude that "the model of the individual, autonomous scholar continues to be more highly valued by social scientist who control publication in national mainstream journals," resulting in a subtle evaluative bias that regards solo-authored research as better science.

Further evidence of bias against women is evident in Ferber's (1986) research. In her analysis of economics journals, she hypothesized that women are at a disadvantage in accumulating citations in a field such as economics, in which they constitute a minority. Employing a quantitative bibliometric methodology, she was able to confirm her hypothesis, leading her to a conclusion originally reached by Hirsch and Hirsch in 1978: that citation should not be regarded as unbiased indicators of merit. "The issue here is not that men or women--or both--consciously discriminate
against authors of the opposite sex but rather that any affinity between authors of the same sex works to the disadvantage of those in the minority" (p. 389).

In a later study which she expanded to include journals in mathematics, developmental psychology, sociology, labor economics, and financial economics, Ferber (1988) found once again a significant difference between men and women authors in their references to women's publications. However, she also found, "the ratio of the percentage of references to women's publications in articles written by women as compared to articles written by men tends to decline as the ratio of women to men in the field, and among authors in the field, increases" (p. 86). Ferber's analysis lends support to Kanter's (1977) theory of token women in organizations who tend to find themselves isolated, whereas a larger minority population finds it easier to build networks and become integrated into the larger group.

Women Faculty and Their Status in the Academy

Although women have held faculty positions in American colleges and universities since the nineteenth century, they were rarely the focus of social science research until the early 1960s. Ironically, it was not their increasing numbers and influence in the academy which brought them to the attention of researchers but their conspicuous absence
from university classrooms during a period in the nation's history when campus were swelling in size and increasing in number. Bernard's (1964) Academic Women offered a persuasive (if nonthreatening) argument for bringing more women into higher education to address the shortage of qualified instructional faculty. Like many of the scholars who followed immediately after her, Bernard appears cautious in her approach, choosing to analyze the attributes and behaviors of the women themselves rather than focusing on discriminatory structures, attitudes, and practices within the academy.

By 1967, other faculty women in the social sciences were focusing attention on doctoral-trained women and comparing their academic careers with men along such dimensions as field, marital status, children, productivity, income, and other professional and personal characteristics. Simon, Clark, and Galway (1967) concluded from their study that the differences between men and women were relatively small and decreasing. However, they suggested that:

...the "problem" which bothers the woman Ph.D. who is a full time contributor to her profession is that she is denied many of the informal signs of belonging and recognition...she has achieved less than full membership in the "club" and she is left with a feeling that she belongs to a minority group which has not gained full acceptance (p. 236).
Other work on faculty women in the 1960s and early '70s documented the underrepresentation of women in specific institutions and fields and began to explore reasons for the career patterns which emerged. Graham (1970, 1978) pointed out the numerous psychological and cultural obstacles which limited the aspirations of young women. Lewin and Duchan (1971) documented evidence of discrimination in the hiring process, and Bayer and Astin (1975) documented sex bias in the reward system. Tidball (1976) raised concerns about the differential impact college and university environments had on women faculty and women students, suggesting that women's self-esteem and social values may be diminished in male-dominated institutions.

Throughout the 1970s and particularly after passage of affirmative action legislation, the careers, status, and productivity of women faculty members were carefully scrutinized, and efforts were made to explain the continuing evidence of discrimination against women despite their gains on a number of traditional productivity measures (Astin, 1978). Kaufman (1978), looking at structural rather than psychological barriers, explored collegial-friend relationships and concluded that women's exclusion from male networks served to isolate them from important informal contacts and leave them at a professional disadvantage. Hirsch and Hirsch (1978) speculated that women and
minorities were more likely to suffer from a reliance on surrogate measures of quality, such as institutional prestige and number of publications, that often fail to reflect true ability. They note that the rapid expansion of higher education in the 1960s and 1970s had contributed to time-saving assessment methods replacing careful and deliberate judgment. They cautioned that "the price of overreliance on signals and symbols may be...that they become ends in themselves, surrogate goals; and in this rests a threat to scholarship and excellence." (Hirsch & Hirsch, 1978, p. 161). Noting the difficulties inherent in the evaluation of published work, they ask:

Are those who use these methods of evaluation sufficiently aware of the differences between certain areas of research which make it possible for some to publish dozens of papers per year where others must labor long and hard for each contribution?...Have they developed methods to account for the different meanings attached to coauthorship of papers in different fields--for example, in physics compared with the humanities?" (Hirsch & Hirsch, p. 163.)

Due in large part to the influence of the women's movement and the growth of feminist scholarship, research on academic women turned from tracking the careers of faculty women and documenting discrimination with quantitative measures to attempting to theorize and describe women's experiences in more complex ways. Langland and Gove (1981) observed that women's studies programs had begun to alter faculty scholarship but had yet to have a substantial
influence on the traditional curriculum, noting that women's studies remains the voice of the outsider in academe, upsetting the received wisdom of the male-dominated curriculum by insisting on the importance of women's experience. Jensen (1982) interviewed women who were either completing their Ph.D. degrees or recently employed as junior faculty members. She identified three modal styles of behavior and values which characterized her participants' adaptation to academic culture: reorientation, reflecting the effort of women to exemplify the norms of male academic culture; reaffirmation, requiring the command of both professional norms and traditional feminine roles and values; and reconstitution, revealing an effort to reformulate professional participation into a lifestyle more compatible with women's cultural norms. Intrigued with the mix of goals, achievements, and attitudes expressed by women in the third group, Jensen (1982) concludes that the reconstituted faculty women were directing their energies "toward integration of life activities in the two cultures of academia and womanhood and toward a wholeness which we may come to recognize as women's culture" (p. 82).

Much of the research on academic women which appeared in the '80s acknowledged women's disadvantage and frequent isolation in an institutional culture long dominated by men. Fox (1984) posited that women's depressed status was due to
a wide variety of factors, including socialization, constraints of family roles, restrictive political and economic opportunity structures, and a male culture with its powerful informal networks which often excluded women. Clark and Corcoran (1986), focusing upon the socialization experiences of faculty woman, suggested that women's experiences are qualitatively different from men's, resulting in accumulative career disadvantage. Significantly, Fox noted that the dominant academic culture is not only male but also white, compounding the problems which women of color must face. Menges and Exum (1983, p. 127) confirmed that minority women are "the least well-represented group among tenured academics." Furthermore they argue that women and minority faculty progress more slowly through the academic ranks because of the distinctive problems that they face in negotiating peer review processes that favor the scholarship and career patterns associated with white males.

Without minimizing the obstacles which academic women continue to face in their struggles to succeed as "women-of knowledge," Simeone (1987, p. 75) contends that the situation for women has improved and cites the following indications:

...the growing prominence of women's studies and feminist scholarship, the expansion of women's scholarly and professional networks for communication and support, the increasing numbers
of women faculty at research institutions, the implementation of anti-discrimination laws, and the increasing publication rates for women.

Although many scholars would agree with Simeone's contention that the entry and movement of women through the faculty ranks had improved since Bernard focused attention on their status in the 1960s, research in the 1990s continues to document women's isolation and exclusion from informal male networks and positions of power and to draw on the feminist themes of connected and caring relationships to theorize women's relationships to the academy. Moore and Sagaria (1991), for example, used the concepts of numbers, opportunity, and power to look at coalitions in elite research universities and editorial boards. They documented the underrepresentation of women from positions of power and challenged the idea of the university as a neutral concept. Particularly significant for my research, Moore and Sagaria (1991) added:

...feminist scholars have argued that women must create a major shift in ideology that should and would change academic culture by making it more inclusive, humane, and collegial. It could also bring a shift in the way academic power is determined and move personnel decisions from a competitive to a collaborative mode. Emphasis for change would be less on the legalistic mechanisms and hierarchical structures of the academy and more on the dynamic functioning and social interactions of the members. This could result in rethinking graduate education and junior faculty experiences as a time of individualistic challenge and competition to a time of mutual investment in talent development, generativity, and collaboration (p. 196).
Women's Friendships, Values, and Culture

The values and relationships that have long been associated with women in Western culture—nurturance, reciprocity, intimacy, mutuality, care and concern for others—appear repeatedly, both implicitly and explicitly, in the literature on collaboration. Appley and Winder's (1977) essay cited earlier is just one example of mainstream research in a growing body of scholarship which links collaboration in its variety of forms and settings to feminist values. Belenky, in an interview with Ashton-Jones and Thomas (1991), suggests that women, on the whole, work better in collaborative situations. Drawing on Chodorow's work in gender identity and Ruddick's theory of maternal thinking, Belenky adds, "To be noncompetitive—to be connected, to care, to engage in dialogue, to draw out the other person—is a good way to be if you want to sponsor the development of others....it provides a collaborative stance toward the world" (Ashton-Jones & Thomas, 1991, p. 35).

Feminist philosopher and educator Noddings (1986) also agrees that in her work, as in Gilligan's, the "different voice" expressing an ethic of caring is more likely to be female than male. However, she attributes that connection to culture and experience and not to biology or "nature."
Also contributing significantly to our understanding of the ties between feminism and collaboration is a rich body of historical research on the lives of American women—particularly white, middle class women. Looking particularly at women's diaries, letters, and personal records in order to gain insight into the ways in which eighteenth and nineteenth century women lived their lives, feminist historians have demonstrated the importance and significance of women's associations with other women. Smith-Rosenberg (1975) describes American society as characterized by a rigid gender-role differentiation which led to the development of supportive networks of women. These networks were "institutionalized in social conventions or rituals which accompanied virtually every important event in a woman's life, from birth to death" (Smith-Rosenberg, 1975, p. 9). The "women's sphere," which was created within the family and extended to the larger society, had an integrity that grew out of women's mutual affection and shared experience and provided an important sense of continuity in a rapidly changing society.

Cott (1977) asserts that women's friendships were particularly attractive because they represented peer relationships, allowing women to escape the subordination and disparagement of their capabilities which they often suffered in their relationships with men. "[F]emale
friendships assumed a new value in women's lives in this era because relations between equals--'peer relationships'--were superseding hierarchical relationships as the desired norms of human interaction" (Cott, 1977, p. 187). White middle and upper class women, still not regarded as the peers of men despite their gains in family influence, religious leadership, and in education, turned to each other for relationships based on equality and respect.

Through the development of peer relationships which were based upon their acceptance of their subordinate gender status, women ironically were able to enter into relationships bases on their individuality. Cott (1977, p. 194) suggests that women's reliance on each other to confirm their values "embodied a new kind of group consciousness, one which could develop into a political consciousness." She further asserts, "The 'woman question' and the women's rights movement of the nineteenth century were predicated on the appearance of women as a discrete class and on the concomitant group-consciousness of sisterhood" (p. 194).

Freedman (1979), drawing on Smith-Rosenberg and Cott's research, further develops the linkages between the culture of white, native-born, middle class women and feminist politics. She argues that the rise in women's societies and organizations, or "female institution building," although not necessarily representing a political strategy,
nevertheless provided nineteenth century middle class women with resources which were integral to the emergence of feminist politics. Freedman suggests that the integrationist strategies which replaced separatism after the success of the suffrage movement may explain the erosion of the women's culture and the decline of feminism after 1920. Applying her theses to women in universities, she observes:

Examples of this integrationist approach can be found in the universities, the workplace, and politics....In the universities, the success of the first generation of female academics did not survive past the 1920s, not only because of men's resistance, but as Rosalind Rosenberg has explained, "Success isolated women from their culture and placed them in an alien and often hostile community." Many academics who cut off their ties to other women 'lost the old feminine supports but had no other supports to replace them."

Two conclusions which Freedman draws from the history of women's institution building--with contemporary women's studies departments serving as just one notable example--are that women must draw on the cultural resources that emanate from a separate and distinct women's culture while continuing to examine that culture critically. However, an inherent danger in relying on a women's culture, as Cott also observes, is that women may become too comfortable and fail to push for change in the larger society. Ryan (1979) agrees that it is the use of women's social and historical power which must concern feminists, and she expresses
skepticism "as to whether women's culture and female networks, which continue to be rooted largely in the relations of housewives and mothers, can generate much more than reflexive and defensive, rather than critical, responses to social and familial change.

Rosenberg's research into the feminization of the curriculum at the University of Chicago at the turn of the century reveals the extent of women's gains and losses as a result of their integration into male-dominated universities. "The triumph of higher education in America had a major impact on feminism" Rosenberg (1979, p. 338) asserts and further explains:

The ideological change fostered by work in the social sciences freed women from the restrictions imposed by old prejudices about female inferiority, but at the same time undermined the sense of support women had enjoyed as members of a distinctive and self-consciously separate community. Having won a place within higher education, women suffered the strain of no longer feeling secure in the old, separate world of womanhood, and maternal nurture, without being fully accepted or feeling comfortable within the new world of professionalism and science.

Historical inquiry into women's culture provides a revealing but incomplete picture of female relationships. More recent research into women's friendships, building on the work of feminist historians, is attempting to contribute a more complex and critical literature. O'Connor (1992) concludes from her review of the limited research on friendship that this area of study has been overlooked and
frequently trivialized. She argues that friendship is a culturally constructed form of relationship which varies both historically and cross-culturally, that friendships have an effect on the individual's identity and well-being, and that they play a part in reflecting and reinforcing class position and marital status. Significant to my research, O'Connor suggests that one of the most important questions which needs to be addressed through careful research is the extent to which women's friendships are liberating or limiting forces. She explains:

...it will be necessary to look at the ways in which such structural realities shape friendships, and are shaped by them. In this context, one of the most important questions which arises is the extent to which friendships between women bring about change in the social structure--or, alternatively, simply perpetuate it. This seems likely to be one of the central questions of the 1990s....This work will also need to be rooted in an understanding of friendships as social processes....[I]t is increasingly clear that an understanding of friendship must deal with issues related to the resolution of conflict, management of inequality and the creation and maintenance of relationships. (O'Connor, 1992, p. 191-192.)

Summary

There is a growing body of published research in social science disciplines as well as the humanities which investigates collaboration and coauthorship as scholarly practices. Included within this research are empirical and conceptual articles framed by a feminist perspective. Increasingly these studies suggest that there are
differences in the ways that women and men faculty approach their scholarship, interact with colleagues, and experience academic culture. Despite the increasing diversity and richness of these studies however, many of them have looked primarily or exclusively at white male scientists or male-dominated disciplines. Therefore our knowledge of faculty women who choose to work collaboratively with other women remains sketchy. Little is written about the professional relationships and friendships which help to support and define academic careers, which help women faculty to construct their scholarly identities, and make productive scholarly lives possible, challenging, and perhaps limiting for many women. Also missing in the literature are detailed descriptions which illuminate how feminism, scholarship, and collaboration intersect.

This study is informed by the literature on collaboration and coauthorship in academic science but its focus on women is supported by two related literatures: research into the status of faculty women and research into women's friendships, values, and culture. Inquiry in these three areas contributes to an understanding of research university environments, the norms which govern research and scholarship in particular disciplines, and why women historically have been underrepresented and undervalued. Furthermore, it sheds light on the cultural knowledge and
values that women are likely to bring to their scholarship and their collaborative partnerships.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Inquiry into collaboration in academic scholarship may be conceptualized and conducted in many ways. As I have shown in Chapter II, collaboration has been a topic of inquiry in a number of disciplines and has therefore been guided by a variety of research questions and methodologies. Within the social sciences, collaboration has been most frequently investigated using quantitative, bibliometric methods which focus on citation counts and name ordering patterns. Although these methods have yielded important findings, they are not well suited for capturing the multiple meanings which individual scholars construct of their experiences as collaborators.

Inquiry that purports to describe and expand our understanding of a phenomenon is enhanced by an epistemological stance that minimizes the distance between "researcher" and "subject," questions objectivity and the other requirements of positivistic science, and recognizes that all knowledge is socially constructed, historical, and partial (Roman and Apple, 1990). To conduct this type of inquiry, I employed an interpretive research design which
permitted me to approach my research participants—women faculty—as articulate, meaning-making colleagues and to talk with them about scholarship, collaboration, and feminism. Furthermore, my choice of qualitative methods allowed me to capture, record, and analyze their individual narratives holistically and yet systematically and rigorously, to describe them in detail, and to situate them in social contexts which influence groups of faculty women.

The Feminist Researcher

As a feminist, I am committed to placing women and their experiences at the center of my inquiry. "Through the questions that feminism poses and the absences it locates, feminism argues the centrality of gender in the shaping of our consciousness, skills and institutions as well as in the distribution of power and privilege" (Lather, 1991, p. 70). For the researcher who links feminism to a poststructural concern with discourse and textuality, collaborative research and collaborative scholarly writing can be framed as relationships of power, ways of constructing texts and representing knowledge, ways of challenging academic norms and ideologies, and all of these things. In this study, I approach scholarly collaboration as a complex social process. I hold the belief that a deeper understanding of collaboration can provide insight, not only into the construction and
legitimation of knowledge, but also into the ways in which those processes and relationships influence the ways in which women construct their identities as scholars.

Fonow and Cook (1991) point out that there is "the expectation among some scholars that feminist collaboration will bring about a deeper intellectual analysis, an original approach to framing the questions, with a mind-set of innovation to deal with the gendered context of research" (pp. 4-5). With an appreciation for that expectation, I also desire to bring about a "deeper intellectual analysis" and "an original approach to framing the questions" about the phenomenon of scholarly collaboration. Furthermore, my goal is to make visible the linkages between politics and scholarship, and between women's feminism and our research, in order to resist the dominant, positivistic understanding of science which "treat[s] the relationship between the women's movement and women's research in the usual ahistorical, abstract way" (Mies, 1991, p. 62).

These emancipatory goals call for postpositivist epistemologies and methodologies which capture women's experiences as multiple and shifting realities and which recognize that knowledge, truth, and even subjectivity itself are always partial, contextual, and historically situated (Harding, 1987). Embracing a constructivist view of gender, knowledge, and social life, postpositivist
inquirers reject the research methodologies embraced by a logical positivist paradigm. Postpositive inquiry reveals the limitations and the conservative interests of Enlightenment rationality and liberal humanism for understanding the complexities of individual experience and social life (Harding, 1986). "What this mean," argues Lather (1991, p. 52) "is that openly ideological, advocacy-based research has arisen as a new contender for legitimacy." Feminist epistemologies and methodologies, with their attendant political desires for social justice and the eradication of patriarchy, are embraced as potentially powerful ways of analyzing and theorizing women's experiences (Harding, 1987). But feminism requires that analysis and theory be linked with action, that theory be mobilized "in order to develop strategies for change on behalf of feminist interests" (Weedon, 1987, p.11). My inquiry therefore takes on a critical edge.

Marxist ethnographer Thomas (1993, p. 4) reminds us that conventional science describes, affirms, and assumes the status quo; critical ethnography has an explicitly political purpose:

Critical ethnographers...accept an added research task of raising their voice to speak to an audience on behalf of their subjects as a means of empowering them by giving more authority to the subjects' voice. As a consequence, critical ethnography proceeds from an explicit framework that, by modifying consciousness or invoking a call to action, attempts to use knowledge for social change. (Emphasis in the original.)
"Recognizing," as Carolyn Heilbrun (1988, p. 121) writes, "that women could not speak to other women as men had always spoken, as though from on high," my goal is to use knowledge to question authority and to speak with, in addition to on behalf of, other women. Speaking for the people with whom one questions and learns, even speaking as I am from an explicitly feminist poststructural framework, is in itself a reenactment of power, both revealing and concealing specific political interests (Roman and Apple, 1990).

Feminism seeks to transform the content of knowledge and the practices and institutions which have historically limited women's access to it. "To do so," Weedon (1987, p. 7) argues, "requires that we tackle the fundamental questions of how and where knowledge is produced and by whom, and of what counts as knowledge. It also requires transformation of the structures which determine how knowledge is disseminated or otherwise." This is an openly feminist study which focuses on specific institutions and practices of knowledge-making. Central to feminist inquiry, it is grounded in the lived experiences of women. It reflects my concern for women and my desire to place women at the center of my inquiry. Furthermore, it reflects my own experiences as a woman, a feminist, and an aspiring scholar who has worked both independently and in collaboration with other women.
Research Design and Focus

This study focuses on women faculty in research universities who identify themselves as feminists and who have chosen to do research, to write scholarly papers, or to create an artistic work in collaboration with another woman. My goal has been to describe how feminism, collaboration and scholarship interrelate and, in so doing, to gain a deeper understanding of collaboration as a dynamic process in which faculty form meaningful relationships in the advancement of their scholarship. In order to accomplish this goal, my inquiry was guided by the following overarching research question: How do the commitments which women faculty bring to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration intersect?

In order to conduct advocacy-based research that captures the complex ways in which scholarship, feminism, and collaboration interrelate and that honors the academic women whose experiences form the basis of this inquiry, I selected an interpretive research design which employs qualitative methods. As Erickson (1986) points out, interest in interpretive content--human meaning in social life--leads the researcher to search for methods which will be appropriate for the study of that content. My search was for methods which would bring me in close contact with faculty women who work together in collaboration--methods which would permit me to share in their meanings, and
through our mutual engagement in the research act, add to our understanding of ourselves as feminist researchers and knowers.

Extending Harding (1986) and Collins' (1991) analytical frameworks to my research on feminism, scholarship, and collaboration allowed me to formulate additional research questions and to begin to focus my inquiry more clearly on faculty women as individuals, as partners in collaborative relationships, and as scholars whose work is done in a particular institutional and disciplinary context.

Specifically, my study asks:

1. How does working in collaboration with other women encourage and/or inhibit faculty women's construction of their own scholarly identities?
2. What are the social relationships that develop among feminist women who collaborate in their research?
3. In what ways do the these intersecting commitments challenge as well as reinscribe the dominant norms of academic scholarship?

It was my expectation that their narrative accounts would reveal variations in their experiences and in the ways they saw those collaborative experiences as both reflecting and shaping their scholarly identities, their social relationships, and their research strategies. It was also
my hope that themes and patterns would emerge from the diversity which characterizes women's lives, leading to a more complete description and a fuller understanding of feminism, scholarship, and collaboration as intersecting commitments.

The Process of Participant Selection

The focus of this study is the individual woman scholar and her narrative account of collaborating with another woman in an artistic, scholarly, or research project. I selected participants by employing a purposeful, criterion-based sampling technique (Patton, 1990). The criteria which I established for the selection of participants are: 1) employment status as a full-time tenured or tenure-accruing faculty member at one of two Carnegie Foundation type I research universities in the Midwest United States; 2) a core, joint, or adjunct appointment in a department of women's studies; and 3) experience collaborating with another woman on a research project, a scholarly paper or article, or project in the creative arts.

I identified three large public research (Carnegie type I) universities which were located within 150 miles of my residence at the time of the study. Each of the institutions employs women as full-time tenured or tenure
track faculty, and each has a formal women's studies program or department with a published listing of core, jointly appointed, and/or associated faculty members who have primary disciplinary affiliations and faculty appointments in other departments. Appointment to the women's studies faculty as an adjunct or associated faculty member is based on a formal process of reviewing a scholar's research and course content for coherence with the program's feminist ideology and goals. As in most research institutions, the women's studies faculties of the two sample universities come almost exclusively from the humanities, social sciences, and selected professional schools. Few women in the physical sciences or male-dominated professional schools (such as engineering or medicine) are affiliated with women's studies programs (Rosser, 1986). One of the three institutions was selected as the site of my preliminary field work/pilot study and participants were identified using a limited chain sampling or snowball technique (Patton, 1990).

Early in the spring of 1993, I contacted the women's studies departments of the two remaining universities by telephone and requested a listing of the women faculty members who held formal appointments in the program during the current (1992-93) year. Names, departments, and campus addresses were provided by one institution. The second
institution provided a departmental brochure which contained the names, departmental affiliations, and research interests of the women's studies faculty. I obtained individual departmental addresses from a published faculty/staff directory.

From a list of 110 total faculty names, I eliminated all male faculty members, women who were full-time administrators, and women who had retired. I contacted the remaining 93 women by mail, providing information regarding my research project, the criteria for the selection of participants, a response letter, and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope (see Appendix A). Two letters were returned as undeliverable (one faculty member had left the institution and a second was deceased), and three were returned too late for further consideration. Thirty-six women returned the response letter with 18 indicating that they were unable to participate and 18 indicating that they were interested but had not collaborated with another woman in the conduct of their research. In order to discuss their experiences and to clarify my criteria for participation, I contacted by telephone several of the noncollaborating women who expressed interest in the study and who also provided a telephone number. Two additional respondents contacted me by telephone in lieu of returning the response letter; one
became a participant and the other confirmed that she had not collaborated.

I received 29 response letters from women who indicated that they had collaborated with another woman and were interested in participating in the study. I contacted each respondent by telephone at the number and time indicated as a preference on the letter. Each telephone conversation was brief and cordial. I addressed each respondent by her formal title (e.g., Dr. Smith), introduced myself, and referred to my letter of invitation to participate in the study and her response letter. The purpose of my follow-up telephone call was to answer questions or to provide more information about the study; to confirm the respondent's experience as a collaborator as well as her willingness to participate and to provide a curriculum vitae; and to schedule an interview session at a convenient time and location. I also called one of the 20 remaining nonrespondents early in the interview process in an attempt to increase the number of women of color in the sample; however, the respondent classified herself as a noncollaborator and was therefore not able to participate.

Of the 93 letters mailed during the last week in May, I received 71 total responses and scheduled 28 interviews. Two interviews which were originally scheduled were
cancelled when the participants encountered scheduling conflicts; I was able to complete 26.

The Sample

There are no rules for sample size in qualitative inquiry (Patton, 1990). Sample size is determined by the purpose of the inquiry, what can be accomplished with available time and resources, and what the researcher wants to learn. During my preliminary planning for the study, I established a range of 20 to 30 participants representing two universities as an optimal sample size. By drawing participants from two large institutions, I hoped to increase the opportunity of obtaining an optimal sample and to afford my participants an added measure of confidentiality. The final sample size of 26 participants fell within the range established prior to the study.

Although sample size in qualitative inquiry is not a crucial factor for reasons of statistical significance and generalizability of results, it nevertheless influences the way in which a study unfolds, the amount of time available for in-depth interviews, the allocation of other resources, and the range of experiences which are represented in the qualitative data. Whereas a large and diverse sample can provide the study with increased breadth and variety, a smaller sample can add depth through a more lengthy and
intensive or iterative interview process. A sample size of 26 was both manageable for the time allotted for data collection and of sufficient size to provide depth, breadth, and confidentiality. As it became clear that the participant selection process had yielded a sample of optimal size, my decisions regarding follow up procedures were determined by my interest in maximizing diversity.

Maximizing diversity in rank, discipline, race and ethnicity, sexual orientation, and other demographic characteristics became an important consideration in the selection of participants. Although my desire was not to select a statistically representative sample, I nevertheless realized that my research would be limited to the extent that it drew only from the experiences of a homogeneous group of women—a criticism that women of color have directed toward most Western feminist research. My method of participant selection, a criterion-based sampling technique, has no way of insuring that the resulting sample will be diverse and in fact attempts to screen out participants to the extent that they do not meet specific criteria. As I began to receive positive response letters, I developed a system of recording the obvious demographic characteristics of the evolving sample (early interviews were held before all responses were received and interviews scheduled.) Although each participant provided a copy of
her curriculum vitae which contained some demographic information, the interview itself provided an opportunity for the participant to reveal and to discuss the categories and labels which she felt shaped her experiences as a woman faculty member. Some participants openly shared information about their families, age, ethnicity, marital status and partnerships, and sexual orientation. Others spoke little about their personal lives and backgrounds. However, as the number of participants increased, so did the diversity of the sample.

The final sample of 26 women includes six assistant professors, eleven associate professors, and nine full professors representing eighteen different schools and departments. Twenty-three participants are white, three are women of color, and two women claim other ethnic or national heritages. Three identify themselves as lesbian. Fourteen of the participants described themselves in their conversations as currently having life partners, and twelve of the fourteen are currently married or remarried. Eight are divorced. Fourteen have children and/or stepchildren. Participants range in age from their mid-thirties to late sixties and, in year of the completion of their highest degree (one did not have a terminal degree), from 1955 through 1990. The three women who returned response letters late in the research process (after data analysis)
Methods of Data Collection

The Qualitative Interview

As a feminist researcher wanting to use methods and to collect "data" that are not only useful to me but are meaningful to the participants themselves, I chose the qualitative interview as my primary method of inquiry. Kvale (1992, p. 1) describes the qualitative interview or conversation as "a dialogue between two partners about a topic of common interest." The qualitative interviewer assumes that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit (Patton, 1990). And what is knowable, from a poststructural perspective, is always linguistic, contextual, and interrelational. Knowledge and meaning are locally and socially constructed, or made explicit, through discourse. Thus, the interview, a linguistic event, takes on added significance in postpositive inquiry. "[K]nowledge is not a matter of interaction with non-human reality, but a matter of conversation between persons; the conversation becomes the ultimate context within which knowledge is to be understood" (Kvale, 1992, p. 1).
Each conversation was semi-structured using a general interview guide (Patton, 1990) which I designed in such a way as to probe general topics of interest while encouraging in-depth responses (see Appendix B). By using a general interview approach I was able to focus the conversation while also allowing each participant's perspectives to emerge. Although the general interview approach provides more structure than the informal conversational or ethnographic interview, it is an approach which gave me the freedom to word questions spontaneously, to interject follow-up questions when appropriate, and to establish a comfortable, conversational style without sacrificing focus and direction.

The general interview guide which I developed for this study consists of approximately 35 open-ended questions which focus on the three primary phenomena of interest: feminism, scholarship, and collaboration. It is also designed to elicit participants' perspectives on three overlapping dimensions: the research university and disciplinary context, their professional and interpersonal relationships with their collaborators and other women faculty, and their growth as scholars and feminists.

Beginning in late June, 1993, a summer term for many of the participants, I scheduled individual interviews. I invited each participant to select a convenient date, time,
and location where she would have the opportunity to reflect on her experiences and to talk with me about feminism, scholarship, and collaboration. I suggested that a period of 90 to 120 minutes would be optimal but indicated my willingness to vary the time period according to individual needs and interest. All interviews were held privately and in person, usually in the participant's home or office. Each participant consented, verbally and in writing (see Appendix C), to my request to be allowed to take written field notes and to tape record the conversation. Tape recording provided a number of advantages in the data gathering phase of the study, permitting me to direct my attention to the participant, maintain eye contact, listen intently to her responses, and to note key words and phrases. As Reinharz (1983) confirms, the recordings also allow the researcher to relive the experience afterward and to use the language of the subject when presenting interpretations. Participants occasionally shared stories that they asked to be kept off the record because of their concern for confidentiality. I also indicated my willingness to turn off the recording equipment at their request. The tape recorded interviews varied in length from a minimum of 45 minutes to over two hours, with most lasting approximately one and one-half hours.
Documents and Biographical Data

Most participants were asked during my initial telephone conversation if they would provide me with a copy of a current curriculum vitae. Although several mailed a vitae to me prior to the scheduled interview, most provided it during, or within the month following, the interview. My purpose for collecting vitas was to gather detailed information about each participant's academic career (i.e., degree granting institutions and years, faculty rank, years at current rank and institution, evidence of feminist research, number and type of coauthored publications, name order patterns, and so forth) without taking time during the scheduled interview period.

In addition to vita, several participants gave me other written documents (published journal articles, drafts of articles in progress, and conference papers) that related to their specific research interests and experiences as collaborators. Their willingness to share documents confirms Reinharz's (1983, p. 179) experience: "Data gathering in the experiential mode is not exclusively data creating but can really be 'gathering up' what is already there."
Pilot Study

In order to refine the interview guide and method, I conducted interviews with groups and individual faculty women who had worked collaboratively with other women on at least one research or academic writing project. All of the women I interviewed identified themselves as feminists, although one participant did not have a formal appointment to the women's studies faculty at her university. With the participants' written and oral consent, all preliminary interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. Excerpts from four of the pilot interviews are presented in this text in the form of a four-part poem. However, no other references are made to specific participants from the pilot study in the remainder of the study.

Site selection for preliminary field work was influenced by geographic accessibility. Faculty women selected for the preliminary study were employed in full-time tenured or tenure-accruing positions at a public research university (Carnegie category I) in the Midwest.

The Process of Data Analysis

Data analysis, as with all phases of qualitative research, is a highly idiosyncratic process. Reinharz (1983) asserts boldly that "[t]here are no rules for data analysis except one--that the analysis draw heavily on the
language of the persons studied, i.e., that it is grounded" 
(p. 183). The data which I collected in the course of my inquiry included the observed and recorded conversations which I conducted with 26 women faculty over a period of approximately six weeks. These "events," supported by my field notes, participants' curriculum vita, and other documents (described above) were transcribed, analyzed, and coded using a detailed process described by Strauss and Corbin (1990) as open coding.

Open coding is the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data. By engaging in the process of open coding, I carefully examined, reexamined, and labeled each line of data, building and refining codes, and then separating the coded bits of verbal information into files which I then summarized and further refined into major and minor categories. Because the beauty of qualitative data is that it is descriptive and contextual, I was reluctant to separate the words from the speaker. I recognized and felt that it was essential to this study to note that an African-American women used a certain metaphor to describe her writing, or that a foreign born woman in a specific field expressed antipathy to American feminism. In order to maintain the integrity of each individual's experience during the coding process, I coded each transcript with an
identifying number as well as a thematic code (IA-fem, for example.) Furthermore, I worked back and forth between the analytical files which contained bits of narrative and the complete transcript. As I was able to combine individual codes into larger categories, I recoded the transcripts, using Strauss and Corbin's (1990) process of axial coding.

A useful feature of Strauss and Corbin's axial coding scheme during this stage of the analysis is the paradigm model. Although my research was guided by a general research question, a literature review, and my own experience as a collaborator and therefore did not purport to develop "grounded theory," the paradigm model is a method of organizing qualitative data which responds well to process and action. Drawing on the processes of inductive and deductive thinking, the paradigm model encourages the researcher to develop each category (each occurrence of collaborative research, for example) in terms of its antecedent conditions, its specific properties, context, intervening conditions, action/interactional strategies used to handle, manage, respond to this phenomenon in light of the context, and consequences. By organizing the coded bits of data around each specific collaborative event, I was able to see new themes. The identification of these themes led to the refinement of my three research questions which then became the basis for a higher level coding scheme.
The early inductive stages of coding and classifying data were often frustrating and tedious for me, generating far too many ideas, questions, and possibilities. It was particularly difficult at this stage to remain focused on the original research question, which seemed far too general to serve as a guide to data reduction. Furthermore, the Strauss and Corbin's coding schemes appeared too positivistic and reductionistic for my feminist stance. In retrospect, such a segmented approach to data analysis was inappropriate for my research goals and for my data. I describe it here, however, because of its significance in my learning.

Each subsequent (and faltering) step helped to lead me out of the data wilderness, "the code mines" as Glesne and Peshkin (1992, p. 132) describe them, and toward the story that I wanted to tell. Rereading and recoding each transcript with my three major themes clearly in mind allowed me to see linkages that had been too embedded in the narratives to notice earlier. My analytical notes which filled the margins of the transcripts changed from "antecedent condition" and "action strategy"--phrases which characterized the positivistic paradigm model--to the short narrative descriptions which characterize selective coding (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). The text below, from an
interview with Marian, provides an example of the analytical coding process (my notes in italics):

"...faculty there saw a woman primarily as doing some kind of technical work...all male faculty in the _______department. They'd make references to you getting married...and can't really commit to your career." [Repeated confrontation with male defined and enforced norms; constant limits and stereotypes] "I think it would have been a real difference if I had had a strong woman at some point there who could have shown me what you could do. At that point I had nothing to challenge my ideas." [No one to help her identify choices and to help her structure a different identity that placed value on her "passion." ] "There were very, very few who saw any possibility for me doing research. And research is what I really enjoy." [Note contrast with "Jill who feels that she was "meant" to do qualitative research.]

The process of data analysis was not (and is perhaps never) completed until the writing was done. Richardson (1993) repeatedly encourages her students to write throughout the process of data analysis, urging "Writing is the analysis." Glesne and Peshkin (1990, p. 151) note similarly:

Writing gives form to the researcher's clumps of carefully categorized and organized data. It links together thoughts that have been developing throughout the research process. The act of writing also stimulates new thoughts, new connections. Writing...creates the product, the housing for the meaning that you and others have made of your research adventure. Writing is about constructing a text.

Thus, any formal discussion of my data analysis process is partial and incomplete. Data are not analyzed until the
final text is completed and the story--one of several possible stories which exists in any data--is told.

Trustworthiness

The truth-value or trustworthiness of qualitative research cannot be determined by those criteria traditionally used to judge quantitative work. The possibility of a finding occurring by chance can never be statistically eliminated. The language of positivism--"results," "statistics," "chance"--is not appropriate to a paradigm which sees truth as contextual, socially determined, and historical. Reliability and validity criteria must be questioned and replaced either by criteria which parallel the well-known positivist truth-value tests or with criteria which are authentic to qualitative inquiry (Guba & Lincoln, 1989).

Scheurich (1992, p. 14), in his rhetorical questioning of why postpositivists have retained the positivist criterion of validity, suggests that, even in interpretive inquiry, validity manifests a "hidden sameness within apparently oppositional epistemologies." Validity serves a boundary purpose in all research; it becomes the "method or criterion for deciding whose work is good, acceptable,
allowable, punishable, sensible, meaningful or useful...." (Scheurich, 1992, p. 3).

Kvale (1989, p. 90) cautions against a focus on validity which may "foster an emphasis upon the verification of existing knowledge rather than the generation of new knowledge" and lead to a never-ending quest for certainty. Echoing their postmodern concerns, I might begin this discussion by asking, "Is validity a legitimate issue in my research?" "At best," Scheurich (1992, p. 6) responds, validity purchases quality and trustworthiness at the high price of excluding new alternative perspectives. At worst, validity simply enforces the status quo."

Guba and Lincoln (1989) offer an approach to the validity paradox by providing qualitative researchers with criteria which are based on constructivist rather than positivist assumptions: fairness and authenticity which is ontological, educative, catalytic, and tactical. Kvale (1989) also alters the concept of validity to reflect a constructivist view of social reality. He suggests that to validate is to investigate, to check, to question, and to theorize with the ultimate criteria for social science inquiry being truth, beauty, and goodness. Reinharz's (1983) validity criteria for alternative or feminist research are: completeness, plausibility, illustrativeness,
understanding, and responsiveness to readers' or subjects' experiences.

As a novice researcher whose goal is to engage in research which is both rigorous and convincing, my immediate task is to convince other feminist postpositivists that my inquiry is grounded in the narratives of my participants, and that I have taken steps to account for the possible sources of bias which can limit the credibility, dependability, and transferability of my research narrative. Guba and Lincoln (1989) define credibility as a match between the constructed realities of respondents and the representation of those realities by the researcher. In order to maximize credibility, I built additional rigor and reflexivity into my research design by incorporating opportunities for prolonged engagement, confronting subjectivity, and limited triangulation. The trustworthiness criteria of confirmability and dependability were maximized in the documenting of the research process and the careful management of data.

**Prolonged Engagement**

The trustworthiness of a researcher and her interpretations are more likely to be enhanced by time in the field and the establishment of rapport (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992; Guba and Lincoln, 1989). "One's
trustworthiness is not confined to what one says, of course, but also how one acts and who one is" (Reinharz, 1983, p. 177). My inquiry into faculty women's experiences in collaborative research required that I commit myself to substantial involvement and investment at the site of my inquiry (research universities) in order to "overcome the effects of misinformation, distortion, or presented 'fronts'...and to facilitate immersing oneself in and understanding the context's culture" (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p. 237). My inquiry therefore required that I present myself honestly, openly, and with sensitivity to my participants' differing perspectives and experiences.

My engagement with the specific faculty women who participated in my study was "intermittently intense " (WoodBrooks, 1991, p. 119) rather than routine and sustained over a long period of time as one might expect in an ethnography. Appropriate to my inquiry, however, my full engagement with participants derived from my successes at each stage of the research process, from gaining entry to the research sites, eliciting the involvement of my participants, collecting data, and interpreting the meanings in the data. Substantial involvement in the culture cannot be defined by hours or weeks; it is defined by the researcher's ability to establish trusting relationships which encourage honest disclosure.
Although my engagement with individual faculty women was intermittent as are most social relationships, I was and am not an outsider to institutions of higher education. My immersion in university cultures has taken place over a period of more than eighteen years. Having participated in many aspects of university life in a variety of roles (administrator, instructor, faculty wife, student), I have developed an insider's knowledge of the organization, values, language, and rituals associated with higher education. For the four years prior to conducting this study, I was associated with a research university as a doctoral student. In that role I maintained a weekly, and often a daily, presence on a university campus, frequently observing, learning from, and spending time with a diverse network of faculty women and graduate students who are feminists and who collaborate with other women in their research and writing.

Progressive Subjectivity

Glesne and Peshkin (1992, p. 101) describe subjectivity as "a personal encounter with self in the course of research." In qualitative research, the researcher is a participant observer, an instrument, a human being who makes sense of the people and the culture which she is studying. Therefore she brings her own perceptions, attitudes,
experiences, and biases to the research site where they may assist her or inhibit her work. Glesne and Peshkin (1992, p. 104) write:

My subjectivity is the basis for the story that I am able to tell. It is a strength on which I build. It makes me who I am as a person and as a researcher, equipping me with the perspectives and insights that shape all that I do as researcher, from the selection of topic clear through to the emphases I make in my writing. Seen as virtuous, subjectivity is something to capitalize on rather than to exorcise.

In pursuit of my own progressive subjectivity, my challenge was to be aware of and record, rather than to exorcise, my personal constructions so that they would not become privileged in my research. Guba and Lincoln (1989) offer the technique of progressive subjectivity as a way of checking on the degree of privilege that I grant my own version of reality. They suggest that the researcher record her pre-existing constructions before entering into any research activity and that she continue to record her developing constructions at regular intervals throughout the inquiry. Reinharz (1983, p. 175) also recommends that the researcher keep a personal diary during the research process and explains, "This record also draws one's attention to the researcher as a human being, not a replaceable object." She continues:

Many of one's predispositions, when known, can be questions put to the persons one is studying--they need not be discarded. They are only 'biases' if they are not acknowledged or
explored, as is almost always the case in positivist research. (Reinharz, 1983, p. 175.)

Throughout the research process, I recorded my thoughts and research activities in a journal in order to establish the habit of confronting my own subjectivity. The journal allowed me to have frequent personal encounters with my own constructions and expectations regarding all facets of the inquiry process and my own development as a researcher. A researcher journal, however, is more easily kept in theory than in practice when the demands of traveling to research sites, hours spent transcribing tapes, and the tedium of data coding and sorting leave one little time and even less energy for recording thoughts coherently in a computer journal. In reality, the journal became the formal repository of my research activities and contacts as well as a summary of many thoughts, insights, confrontations, joys, and frustrations that were more likely to strike while I was far from the computer with only a pencil and slip of paper at hand.

Limited Triangulation

Although triangulation of data sources is often viewed as an important element in the establishment of trustworthiness in qualitative research, triangulation also suggests the existence of an objective reality which can be "objectively" verified. A social constructivist approach to
interpretive research does not require the verification of a participant's reality but encourages the researcher to join in its interpretation as it is revealed in conversation. Within the context of this study, curriculum vita and other written materials documented the participants' experiences as coauthors and collaborative researchers.

**Auditing for Confirmability and Dependability**

Confirmability and dependability are additional trustworthiness criteria suggested by Guba and Lincoln (1989, p. 241) for tracking the stability of qualitative data over time and "assuring that data, interpretations, and outcomes are rooted in contexts and persons apart from the researcher." In order to establish confirmability and dependability and to insure that both the process and the data are available for auditing, I documented the research process chronologically in my researcher journal, which was archived in hard copy and disk form with all other materials and documents related to the study, including transcripts, field notes, analytical files and summaries, and rough drafts of dissertation chapters. I also protected confidential materials, such as participant lists, audio tapes, consent forms, and curriculum vita, by storing them in a secured work area in my home located more than 100
miles from the nearest research site. All confidential materials were destroyed at the conclusion of the study.

Political and Ethical Issues

In feminist inquiry, a researcher has an additional obligation to promote feminist goals and to work toward liberating social, political, and economic relationships. However, academic women—particularly white, heterosexual, able-bodied women—are rarely viewed as disadvantaged or oppressed despite their underrepresentation in most fields and in positions of power. I repeatedly asked myself: What are the relations of power that exist between us as researcher and participant? How can I use my power as a researcher to further feminist political goals in the academy? Can I construct knowledge which is useful to my participants, to "elite" women, most of whom are advantaged by class and race, who are already well-educated, and employed in prestigious research institutions? What are the potential risks as well as the advantages to participating in this study?

My first obligation as a researcher is to my participants. That obligation demands that I be open and forthright about the goals, purposes, and uses of my inquiry, and that I take firm measures to insure that the participants' privacy is not violated. I believe firmly
that trustworthiness must be a characteristic of the researcher as well as of her constructions and interpretations. Above all, participating in research should not put a participant at risk. Patton (1990) cautions us to be aware of the power of qualitative methods and to anticipate the ethical issues which can arise from the intrusiveness of methods that are highly personal and take the researcher into the real world where people live and work:

Interviews are interventions. They affect people. A good interview lays open thoughts, feelings, knowledge, and experience not only to the interviewer but also to the interviewee. The process of being taken through a directed, reflective process affects the persons being interviewed and leaves them knowing things about themselves that they didn't know—or least were not aware of—before the interview. Two hours or more of thoughtfully reflecting on an experience, a program, or one's life can be change-inducing. (pp. 353-354.)

The women faculty who conversed with me throughout the course of this study told stories of doubts and difficulties as well as strengths and successes. They relived painful experiences, occasionally with tear-filled eyes. They laughed at their mistakes and naivete and expressed anger at ignorance and injustice. They were articulate, thoughtful, cooperative, and often amazingly bold. At times they made comments that were sharply critical of the academy and of other faculty. Most of them knew that they might be identified as participants in the study, not only by
references to race, ethnicity, research focus, discipline, or institution but also by my reference to a particular experience or conflict in their department. Several times I heard, "Don't use this without letting me know..." or "If you use that, I'll be in trouble."

I have made every effort to honor their requests by omitting descriptions and distinguishing characteristics that might reveal their identities. Furthermore I have given them full code names and titles (see Appendix D) that disguise their identities but also reflect their education and faculty status. Although many participants asked me to call them by their first names during the interviews—a gestures that I interpreted as a deliberate attempt to put me at ease and to minimize the distance between doctoral student and faculty member—I have rejected the common practice of referring to them throughout the study by first name only. Each participant is introduced formally in the study as she would be introduced in an academic setting. I use first names in subsequent references to reflect the intimacy of our conversations.

Despite the risks associated with participating in the study however, 26 women chose to share their stories with me. Some were motivated by an interest in the topic. Others were committed to helping women students. For many, participation was motivated by the desire to share a
particular meaningful experience, to tell a story that needs to be told. As Dr. Karen Bell explains her decision to talk with me, "This will be my postscript to collaborative effort and that will be done."

A participant's willingness to share sensitive information may be an indication of the importance she places on topic and/or the rapport that exists between the researcher and the participant. In most cases, I knew very little about the women in the sample. I approached them as openly as possible, prepared to learn about their experiences, to answer questions, and to reveal as much about myself as necessary without becoming the focus of the conversation. I tried to avoid making assumptions about any participant's personal characteristics or background. As in any study, rapport is established more quickly with some participants than with others, and some women appeared more comfortable with my presence and my questions than others. I dressed "professionally casual" to fit in with the women faculty and doctoral students on a hot university campus in the summer. I am easily identified, however, as a white, able-bodied woman in her mid-forties.

Because skin color is such a significant physical and social characteristic in American society, women of color, perhaps responding to my own physical appearance in addition to my interview questions, emphasized race, class, and
culture in their stories, explaining how their experiences as feminists, collaborators, and scholars are determined by color and how they differ from majority women and men in the academy. Ethnicity, culture, and nationality are also important themes in my interviews with foreign-born women. However, relationships among a participant's sexual orientation, her feminism, and her scholarship did not emerge as an important topic in the participants' narratives, in marked contrast with an interview with a pilot participant\(^3\) who identified herself as lesbian. Unlike race and ethnicity, an individual's sexual orientation can either be revealed or concealed in an interview as she chooses. Two of the three participants who identify themselves as lesbian shared their sexual orientation with me by referring explicitly to collaborations with their life partners but spoke very little about their partners. A third discussed her current scholarly interest in a lesbian topic in her field.

The absence of these themes is potentially a limit in my research. However, this absence can also be valued for the political and ethical issues that it reveals and questions it poses. Can our differences be explored in our research? Are our experiences as women and our commitments

\(^3\)Although I had not met this participant before I interviewed her for the pilot study, we did have a mutual friend. However, this was also true of other participants in the study who chose not to discuss their sexual orientation.
to feminism enough to bring us together in meaningful conversation? Were important themes hidden from me because my participants perceived me as "other"? Did the nature of my inquiry put minority women, even those in elite positions, at risk?

Significance of the Research

Naturalistic or qualitative inquiry "explores the poorly understood territories of human interaction" (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992, p. 173) and allows the researcher to approach an understanding of the meanings which others make of a phenomenon. Its goal is not generalizability but depth of understanding and richness of detail. Austin and Baldwin (1991) have lamented the absence of qualitative research in a growing literature on faculty collaboration. This study attempts to contribute an understanding of the phenomena as they are practiced and made meaningful by women faculty who work in research universities. The usefulness of my research is measured by the extent to which it motivates the participants themselves to act on their insights, not to the extent that it explains the collaborative scholarship and feminism of other scholars in other settings. Its transferability, however, can and must be determined by the reader.
I have attempted to interpret the data collected in this context and to represent the stories of these women in a way that speaks to the participating women themselves and to other scholars and potential scholars. Reinharz characterizes feminist experiential research as starting with the understanding that one's private dissatisfactions with conventional methods derive from the structural inconsistencies underpinning the methods themselves:

When one's critique is articulated and made public, others will find resonance in their own experiences and thus one's private concerns will be redefined as shared. Making one's concerns public requires some courage. Being stuck in the extreme dualism of micro- and macro-interpretations of one's thought is paralyzing. The challenge is to convert the private concern into a public issue. (Reinharz, 1983, p. 166.)

Richardson (1990, p. 26)) has similarly reported:

People who belong to a particular category can develop a consciousness of kind and can galvanize other category members through the telling of the collective story. People do not even have to know each other for the social identification to take hold. By emotionally binding together people who have had the same experiences, whether in touch with each other or not, the collective story overcomes some of the isolation and alienation of contemporary life. It provides a sociological community, the linking of separate individuals into a shared consciousness. Once linked, the possibility for social action on behalf of the collective is present and therewith, the possibility of societal transformation.

This study which draws on the collaboration experiences of a selected group of women who work in research universities, like every study, is limited in several important
ways. First, it excludes important groups of women faculty: (a) feminist scholars who work in other types of colleges and universities where research opportunities and expectations are limited; (b) feminist women in the natural and physical sciences or in professional schools, such as engineering and medicine, where collaborative research is the norm; (c) women faculty who are not affiliated with women's studies programs; (e) women who work in administrative positions; and (f) collaborating faculty women whose careers have been unsuccessful and who have left the research university environment. Clearly our understanding of feminist, scholarship, and collaboration would be enhanced by hearing the stories of women faculty from these important groups.

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

Third, participants in the study were interviewed individually and privately rather than as collaborating pairs or teams of faculty women. Knowledge of collaboration
constructed by groups of women might provide a view of relationships and socially constructed identities missing in this study. A careful consideration of these contexts, although fruitful areas for further research, is outside the scope of this study.

My conversations with women who collaborate successfully suggest that in-depth studies are also needed to explore other common types of collaboration, with student/faculty research partnerships being a particularly rich area for study. Similarly, other collaborations that display power and status differences, such as those involving women and men, junior and senior faculty, African-American and white faculty, and United States and Latin American researchers deserve scholarly attention. These collaborative relationships raise questions about how the partners manage their differences and how these perceived differences both advance and inhibit meaningful scholarship, democratic relationships, and the development of the scholars as individuals.

This study represents my attempt to describe and understand the many ways that scholarship, feminism, and collaboration intersect. Clearly there is need for additional investigation if these relationships are to be well-understood and useful in our work as faculty. These limitations should not, however, prevent important questions
from being asked of a specific group of faculty women about the connections they make between their feminism, their scholarship, and collaboration. To seek to understand their friendships and to capture the meanings they make of their lives is to honor their struggles and to offer strategies to other women who seek to live productive and confirming lives as academic women.
Part Two

We sit down and we talk
About what we'd like to do.
We go away and write it. Then
We come back and rework it
So it fits.
And the tone
And the voice
Are fairly similar.

It's very important, to feel comfortable
With your partner.
Informality. Flexibility.
An understanding of our particular students.

A willingness
To be
Obsessive
About work.

I resent it, when I feel
I'm carrying the load myself.
And I'm not very good
At saying "NO!"

Yes, I was also looking, at that time,
I think, for someone to balance
The pair.

I don't have the patience or tolerance
And I tend not to mince
Words.

She calls me her right hip. And
We spend a lot of time
Together.

But there are days I feel
I can do it faster and better
Myself.

So there are days when I think
"God, I'd love to do something
On my own."
I was told here early that it might be wise
To do more things on my own.
Because those seemed to be
More highly valued.

But that was five
Years ago.
And I simply paid
No attention.
CHAPTER IV

ACADEMIC NORMS AND THE UNIVERSITY MILIEU

Multiple Meanings of Collaboration, Feminism, and Scholarship

The women faculty members who participated in this study appear to have a great deal in common with their women's studies departmental affiliation in large, research universities dominated by men and their commitments to scholarship, feminism, and collaboration. Their stories, however, reveal the complexity and fluidity of the institutional milieu in which they work and in which their commitments are shaped and enacted. Together the participants tell tales of an institutional culture that is formed by many cultures and many communities, each with its own values, norms, and traditions. Perhaps it is not surprising that in these tales scholarship, feminism, and collaboration also have multiple meanings and forms of expression. In this chapter I explore these multiple meanings as they are constructed by women faculty who work in research universities, and ask: In what ways do their intersecting commitments challenge as well as reinscribe the dominant norms of academic scholarship?
Collaboration as a Continuum of Working Relationships

The women faculty in this study vary significantly in their descriptions of the collaboration process and its defining characteristics. For some, the definition of collaboration is as simple as Professor Lori Boothe's, a senior faculty member in the humanities: "Any process of people working together on the same project." Others distinguish among several different models, and some view collaboration as a continuum of relationships. Descriptions of collaborations range from informal networks of scholars who share research interests and information but who never actually coauthor to formal relationships with clearly defined roles, responsibilities, and rules of author attribution. Dr. Lucille Green, an associate professor with an interdisciplinary specialty, distinguishes between a narrow and a broad definition of collaboration:

There is what I would consider "formal collaboration" when two people...are dividing up the labor and then are ultimately responsible for the final project....And then in a broader sense, I would use "collaboration" as people who talk to each other, give support to each other--that is, read each other's work or recommend ideas. All of those kinds of things are one kind of collaboration that is informal...but it's more than just being a colleague....I would say that collaboration's when you're actually focusing on something--it may be a panel for a conference...something that actually takes your time and draws upon your own expertise in some way that you're involved with another person.
A fairly complete and accurate description of collaboration for many participants is a research process conceptualized as a machine where discrete roles are divided up, each person does her part, and all the parts are put back together. For other women faculty, however, collaboration is a qualitatively different and richer process, relationship, or environment. It is conceptualized as an organic whole that is significantly greater than the sum of its parts. As Patricia Carter, an associate professor in a professional field, notes, "It doesn't matter so much who does what piece, it's the environment...a supportive environment, one where you're learning together."

"Real collaboration," a phrase I heard often, is differentiated from the mechanical process of dividing up and recombining the discrete parts of a research project. Real collaboration is not equated with coauthorship. Jill Hastings, an assistant professor in the social sciences, tells about working on one coauthored paper "in chunks and then putting them together" but admits "it didn't feel like the next level of meaning and understanding came to that piece." Phyllis Brown, an associate professor in a professional field who frequently collaborates using several models, describes true collaboration "where the ideas are coming from both of us....in a symbiotic kind of way."
These multiple meanings, metaphors, and experiences confirm that there is no universal definition or process of collaboration. To collaborate in scholarship and research, in the writing of a paper, or in the creation of an artistic work implies a wide range of activities and consequences, depending in part on one's field, specialization, academic role, status, and experience. Collaboration, as it is often practiced in the natural sciences for example, can mean being part of a large team whose members rarely interact in person. This model of collaboration was unusual in this study where collaborative partnerships typically involve only two or three people. For some participants, particularly faculty in the humanities, formal collaboration and coauthorship is limited to edited books, anthologies, and special journal issues; individual journal articles and "major" books are rarely coauthored. In other fields, colleagues may collaborate on a research project but write and publish their findings as individual authors. More commonly, however, collaborative research ends in one or more coauthored papers. For Professor Taylor Woodrow, a senior social scientist, collaboration always results in coauthored papers; she defines collaboration as "working together with somebody on a project that's going to lead to a joint publication or more than one series possibly--but at least one joint publication."
Even the metaphors of the machine and the organism fail to capture the many ways that women faculty talk about collaboration. In their review of the literature on collaboration in faculty research and teaching, Austin and Baldwin (1991, p. 5) define academic collaboration as "a cooperative endeavor that involves common goals, coordinated effort, and outcomes or products for which the collaborators share responsibility and credit." Many of my participants would argue that Austin and Baldwin's definition is narrow and incomplete, failing to include informal collaborations and to convey the unique qualities of "real" or organic forms of collaboration. A broader definition such as Reither's (1987, p. 5) "making meaning in community" offers the range of meanings and relationships that many of the participants in this study describe. As Dr. Betty Line concludes, "The question is 'What do you mean collaborative?' Is there anything that isn't collaborative?"

**Defining Academic Feminism(s)**

Feminism, like collaboration, reveals its multiple dimensions in the stories of women faculty. All but one of the participants in this study identify themselves as feminists. And though there is general agreement as to what feminism means--an awareness of and challenge to women's
unequal position in society--women in the study define and experience their feminism in different ways. Women of color and foreign-born women express particular dissatisfaction with forms of academic feminism that they associate with white, middle class, American women. For example, Carol Hoffer, an associate professor in the social sciences, espouses an ideology of female emancipation but rejects American feminism:

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

Nina Caruso, an untenured professor in the social sciences, is also uneasy with the label of feminist, which she sees as limited to white women and not inclusive of women of color: "I'm very interested in women and women's lives, and what's going on that affects women's lives." Her relationship with women's studies, like Professor Hoffer's, is an uneasy one, and she admits to feelings of suspicion and exploitation. She chooses to have her courses identified as women's studies courses because of her pedagogical emphasis on women and her desire to reach more women students. However, she disagrees with the positions that women's studies faculty take on many issues and feels
that, as a woman of color, her concerns are disregarded by the white majority.

Other women of color accept the label but hasten to qualify its meaning. Myra Kramer, an associate professor in the social sciences, is closely aligned with women's studies on her campus but notes, "We still have a problem with that racism/sexism interface...that's still troublesome." Karen Bell, a tenured professor in the humanities, describes herself as "a feminist womanist" and explains:

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

Like collaboration with its multiple meanings, definitions of feminism vary in their specificity. For Mildred Ryan, a professor in the social sciences with a long association with women's studies, feminism is most broadly defined as "believing in equality of opportunity for both sexes." For Professor Edith Ross, also a senior faculty member, feminism is action-oriented, "You have to live what you are saying." Jill Hastings similarly sees her feminism as "a part of how you do life." Fay Jones, a younger untenured professor in the humanities, experiences feminism as "a critical angle of vision." Dr. Sally Miller reflects
on how the meaning of feminism has changed for her over the years:

I think when I first started to be a feminist, which was early '70s, that it was much more just a political movement and marching in the streets for equal rights. And now I see it as much more personal in the sense of creating an atmosphere wherever I go of feminism, creating ways for women to express themselves, for other people to come to know what feminism is about. And I think I'm much less—and this probably has to do with this feminist theory that I'm working on now—but I'm much less aggressive about pushing feminist views on other people. I simply try to be it. And if they're interested,...it's sort of an invitation. And if they're interested, they can come to know about it.

Scholarship and the Traditions of the Discipline

Scholarship is a term that is also broadly defined by most of the participants in the study in order to subsume the wide range of intellectual activities that are performed and valued in the academy. At its most fundamental level, scholarship is systematic inquiry that contributes to the knowledge base of the field—what Betty Line, a senior professor in a professional school, describes as "knowledge building." In some disciplines, as Professor Line points out, inquiry is valued for its inherent worth or "ideological purity." However, in her field, valued research is policy oriented, often grant funded, and conducted "for the purpose of improving life." Kate
Washington and Nina Caruso are also in fields where securing grant funding for large research projects is an expectation of scholarly performance. They share Betty's commitment to doing research that has policy relevance but work in an area where basic research is more highly valued. Kate, in fact, chose her current institution because the department encourages policy-related work. She admits, however, that many faculty in the discipline as a whole look down on policy specialists as "people who can't make it in academia."

Publish or Perish

For some women scholarship, like collaboration and feminism, is not easily separated from the other work they do--teaching, mentoring and advising students, and performing service to their various communities. Scholarship includes their thinking, their writing, their speaking, and their interaction with students and colleagues. Fay Jones, for example, describes her graduate seminars as "doing new work" which is exciting "but it's not a tangible thing that can get measured, can get rewarded." In her field the scholarship most valued is "production, getting published, and having high visibility." Karen Bell, a popular teacher and winner of a teaching award at her previous institution, was hired by her current university
because the "chair wanted to strike a balance between research and teaching." Dr. Bell admits that she has difficulty drawing distinct lines between her teaching and her scholarship. She confesses, "For me collaboration is not just in writing--in funny ways--I see students as collaborators--as sappy as it sounds....That to me is what teaching is all about." But she admits, "not having published is killing me."

All of the faculty women in the study acknowledged that academic scholarship requires publishing, and publishing entails rigorous and critical thinking, writing, and submitting one's ideas and arguments to public scrutiny. Lucy Green observes, "You have to publish to achieve value." However, the type of research questions, methods, and publications that are valued vary significantly, depending on the participant's academic department and field, her scholarly background, and her particular research specialty. Betty Line, also the recipient of a teaching award, believes that her publications are not the only scholarly contributions for which she has been rewarded:

I would say that I am one of those cases in promotion where I make the case for the university that there is no one single model. That you can do a lot of things well enough. I am not the most outstanding scholar...in terms of publications. I have outstanding teaching awards, major university teaching awards. I have intensive amounts of community service work and university work with major committees. So I'm kind of that 'all-around' [faculty member].
Professor Ryan, admitting to a bias for experimental studies and statistical analysis, has a long-term research interest that she describes as fundamental to understanding other areas in her field and therefore highly valued. As a new faculty member, she knew that she would have to acquire her own research grants and publications to get ahead: "One needs to have a reasonable record of accomplishments or no one is going to take you seriously." Phyllis Brown agrees, "You have to kind of earn your right to be listened to."

**Adapting to the Norms**

Earning that right sometimes means adapting one's research interests to fit the institution or finding an institutional home with a more comfortable fit. Nancy Connor, a senior professor, admits that her whole research agenda changed because she was denied tenure at another research institution, "Over a period of 15 years, no one was tenured there except in the hard sciences." She explains:

> It was traumatic at the time....I was just one of a whole parade of individuals who went through that process. They were looking at the hard science research and the social science research was not valued by the department. And if you can't get out of the department in a tenure process, you're in trouble to begin with. It was men and women both. It was a departmental research agenda.
Edith Ross also changed the focus of her scholarship from the production of creative work to published research because her writing is more highly valued and rewarded in her professional school. Lucy Green claims to enjoy writing and publishing but finds it slow and gets more satisfaction from mailing an article off for publication, a sentiment that several of the participants express. Suzanne Smith admits, "I don't necessarily enjoy any of the scholarly work I do--until it's done."

Many faculty, like Kate Washington and Phyllis Brown, work in departments where "numbers count," where an individual's contribution to the knowledge of the field is measured by the number of articles published in respected refereed journals, number of doctoral students advised, and number as well as size of research grants received. Phyllis's department is a place where "we count articles a lot." Kate, a junior faculty member, keeps a listing of her juried articles above her desk at eye-level as a reminder that a minimum of ten is needed for tenure. Others know that a single-authored book--not an edited book or anthology--is needed for advancement in their field. Pat Carter was told that her book was "just another edited volume." Suzanne Smith similarly notes that her current project, a coauthored edition, will be valued as an editorial project and not as an original piece. Without her
own book, she speculates that she may make associate but will probably not be promoted to professor.

Ellen Frank came to her current institution with tenure because she had a single-authored book. Marian Thomas has two original books, one single authored and one coauthored, but wonders if they will be adequate for tenure and promotion in her professional school which increasingly values other kinds of scholarship:

I have spent the past six years...becoming the best [scholar with her specialty] that I could become....I won two national research awards....All of this has fallen into place, except that I don't know that I'm in the right place.

Marian's concern is not an uncommon one, nor is it unfounded. Conforming to the expectations of the discipline, even excelling in one's work, may not lead to acceptance by one's departmental colleagues. To demonstrate one's scholarly productivity by publishing the requisite number of books or articles does not eliminate the possibility that the rules will change and one's scholarship will be discounted.

Academic Norms and Collaborative Research Strategies

The Complexity and Ambiguity of Scholarship Norms

The Limits of Administrative Influence

The participants who work in one of the research universities in the study confirm that senior administrators
have recently begun to encourage and support collaboration. Jane Kelly, a senior professor who has been at the same institution throughout her career, reports that her professional school is also emphasizing collaborative work. "It's easier to get visibility if you're doing a joint project.....People are interested in it." She adds that interdisciplinary work in her professional field is particularly difficult and "may be a trend since it's newer and there's a certain amount of [personal and professional] growth in doing this type of research." Both Nancy Connor and Jill Hastings, however, acknowledge that administrative efforts to encourage collaboration institution-wide are meeting some resistance in their colleges. Nancy thinks the faculty feel that it is being imposed from above: "If they're going to work with somebody, they want to find somebody who's interested in what it is they're doing, and they'll go from there." Jill agrees that her department "gives lip service to it" but also minimizes all that's involved in collaboration with the "notion that this is somehow reducible--that it isn't a systemic function where you actually end up with more." Although administrators at the department and school level have expressed support for collaboration, she maintains that they don't know how to go about supporting a process that she describes as "organic."
Dr. Suzanne Smith is in a field that values and even depends on collaboration, "It is the way things happen....part of our daily existence." However, many of her colleagues' efforts to collaborate have been limited by organizational features of the university system. She explains:

The way collaboration is discouraged is not intentional, but it's structural. What has happened...is it starts out with people desiring a true collaborative educational experience where the direction of the class would be formed by a collaboration or team. But because of the multiple demands within the department, what I think usually happens is that type of collaborative effort turns into a lot of mini-units.

She concludes that faculty lack the structural support mechanisms needed to maintain collaboration in teaching and in research: "There may be a lot of start up support. There is not a lot of maintenance support."

Dr. Marjorie Baker's view, from her position as a full professor who worked at several other research institutions, is less benign. She notes that "there is absolutely no collaboration" in her department and attributes that to personalities and a competitive culture. She exclaims "I find that selfishness and not only careerism but this 'elbowy' behavior is what gets rewards and what is very much ingrained in academe--although the rhetoric is different. The rhetoric is all democratic and cooperative, and the very reverse is true." Carol Hoffer also experiences American
university culture as highly competitive and depersonalizing. She acknowledges that the academic culture in her native country is also competitive because the amount of government funding available for research is less. Comparing faculty cultures in the two countries, she describes research in her native country as more team based. She continues, "There they struggle for crumbs. Here they struggle for bigger things and maybe that's why it's more competitive."

The Power of Departmental Norms

In spite of recent institutional efforts to encourage collaboration, the dominating norms of a department or field are powerful determinants of the type of scholarly work faculty undertake. The values held by scholars in any field may either reinforce or conflict with the norms that dominate the institution as a whole. Moreover, a field may be composed of several research specialties or communities whose norms, values, and research traditions both reflect and conflict with those prevailing in the field as a whole. Further adding to the complexity and ambiguity of the context in which faculty pursue their research agendas, the values and normative behaviors which are manifest in these multiple communities are not static but evolve and change
over time, providing new opportunities for scholarship while eliminating others.

Many of the participants work in departments where significant changes are occurring in administrative leadership, in the composition of the faculty, and in the department's curriculum. Sally Miller, Suzanne Smith, and Fay Jones, for example, are in departments and fields whose norms are changing to accept their feminist scholarship. In Fay's discipline, feminism has "cache." She adds, "I was hired because I was a feminist. They needed me." Suzanne explains similarly, "There is a demand for at least token representation of women/feminist scholarly work in every journal." Sally admits that her particular type of research was not valued for a long time but adds, "I'm seeing some signs that things are changing. There is no way we could have got this stuff published five years ago. So now it's really becoming valued." She continues, "This is the only place I've been where there is actually quite a strong contingent of feminist researchers in the department....And we're attracting a lot of women graduate students who are very strong feminists and want to do feminist scholarship."

Pat Carter and Marian Thomas are in professions in which the gender composition of the faculty and students is also changing; Pat's field, like many, is becoming "feminized" and Marian's field, once considered a "woman's
profession," is attracting more men. Both departments are also adapting to changes in administrative philosophy and leadership and to technological advances in the field. Not surprisingly, these dramatic changes have also influenced faculty scholarship, both directly and indirectly, through changes in hiring priorities and tenure and promotion decisions. Pat has begun to feel like "less of an equal than I did previous to now" in a department that no longer values her professional expertise as it once did. "The evaluation for all of us now is the same" as the department strives to become "more like all the others and less a unique professional school."

Marian describes her department, under the direction of a new administrator, as "in transition" as younger men are hired as replacements for older, retiring women: "It's not so much the change in direction as the way it's being accomplished....The senior faculty were devalued because age was associated with not being technically proficient." The newer faculty "value and practice collaboration more on scientific topics, following a scientific model." She continues: "The pattern is to do collaborative research with a number of students...to have one large topic that you shape into several projects, all of which can be published." Marian suspects that her own feminist research, based on a
humanities model, is not an area of inquiry that the department wants to foster.

**Serving Multiple Masters**

Conflicts between subspecialty, disciplinary, and institutional norms are not uncommon, often erupting in the tenure and promotion process. As the participants' experiences demonstrate, feminism is valued in some areas and not in others; collaboration is the norm in some fields and is suspect in others. Phyllis Brown notes:

> One never knows what the composition of the committee is going to be like—-they change from year to year. One would be foolish to base their activities and their strivings for tenure on the culture of their own department, because their own department does not have the final say.

Senior women in the study are in a position to lead overt challenges to the practices and values they do not endorse. Dr. Isabelle Antonio, describing herself as "nontraditional" and "a rebel," tells stories of her battles on a faculty governance committee. She asserts boldly, "I find being old and gray-headed is an advantage. Not yet senior however, Pat Carter admits, "If you're a full professor...you can fight those battles that have to be fought instead of having to turn out the publications."

Betty Line, like several women in the study, has been on college and university-level tenure and promotion committees. She remembers a former provost who was biased
toward single-authored work and believed that scholars should publish only in their own disciplines. Betty exclaims:

All of that garbage goes with the old rational model--positivistic model--and the idea of singular research where we have to know who owns it, who created it. I just don't think that's a functional model for the state of knowledge today...and I'm fighting like hell to change that value in my own department in its criteria around promotion and tenure. I'm trying to support collegial and collaborative work and recognition of that.

Faculty who want to build successful academic careers must win the respect of their peers and survive the tenure and promotion process. To do that, they must identify and accommodate the changing and sometimes conflicting norms of the complex institutions in which they work. Challenging the dominant norms of a community carries significant risks, particularly for junior faculty and tenured women seeking promotion to full professor. However, their commitments to collaboration and feminism, often experienced as liabilities, may also provide resources that are both intellectually and politically useful to women faculty. Furthermore their commitments may help them to develop strategies for engaging in research programs that are meaningful, rewarding, and liberating
The Attraction of Working With Others

The decision to pursue one's research agenda as an individual scholar or to share a research program and publications with others is not a decision that faculty make without consequence. The women faculty in this study have experienced both ways of working and most enjoy both. Like Jane Kelly, many prefer to have the option to work alone and to work with others depending on the person, the topic, and the circumstances, "I think I'm glad I don't have to choose. It's the variety I like." Edith Ross agrees that both ways of working offer advantages, "I like to collaborate, but then sometimes I want to do things alone. I have something I want to say." Although a small group of the participants had been given opportunities to collaborate with faculty or other students during their doctoral years, all were "trained" to be independent scholars and most continue to do some, if not most, of their research and writing independently. Many prefer to work alone. Lori Boothe thinks people choose their careers based on their personalities and admits, "I could be shut up 12 hours a day with dusty books and not talk to anyone and be just extremely happy."
Alleviating Social Isolation

Betty Line, at the other extreme, prefers a more social environment: "I've been told all along that I need to have first authorship...that I need to have single authorship. I simply don't work well that way." It is the social attraction of working with others that motivates her collaborations:

Primarily my collaboration has been more based on my wanting to work with people. I think many people in academe work very hard and the only social relationships they have are with those people they are working with. So if there isn't the compensatory social interaction in the work relationship, they wouldn't have any social interaction. So I very often choose to do projects with people that I like being with...who I like thinking with...because it offers me two kinds of fulfillment.

Many scholars, even those working in fields where independent scholarship and single-authored work are the norm, collaborate formally or informally to alleviate the isolation of working alone. Dr. Smith suspects that she was attracted to her field because of its social nature. "I think I liked [the field] because...you didn't work by yourself....I don't enjoy my scholarly research...primarily because it is so isolating. In order to get an article done...I have to become a hermit."

Social interaction is an added benefit for many of the participants, but it is rarely the primary reason for collaborating. Most collaborate only when the topic calls
for it and readily admit that they do not deliberately seek out opportunities for formal collaboration. Professor Ryan collaborated "when people came along whose interest I shared....It was just a nice fit." In Sally Miller's case, collaboration depends solely on the topic. Maggie Grant, comfortable with her solitary mode of scholarship, describes her current collaborative relationship as unique, "I don't think that would happen with other people. [It] hasn't made me want to run out and try to find people to write with."

Collaboration as an Expectation of the Discipline

Clearly many of the participants would not collaborate formally, despite its many advantages, if it were not accepted in their fields. Women who work in the social sciences and science-based professional schools describe team research as becoming increasingly common and even expected. Professors Ellen Frank, Nina Caruso, Kate Washington, and Taylor Woodrow are in fields where the nature of the research problems and methodologies often calls for a team of scholars with different research skills. However, even in these fields, collaborative work may not be fully rewarded unless a scholar is able to establish her own reputation as the senior or lead researcher. Thus, getting first name authorship on a number of publications is a primary career strategy. Balancing coauthored work with
single authored papers is also important. Taylor Woodrow explains:

You have to be a little bit careful with collaboration....If there are two authors on a paper, each person is not going to get full credit. There's going to be some division. And so you have to make sure there are enough papers coming out so that you're getting enough credit for the research endeavor and that you've also balanced that with some single-authored things... It hasn't been a problem....It's just a fact of life.

In Dr. Woodrow's field, as in many of the social science disciplines, collaboration is a characteristic of many large research project and usually provides opportunities for several papers. Ellen Frank agrees and describes her field as becoming more like the natural sciences. "I have coauthors all over the place....The expectation is increasingly that people will do collaborative work." She admits, however, that evaluation is still difficult and that questions are raised during tenure and promotion. "Somebody is sure to ask the question if there's a coauthored paper, 'Was this person just a junior member of the team?'" Ellen does not feel that coauthorship is penalized in her field but admits it is still something people ask about:

It's often generational. The younger people are more likely to collaborate than the older people in the discipline. The older people are evaluating the younger people. It's a mode of scholarly enterprise that they haven't engaged in and so they don't know how to understand it. And they feel a little suspicious. And especially if
they see a younger person coauthoring with an older person, they have to be convinced.

Improving the Quality of the Research

Underlying many collaborative projects is the belief that collaboration improves the quality of the product. Sally Miller attributes the difference in quality to the fact that "you have someone to help you think." Judy Hedge's project, a prize-winning coauthored book, became a much larger project because of the common interests and complementary strengths of two scholars. "There's no way that either one of us could have written this book."

Similarly, Lori Boothe's coauthored book, also an award winner, was motivated by a shared interest and the discovery "that this really was a topic that should be done in an interdisciplinary way--would be done better because it came from two different perspectives." Lisa Gamble agrees that collaboration can lead to a bigger and better product: "I think that the collaboration is that people contribute what they have to the larger venture--which becomes larger because there are more people working on it. And it's better because there are more people working on it."
Modeling Possibilities

Collaboration, for a majority of the participants, is also a way to teach and mentor in ways they would have valued as students. Whether it is done formally or informally, it is a way to model the type of egalitarian relationships that many feminist women believe will improve the academy. Karen Bell, who longs to collaborate formally in her scholarship, muses:

Collaboration is potentially the essence of what women could bring to the academy....We don't want to redo hegemony in female guise, to be female ol' boys, so to speak. I have thought that collaboration would be a way to model possibilities for changing the academy.

Many of the participants collaborate and coauthor with their students. Phyllis Brown admits that collaboration is a shared value in her department and adds, "When I collaborate with a student I feel good because I know it does them a lot of good. It did me a lot of good." Nina Caruso shares those values: "I'm real interested in working with women as well as minority students in the area of research, showing them what it's like, what we can do with it, and training them. I have a real strong commitment to that." Working closely with students and with colleagues, as Edith Ross suggests, has implications for problem solving that extend beyond the academy:

I think that it's important that we learn to work with others, and we're going to have to, more and more, in a global world. And it's important that
groups of people come together in many different ways to address topics and collaborate....Not everybody has to do it this way, but you have to do it in a way you feel is important.

Maximizing Benefits and Minimizing Risks

Even a quick glance at their vita reveals the participants' lengthy lists of publications and papers, many coauthored and many single-authored. It is evident from their records of scholarly achievement and their conversations that the women faculty in this study have either implemented or are attempting to develop effective research and publication strategies. Many of the strategies require caution, compromise, and flexibility in addition to perseverance and hard work.

The Tradition of the Lone Scholar

In the humanities, the tradition of single-authored scholarship is so strong that faculty women below the rank of full professor are reluctant to coauthor any major publication unless they have a strong publication record of original research. Lori Boothe and Judy Hedge had published books in their field and were already tenured before they attempted books with coauthors. Both feel, however, that their coauthored books contributed to their promotions to full professor. Suzanne Smith and Fay Jones, still untenured, have either published or are in the process of
publishing their own books in addition to their co-edited anthologies. Karen Bell, angry and hurt by the treatment her coauthored book received, vows to do no more collaborative writing until she is promoted.

Women in the humanities whom I interviewed for the study are feminist scholars whose teaching and writing focus on women in literature, history, and philosophy—not an unexpected finding given their formal association with women's studies. Their commitments to feminism and scholarship are increasingly made public and are valued, as both Fay and Suzanne reveal. However, their commitments to collaboration are rarely manifest in coauthored publications. More frequently, they collaborate in their teaching, in formal conference presentations, and informally in student research and mentoring.

Lori, for example, does not coauthor with students because it is so unusual in her discipline. "What I do," she explains, "I practically coauthor....I put in as much work...but I consider it just my role as an advisor, and they publish them single-author." Sally Miller brings a similar rationale to her work with students. "I think it always looks a little suspicious for brand new students going out to have something coauthored with a professor. So I would rather help them behind the scenes, a lot, and have them put their name on it by themselves." Edith Ross
collaborates with students on conference presentations, believing that they deserve equal credit. However, she believes that it is hard to achieve egalitarian relationships when faculty work with students. "I know that the power's in my corner....I've written one or two things, but I tend to encourage them to go on their own."

Faculty vary in their attitudes toward collaborating with students and the strategies they find most useful. Very few were given opportunities to coauthor with faculty mentors when they were students and find the practice both attractive and troublesome. Professor Maggie Grant, who never writes with her students, explains:

This is also ambiguous....Some people look at it and say, "That's so wonderful." [The] other view is that this professor is taking major advantage of students. They're absolutely contradictory and you never know what the people who are looking at it are going to think. I don't know what students think. It's probably contradictory with them, too.

Jill Hastings and Lisa Gamble learned to work collaboratively as students and see the benefits in their current positions. As a faculty member, Jill sees her role as more of a mentor but encourages students to work together collaboratively in their own research. Lisa believes that her membership in a student/faculty research group gave her an advantage over people who did not have that experience.
Strategies for Junior Faculty

Women in all fields tend to invoke different research strategies at different ranks, responding to their changing opportunities, status, and priorities and to a changing academy. Many, like the women described above, devote their junior faculty years to increasing their visibility and establishing reputations as independent scholars. These are described as particularly lonely and difficult years for many of the participants. Phyllis Brown remembers her first year as a time of working hard, not having any friends, and wanting to meet other faculty women. Marian Thomas admits to having little time or opportunity to socialize. "I would love to...[but I'm] beginning to think a pretenure faculty member doesn't get to do anything. I don't feel like I can. I feel like I'm under a lot of pressure."

Like their colleagues in the humanities, women in the social sciences and science-based professions enter into their collaborations cautiously with concern for building their reputation as lead researcher. In Mildred Ryan's discipline, "it is a disadvantage if a person has collaborated a lot." She not only limits the amount of collaborative work that she does but also limits the number of coauthors on an individual article. Dr. Caruso agrees that being one of a string of coauthors is disadvantageous:

Most of my coauthored papers are ones where I get first author. And so that has a slightly
different connotation. Had I been second, third or whatever author on other think that the perception of the quality—well, it's not even the quality. It's the perception of how big the role is.

Dr. Brown admits that she collaborated as an assistant professor to help her build a very strong vita. She adds, "I used to say to myself that I wanted my dossier to look so good that they had to tenure me no matter how they felt about me." Kate Washington, an experienced international researcher before she became a faculty member, did most of her research alone until her grant funding began to run out and she needed help to finish the project. Working in collaboration with other researchers raised questions of ownership that were particularly difficult in a field that is "highly competitive....You don't get credit for being second author. There's a struggle for first authorship." Kate admits that her own attitude shocked her: "I was really frightened that I was going to lose the possibility of using my data and publishing things on my own, which of course upset them [her two colleagues] because for them it meant that I didn't trust them."

Many women in the study have found ways to balance the demands of the discipline with their commitments to feminism and collaboration. When Professor Ryan first began publishing her research on gender, she hid it from her departmental colleagues, continuing to publish more traditional studies at the same time. Maggie Grant and her
collaborator separate the feminist writing they do together from the work they publish as single authors in their separate disciplines. Lisa Gamble, Kate Washington, and Carol Hoffer integrate their feminist commitments by using traditional social science research methods to study women in specific ethnic and racial populations. Nina Caruso empowers ethnic women by hiring them as field workers and reinvesting research money in the community she is studying.

For other participants, finding a way to integrate their commitments is much more difficult. Accommodating the norms of an competitive academy long enough and successfully enough to become a full professor is a viable but costly strategy for many. Pat Carter discovered that tenure and promotion to associate brought neither the freedom nor influence that she expected and needs in order to challenge departmental policies and practices. "People in our department run around and say that an associate professor is a senior faculty member. Baloney. They have been intoxicated with that wrong notion." Like Karen Bell, she is limiting her student contact because it takes time and energy away from her scholarship. Admitting that she does not like the kind of person she is becoming, she explains:

The one thing I have come to learn...[is] the university--the system pressures you to do certain things that will allow you to be the first or sole author on articles. Collaboration is much more difficult, especially if you're not the primary author. It's much more difficult to give time and
give energy to something which won't count. If the university could find a way of counting or evaluating collaboration—it's equal to some of these other things—then learning could take place and power could be shared instead of squeezing it into this narrow, narrow hierarchy with everybody striving to be full professor.

Many feminist faculty members like Professor Carter have been labeled by their colleagues, criticized, teased, and called "crazy feminists" and "femi-Nazis." Because of their public support for women's studies, the nature of their scholarship, and even their office decor, feminist faculty have described being harshly evaluated by students and ignored by their colleagues. Struggling to develop or maintain promising careers in departments where there is little support or tolerance for feminism, they seem willing to forego close personal and professional relationships with their departmental colleagues. They are unwilling, however, to sacrifice their scholarly careers or their commitments to their particular feminist or ethnic communities. The full professors in the study, many of them midcareer in age and others considering retirement, admit that they are free now to do what they want. Taylor Woodrow, who planned her career strategies carefully, admits that "collaboration seems very attractive now because there are no costs." Edith Ross, recently promoted, agrees, "You can do more as you want." Nancy Connor adds, "I'm finally free now to do some things I would like to do, and it would be fun to do them with somebody else." Judy Hedge speculates with
amusement about a controversial book that she is writing, "I'm sure it will cause horror....[but] at this point, what have I got to lose--five years to retirement? The book will come out, it will be reviewed, and I'll retire."

**Summary**

Women who work in research universities describe an institutional milieu that is not monolithic but complex and fluid, formed by many competing cultures and communities. Although women who are affiliated with women's studies programs in research universities would appear to have much in common, their narratives reveal a great deal of variation. They not only differ in the ways they define and experience feminism and collaboration but also in the ways they are able to incorporate them into their scholarship. Despite differences in status, scholarly interests, and disciplinary affiliations, they all agree that research and publication are highly valued activities and are fundamental to establishing and maintaining careers in a research university. However, disciplinary norms and departmental cultures are also powerful determinants of the type of research and writing that is rewarded, and they shape the ways that feminist women faculty, particularly those "below" the level of full professor, collaborate with other women.
Although women acknowledge that scholarly collaboration and coauthorship are frequently discouraged or undervalued in many fields, they are attracted to collaboration as a way to alleviate isolation, to engage in a larger research project than they can undertake alone, to produce a qualitatively better product, or to "model the possibilities" for a more egalitarian and inclusive academy. Despite these attractions, however, many faculty women believe they cannot collaborate openly until their reputations as independent scholars are well established and they have achieved the rank of full professor. Conforming to the competitive and individualistic culture that continues to dominate most academic fields, many feminist faculty find that they experience a dissonance between the expectations of the academy and the ways they prefer to enact their commitments as scholars and feminists. For many women faculty, achieving senior status requires years of accommodation and compromise that exact a high personal price. Ironically, it is only in their later years as full professors that they perceive having both the freedom and the influence to fully integrate their commitments to feminism and collaboration into their scholarship.
Part Three

We don't really know where this is going
Or if it's going. Most people,
I think, start out with a goal
But we're more interested in the process
Than the product.

That's one of the really positive aspects
Of collaborating with a woman.
Because in my experience that is not how it works
When you collaborate with a man.

It's much more sharing and women are much more involved
In the process.
It's not just the outcome
As it is with men.

What we did first was get acquainted with one another.
So I said, "You come over to my house.
I'm gonna tell you all about me."
We interviewed each other.

Instead of having the project in mind,
We wanted to know who we were dealing with,
And what was important
And what our hurts have been and our successes.

Sharing with each other and checking our perceptions,
We checked each other's reality.
And that's important because
It's really very easy

To convince women that they're crazy.
And you know, it's in their heads
And there is not reality
To what's going on.
CHAPTER V
THE MEANING OF COLLABORATIVE RELATIONSHIPS

In the previous chapter I described the research university culture as characterized by multiple communities and norms that are complex, ambiguous, and often in conflict. Furthermore, I argued that the scholarship of feminist faculty both accommodates and resists the dominant norms of the institution, the field, and the subspecialty. A portrayal of context is central to describing how scholarship, collaboration, and feminism intersect. A careful look at the relationships that collaborating faculty form provides a second important angle of vision to this study.

Not all collaborative relationships are successful. As Edith Ross points out, sometimes one works with a colleague and decides that the relationship should end. Meaningful collaborative projects, in contrast, are sometimes compared to giving birth in their intensity and duration. They are mutually celebrated and their endings, like postpartum depression, are mourned. Collaborations can develop from, or lead to, life-long relationships that are intellectually exciting and personally fulfilling. Collaborations can also
limit personal growth and creativity. The women faculty who share their stories in this research have formed many professional and personal relationships during their academic careers. In this chapter I explore some of those relationships and ask: What are the social relationships that develop among feminist women who collaborate in their research?

Shared Interests, Complementary Skills, and Personal Compatibility

Most participants agree that collaboration requires a shared interest in a specific research topic, a common theoretical or methodological approach, and a belief that each scholar can contribute something unique to the research effort. Judy Hedge, for example, finds little reason to collaborate if "it's just a question of divvying up ten chapters so each person will only have to write five." Nina Caruso, like many women in the study, chooses her collaborating partners for theoretical compatibility, complementary strengths, and a willingness to work hard. Fay Jones and her collaborator discovered that they had done their dissertation research on very similar subjects. Their decision to collaborate was a way to handle a potentially competitive situation. Lucy Green admits that it is sometimes easy "just to fall into" a collaboration and
thinks that often leads to disappointment. A frequent collaborator, she explains:

One of the principles that seems to me to be very important is that you're not collaborating just because you're a woman, and you're not collaborating because you're at the same university, but you have a common intellectual topic, a specific topic.

Despite having a common intellectual topic, Ellen Frank admits that working collaboratively has taken her research in a different direction, "Some of what I do now is determined by other people's interests....Sometimes the questions being asked are the ones that I wouldn't have thought of."

Faculty like Ellen, Phyllis Brown, and others who have a particular methodological skill or statistical expertise have opportunities to collaborate on research that is peripheral to their interests. The personal attributes of the team members, in addition to shared interest and methodological compatibility, become major criteria for the selection of projects. Betty Line, who admits that she rarely publishes as a single author, attributes her collaborations to personal compatibility as well as shared interests. She explains: I very often chose to do projects with people that I like being with....If we end up with research, it's because we talk to each other and enjoy each other and also find out we're interested in something."
Collaboration, whether one consciously plans it or just falls into it, happens when a variety of factors converge in a particular institutional or disciplinary milieu: two or more people discover that they have a shared interest in a particular research topic, they determine that each can contribute something significant to the research, and they conclude that they can work well enough together to complete the project (Baldwin & Austin, 1992). Part of what is missing from this brief summary, however, is how potential collaborators assess one another. What is it about a colleague that makes her an attractive collaborator? Lucy warns that simply being women or being at the same institution is not enough. Betty, however, suggests that those factors at least provide a starting point.

Selecting Research Partners

Many of the women in the study admit that they usually collaborate with people they already know well. Some, like Mildred Ryan and Edith Ross, collaborated early in their academic careers with life partners who were more experienced researchers. Others like Lisa Gamble and Lori Boothe collaborated as graduate students on research or editing projects with faculty mentors. Some women developed collaborative relationships later in their careers, frequently working with senior faculty colleagues at other
institutions. Both Nina Caruso and Marian Thomas, for example, are involved in long distance projects with senior women because they have no departmental colleagues with whom they share research interests.

Most of the participants are collaborating with women whom they describe as friends and peers. In fact, the idea of labeling a colleague in a research collaboration as "senior" or junior" is distasteful to most of the participants, regardless of differences in experience, age, or rank. For Ellen, Lisa, Edith and others, equality among participants is a requirement of collaboration as they practice it. Ellen warns, "I think collaboration would be very hard for somebody who always had to be in charge. If you have to think of the other person as a junior partner, it's not going to work."

Friendship often precedes the development of a professional relationships. Nina admits that most of her collaborators are friends. Suzanne Smith is coediting a book with a close friend and colleague at another research university, "We went through the same graduate program, and I think that made our collaboration possible because we had a similar background in terms of scholarly training." Kate Washington is also working with women with whom she had developed close personal friendships before asking them to join her collaborative research team. Working on grant-
funded research with respected friends is a way Kate can help to advance their careers. She adds, "I really enjoy working with friends....I have a lot of fun, but there's a lot of emotional involvement, too."

Occasionally participants developed long distance research and writing partnerships with professional colleagues whom they did not know well before the collaboration but whose work they know and respect. Friendships often evolve during the projects. Having mutual friends or being part of a professional network not only brings women with similar research interests together but provides a way of verifying credentials and assessing personal characteristics. Marjorie Baker had a successful editorial collaboration with a young colleague she remembers meeting briefly at the airport several years before their collaboration. "I had seen some work by her in the meantime. I probably had seen her a number of times at meetings." Edith invited a colleague whom she knew only by reputation to become involved in an editorial project. "I like her writing...and I thought it would be interesting to work with her."

Although common, long distance relationships are not ideal. Maintaining a collaborative partnership with a peer or friend on another campus, in another state, or even another country, as many of the participants know, is
particularly difficult. Despite having access to telephones, computers, electronic mail, and facsimile machines, participants express the importance of being together—at conferences, meetings, libraries, or in each other's homes—for uninterrupted work time. Suzanne confirms, "You have to have the ability to have focused time together." For many potential team members, being physically separated precludes collaboration entirely. Mildred Ryan began a research project with an international visitor before technologically sophisticated communications equipment was readily available to faculty members. She found that the distance was too great to continue their partnership when her collaborator returned home. Pat Carter shares her work with an out-of-state colleague to whom she turns for support and criticism but doubts that they will collaborate formally. "It would be wonderful if she were here....I can't quite see it happening otherwise."

Ellen, in contrast, feels comfortable maintaining long-distance collaborations. Relying on electronic mail to communicate with a close friend and colleague, she has found that they can respond to each other's work almost instantaneously. Working in isolation like Pat, she relies on a national network of women and men in her particular field for scholarly support: "Most of us don't find our work particularly valued by our colleagues so we cling to
each other....They're interested in what I'm doing. Their eyes lighten up when I tell them what I'm working on."

Choosing their first collaborating partner, for many of the participants, was more a matter of timing and circumstances than a conscious selection process. Often it was a response to an unexpected opportunity. Judy Hedge, never encouraged to collaborate, describes her own involvement as "happenstance through a personal friendship." Jane Kelley, echoing Judy, describes her decision to work with a team of women on her first collaborative effort as "just the way a lot of women do a lot of things--happenstance." Lucy Green, "having had as many heartbreaks as successes in trying to work collaboratively," has become very cautious about future involvements: "I think I'm getting better at choosing partners, but I think it's also picking a topic." The care with which participants select research partners and enter into research relationships seems to increase with experience.

Regardless of the amount of collaborative experience or number of research partners, most participants agree on the qualities that women should look for in a teammate. Marian Thomas advises: "You have to really respect them as a person and admire them as a scholar....have a good interpersonal relationship....be in closer proximity." She adds, "It's good to have complementary strengths so you
don't feel you're redundant on a particular part of the project." Jane looks for "somebody with a little flexibility, a little give and take." Nancy Connor wants to work with someone "who is on the same wave length." Suzanne Smith suggests qualities that she herself sometimes lacks, "You have to be open and communicative with your partner and tell them when you don't like things and when you do....I don't think I do those things very well. I also stew and brood and then when I get mad enough I erupt." She also advises, "You have to be realistic about really being able to collaborate....[and have] a willingness to really be influenced by somebody else's ideas."

Like Suzanne, Betty Line's experiences have taught her much about her own preferences. Disliking to work with someone who is methodical and reserved, she explains, "I really love it when I'm involved with someone who is intellectually competitive and secure...quick, aggressive thinkers and talkers and are not intimidated....I really like talking and I really like someone vigorous coming back at me."

Collaboration and Feminist Values

It might be easy to assume that women like Nina Caruso and Taylor Woodrow, who do large, government-funded social science research, and Marjorie Baker and Karen Bell, who
rarely work in collaboration with other humanities scholars, would form very different relationships with their research partners. The scope of their different research projects, number of people involved, type of inquiry and methodology, and academic field would all seem to structure their projects and limit the potential for meaningful relationships. One might also expect women who conceptualize collaboration as "specialization and division of labor" to approach their work and their partnerships differently than women who conceptualize collaboration as "synergy," "wild thinking," or a nurturing environment where "everybody is learning and sharing."

Although their scholarship is strongly influenced by the norms of the discipline, participants form many kinds of relationships and collaborate in ways that challenge traditional research models and values. Women faculty in this study describe research and writing processes that are both segmented and rejoined in creative symbiosis. Others tell of seamless writing that begins with collaborators dividing the project into sections and writing alone. They describe collaborations that evolve, fusing the machine and the organic models, or shifting back and forth between them, creating ways to work that reflect their feminist values and commitments. Marian Thomas, for example, describes the traditional team research in her department as "working in a
more segmented way." In contrast, her collaboration on a large qualitative study "was more open-ended" and "could go in any number of directions." Lori Boothe admits that her collaboration broke all the rules, and Suzanne Smith describes a "leap-frog" process--still very individual but each reacting to the other's work.

Women in the study who have had negative experiences as students or junior faculty members know that collaborative relationships can be harmful. Several reveal their experiences with collaborators who were jealous, controlling, and exploiting. Pat Carter describes an unhealthy collaborative relationships, "[It] will keep you running in circles...not getting anything else for publication, not also allowing you to go in your own direction." Edith Ross remembers a painful relationship she had as a student with a senior professor:

I was accused of writing with my husband when I should have been writing with this woman. It was very complicated....Somehow this woman thought she owned me and my life because I worked with her.....She was just very jealous of my working with my husband.....She felt I should be writing books with her and not him. It was like an ownership thing. And that to me is the opposite of collaboration. It's a very hierarchical notion.

More typically, women in the study had no opportunities to collaborate as students. Marian speculates that her male faculty members felt uncomfortable mentoring women students. "There was a kind of distance they maintained that they
didn't maintain with their male students." Sally Miller was
told years after she completed her Ph. D. that she was the
best student her male advisor ever had, yet as a student she
received little encouragement or advice from any of her male
professors. Karen Bell, an African-American woman who
describes herself as predating affirmative action, regrets
her own lack of mentoring:

It's all about having come into the academy and
through my graduate program with not a single,
solitary mentor. So I learned everything on the
assembly line. I had to process the mistakes
standing on my feet--had to figure when to cut my
losses and run, and when to back track.

Jill Hastings, in contrast, worked closely with one of
her doctoral committee members on her dissertation research,
which they later published as a coauthored book. Betty Line
was also drawn into research projects as a student and, like
Lisa Gamble, became a member of a research group, "I got
introduced to the scholarly life--opportunities to make
presentations at national meetings, to have my name on a
paper, to work on a research report." Lori and Suzanne were
both given an opportunity to co-edit journals with their
faculty advisors. Lori asks in amazement, "Can you believe
that she didn't just make me do it and put her name on it--
which is what most people would do?"

Many of the women in the study believe that
collaboration, like all their relationships, can and should
model feminist values. They strive for relationships that
empower women and other groups who have been excluded or undervalued. They work to establish an atmosphere of mutual respect, trust, and support. Equality and democracy are central values in feminist relationships and are concepts that recur in the participants' stories. Myra Kramer sees collaboration as reflecting both feminist and Afrocentric values. Karen Bell firmly believes that collaboration is a way "for women to do differently in the academy...to really make our voices heard." Sally Miller concurs:

I think working together in a collaborative, cooperative, noncompetitive way is one way in which feminism can be modeled to the world....It seems to me that kind of a commitment is very different than what we see in normal departments and normal scholarship where the mode is very much attack another position in order to make your look good....This whole collaboration notion suggests there is another way.

Agreeing with Sally, Pat Carter views the dominant academic culture as pushing people "not only to go against their values but to exploit others." She describes the connection between her values and collaboration, "The values I usually end up advocating have to do with teamwork, cooperation, understanding, mutual respect--so collaboration fits right in to all that."
Relationships Between Collaborating Partners

Feminist women in this study have collaborated in their scholarship with students and advisors; partners, husbands, and other relatives; and friends and colleagues. Some have designed studies and coauthored publications only with white, American women; others have worked closely with women of color, women of other nationalities and ethnicities, and with men as well as women. Some have formally collaborated on a publication only once; others work almost entirely in collaborative research relationships. Despite the wide range of relationships they describe in their narratives, four major types of relationships appear with regularity in the study: intimate, pedagogical, instrumental, and professional. Intimate collaborations are characterized by an emotional and intellectual closeness, shared understandings, and an ease of communicating. Pedagogical collaborations exhibit a concern for nurturance and growth. Instrumental relationships are formed for a specific purpose or project, and professional collaborations are characterized by a shared research agenda, multiple collaborative projects, and a longer term collegial relationship. Although I present these below as four separate types, they are rarely separate or discrete in practice. One relationship may suggest several types as it evolves. Other relationships cannot be easily described as
any particular type. Participants who collaborate frequently may have one relationship that is pedagogical, another that is instrumental, and a third that is intimate.

**Intimate Collaborations**

Unique personal and professional relationships are formed by women in this study who share their ideas and their scholarly lives with family members, life partners, and very close friends. Also included in this category are close collaborative relationships that develop between women scholars who also share a particular racial or ethnic identity and express that shared identity in their work. Maggie Grant's current relationship with her friend, colleague, and collaborator is unlike any professional relationship Maggie has ever had. Describing herself as a solitary person who is happy to be at home alone with a book, she laughs at how her collaborator keeps her connected--"forever dragging me around." In their collaboration, Maggie explains, "We just talk to each other....We've got this code. We can say 2 or 3 words and she'll know what I'm talking about. We agree on most things."

Intimate relationships like Maggie Grant's often reveal an ease of communication and shared understandings. Lori Boothe struggles to explain the process of writing with her
partner and laughs, "It's really funny. It seems like this utterly natural division of labor...we don't even have to talk about it." For Karen Bell and Nina Caruso those easy relationships come in their collaborations with other women of color. Nina laughs in explaining, "I think some of the things that you'd have to explain to an Anglo woman you don't necessarily have to explain. But also I think how we view the world and how we view certain things, it's also shaped by that." Karen wonders, "I don't know whether it's because [she] is my friend and we have the same aspirations, the same rhythms--we were like Frick and Frack. We laugh about that so much now." More seriously, she continues, "We are two people who are dedicated to teaching...we are highly politicized, very conscious of our racial and gender positioning in mainstream academia at this point in the century."

Sally Miller agrees that communication with her collaborator, who is also a family member, is easy and tells how they understand each other's looks and moods. Collaboration with a close relative, however, means that they have to deal with feelings of jealousy, competition, and resentment. Sally describes a relationship that is both permanent and changing:

We always used to have each other read our papers that we'd done singly. And critique each other. And there was a time when she stopped giving hers to me. And then I stopped too. But now she's
started up again, and I don't know what prompted that or what prompted the stopping. I think there was an awareness of something going on and some kind of resentment. I don't know.

Sharing is a key word in the stories that feminist women tell about their collaborations. Jill Hastings points out that that is why many of them are attracted to the academy. Woman who have intimate collaborative relationships share more than their ideas and their papers. As Maggie Grant, Nina Caruso, and Karen Bell illustrate, they often share a way of talking, a network of friends, membership in a culture, and other aspects of their personal and professional lives. Occasionally, they share homes and families. Sally Miller collaborates with students, former students, occasionally with her husband, and most frequently with a female relative. Lori Boothe and Phyllis Brown collaborate with their life partners, and six of the participants collaborate occasionally with their spouses. Collaborating with a loved one adds just one more dimension to an already complex and emotionally intimate relationship. Lori explains, "We're partners as well as collaborators so this is a small part of the whole piece of our relationships....I suppose in a way it makes us even closer."
Collaboration as Pedagogy

For feminist women faculty, nurturing the development of others is an important aspect of their feminism and of their scholarly role. A majority of the participants in the study agree that working closely with another scholar on a shared intellectual project is an important way to foster growth and learning. Thus, collaboration as a form of teaching or mentoring is described often in this study. It is practiced by faculty who collaborate with students and by senior faculty who collaborate with their junior, and usually younger and less-experienced colleagues.

Collaboration in Phyllis Brown's department is a value the faculty share, and she sees a lot of student/faculty collaboration. "A lot of it centers around busy faculty with lots of ideas. Students are interested in some of these same things." Including students in research that leads to jointly-authored papers is viewed as a way "of getting research out in a place with not very many resources--a better way than paying students just to collect data." Phyllis hints, however, at some ambivalent feelings about collaborating with students and admits that she chooses her collaborators carefully. "I collaborate mostly with female students....I view collaboration with students as a mutual thing." She explains,

Part of my feminism was trying to get into the system, so that, for example I can choose what
doctoral students' committees I'll be on--and they
tend to be heavily women, or men who I valued...
I'll put my energy into helping minority students
who are weak and some women who are weak. I can't
help all of the weak students.

Being part of a student/faculty research group not only
added to Lisa Gamble's feelings of professional competence
but helped her to develop close friendships with other women
scholars. She explains: "You still feel a real close bond
with those people--socially and emotionally as well as
professionally--knowing that those are your colleagues who
you can go to when you need help." Now that she is a
faculty member, she has serious concern with exploitation of
students. Like most of the other participants in the study,
Lisa does not agree that faculty should coauthor a student's
research "unless the faculty member really writes or
contributes something significant." She admits that her
opinion is not the dominant one in her department and
describes it as "an ethical issue without a right answer."

Marian Thomas's recent experience as a new faculty
member working with a graduate student shows that faculty
too can be exploited in student/faculty research. She
recounts an unhappy experience with a graduate assistant who
became interested in data she was collecting for Marian's
own research. Unaware of the ethics of the situation, the
student took Marian's data and worked on the topic with
another faculty member. Despite the experience, Marian
welcomes the opportunity to work with students who are interested in her area. Lacking female mentors and collaborative opportunities as a student, she is aware of just how important and advantageous they can be. She credits her collaborative research experience with a senior colleague for her growth as a feminist and as a scholar.

Jill Hastings describes her feminism as motivating her to help other women to recognize their choices and "not get locked into certain ideas of how you're supposed to do things." She is committed to empowering her students and recalls the importance of her own collaboration with a competent female scholar whom she could emulate.

"Collaborating with her allowed me to feel more valued," she admits, wanting to function in that same capacity with students. "Even though I've done a lot of research, I still think of myself primarily as a teacher" and teaching is one way she expresses her feminism.

Nancy Connor, a senior woman who is beginning to talk about retirement, has had few opportunities to direct doctoral dissertations and to write with students because of her particular research speciality. Nevertheless, she is committed to helping women and young scholars. She observes:

If you can pair some experience with inexperience, it really helps to serve in a mentoring way to that person coming along. I'd like to see a lot more of that--particularly young scholars now.
The tenure mill is tough—they're scrambling for six years. If they can get some help, it's useful to them. On the other side of that, sometimes young scholars are a real shot in the arm for somebody like me.

Sharing Nancy's commitment to younger scholars, Edith Ross describes her own feminist stance toward collaboration:

Collaboration is working in a fashion where everybody has input, that everybody's empowered to have equal input....If I'm a senior now, a senior person in my field, and I'm working with more junior women...we're listed equally. I may have contributed more because of my experience, but I don't want to get into that issue. Others mentored me. Now I will mentor them.

Instrumental Relationships

This type of collaboration encompasses professional relationships that are formed in order to accomplish a specific objective or to work on a single project. Scholars come together in instrumental collaborations for reasons that are primarily pragmatic, needing someone with a particular skill or resource to complement their own research expertise. Another reason for engaging in an instrumental collaboration is desiring the experience of working on a particular project, investigating a topic of special interest, or working with a particular person. Some collaborations with students and new faculty are more pragmatic than pedagogical even though learning is a benefit. As Dr. Line recalls:

Politically it was very important to collaborate when I was young, because I needed the strength of
the senior people. They needed my abilities, but they had years and status. So there are times early in my career where I was the worker and they were the name and we used each other mutually.

Professor Carter's reason for collaborating on a survey with a colleague at another institution was their mutual need for papers. "She had the expertise in the area and we were friends--she was in the same kind of situation I was in terms of publications." Pat describes how they "carved it in half after we did the paper" with each of them approaching the data from a different point of view. They published both as coauthored articles.

Ellen Frank's comments that she has "coauthors all over the place" also suggests the formation of instrumental relationships motivated by a need to generate research. Ellen admits that few people worked together in her field 15 years ago and that now it is becoming increasingly common as the field becomes more like the natural sciences. She describes herself as having been drawn increasingly into collaborative work over time. "It's very nice. You can keep a lot of balls in the air at one time." She admits, however, that collaboration requires compromise and a willingness to give up some control, "Sometimes the paper doesn't look exactly like the way you would have written it."
Joining with other researchers in order to generate articles—to increase one's efficiency and productivity—is more frequently seen in the social science disciplines than in other fields represented in this study. However, women in the humanities also collaborate for pragmatic reasons, often joining forces to coediting a journal or anthology or take on a larger project than one can do alone. Much like Dr. Frank's description of collaboration as a division of labor, collaborators in the humanities also divide up the work in ways that are efficient, reflecting their particular strengths and interests. Marjorie Baker, for example, describes how she and her collaborating partner prepared a commemorative volume, "I worked mostly with the publisher...and when there were problems with contributors, it was [her] turn to get on their case. She oversaw the final preparation of the copy editing." They both wrote essays for the volume and collaborated on the introduction. Suzanne Smith describes her collaboration similarly:

It appeared that we had the perfect combination of all the resources to get the project going....It was something that needed to be done and we thought we could do it....Together we had enough need, enough resources, enough opportunity to think the project into existence.
Professional Collaboration Partnerships

Professional partnerships are characterized by shared research agendas and long-term relationships, often lasting several years and through many research and writing projects. The relationships which develop between professional colleagues are cordial and friendly, but they lack the intensity that characterizes intimate collaborations. Professor Nina Caruso is currently involved in a large grant-sponsored, multi-year project that is, or may become, a professional collaboration. She typically has several research projects and relationships going at one time, some pedagogical and others intimate. However, Nina's relationships occasionally have characteristics of the long-term professional relationships that lead to multiple publications over several years. Nina also admits that she is a private person who separates her personal life from her professional life. Discussing her relationships with her colleagues, she explains:

Most of my collaborators are friends of mine.... Basically [the relationships] evolved as friendships after the research part. And we socialize. But we usually socialize [in a way] that is removed from the actual work that we're doing. There is a distinction between what's social and what's work.

Taylor Woodrow, whose collaborative partnerships best illustrate the category, has had several long-term relationships over the course of her scholarly career. She
portrays her relationships as friendly "but never to the point that it dominates." Describing her current research partnership, she explains:

I'd say we're good collegial friends... We go to professional meetings together, room together to save money... and the families are friendly... There is a difference between a good collegial friend and a good friend. There is always a little reserve with a collegial friend that you're not going to have with a personal friend.

Her current professional collaboration is "a long term successful one with grants, papers, [a] book, and presentations." She explains how the relationship began more than six years ago:

We sort of plunged in--we sort of knew each other a little bit socially, both women, both in the department, both at about the same career stage. We had very similar methodological interests and complementary substantive interests. That turned out to be a very good basis for collaboration. But I didn't really know her. We sort of ignored that.

Taylor's involvement in long-term research relationships provides a view of collaboration that is missing in the stories of many of the participants. She talks about her experiences as a doctoral student helping her in "laying the foundation for the first major collaborative relationship that I did have as a professional" and how she learned to put differences aside and maintain a positive relationship:

You have to be a little bit easy going in these relationships... or they'll dissolve... It's not exactly like a marriage, but everybody has to give
more than 50%... You do have to understand the ebb and flow. If you're terribly picky or you're terribly demanding in your collaborative relationship, they will not work.

Summary

The relationships that feminist women faculty form with their collaborators differ in a variety of aspects, including purpose, duration, intensity, and degree of satisfaction and success. Despite these variations, however, the research participants in this study agree that success in any collaborative endeavor is enhanced when team members exhibit a shared interest in a specific research topic, complementary skills, and personal compatibility. In this chapter, I have identified and described four types of collaborative relationships that appear frequently in the participants' narratives: intimate, pedagogical, instrumental, and professional. These four types of relationships are not separate and distinct but are fluid and overlapping. **Intimate** collaborations exhibit an ease of communication, shared understandings, and an emotional as well as an intellectual closeness missing in other types. **Pedagogical** collaborations are characterized primarily by a nurturance and a regard for learning and growth. **Instrumental** relationships, often motivated by a desire for efficiency and productivity, are formed for a specific purpose or project, and **professional** collaborations are characterized by a shared research agenda resulting in
several publications and/or papers, longer term relationships, and a collegial relationship.

The type of relationship that feminist women faculty form is influenced in part by the norms of the department and field. Participants in this study, however, model feminist values in their collaborative partnerships. They strive to establish democratic and egalitarian relationships with their peers, friends, students, and colleagues based on mutual respect, trust, and support. Not limited to any one of the four types, these egalitarian relationships provide an alternative to the hierarchical relationships that characterize academic research in an impersonal, competitive, and individualistic culture.
I'm not a natural collaborator, except
I really like what happens when I collaborate.
So, you know, that ideal me
Lives in my cubicle.

I can intellectualize any goddam thing.
I use it as a weapon, as a defense.
The intellectualizing
Is the way I approach the world.

But when I collaborate I'm in another space.
A space where work and play,
Work and relationships
Things I usually keep separate

All of a sudden
Those things start collapsing on each other.
The intellectual and the relationship
When I collaborate....

So I'm in a place that is wonderfully productive
And uncomfortable.
It collapses my categories
And I like my categories distinct and separate.

When we work together and we seem to move beyond
where I can get by myself
It's something really special.
It's magical

But I have to compromise with my own ways
Of dealing with things,
Tendencies to intellectualize
Tendencies to go off by myself
To a corner
And think.
CHAPTER VI
THE CONSTRUCTION OF SCHOLARLY IDENTITIES

The women faculty who shared their collaboration stories with me tell of experiences that occurred during their years of doctoral study, early in their faculty careers, during their middle years as tenured professors, and well into their years as senior faculty members. Across the group, meaningful collaborations were not limited to any particular age, rank, or period of their careers. However, faculty repeatedly tell of being advised not to collaborate as junior faculty, a time in their careers when many feel unconnected, overwhelmed, and vulnerable.

Some women like Lisa Gamble, Lori Boothe, and Sally Miller came into the academy feeling prepared and confident as scholars. Lisa attributes her confidence to her status as a first born, "I've always felt ready." Sally learned to trust her abilities as a graduate student, a characteristic she does not see in a lot of doctoral students. Lori credits a supportive women's college environment and a collaborative editing project with her advisor for demystifying the academy.
Others like Judy Hedge feel that it took time for them to develop confidence. Judy remembers feeling unprepared by her graduate professors to publish and being "crushed" by her first rejections. She describes herself as "having enough guts to talk to other people and figure out they [received] rejections too." Maggie Grant also admits feeling frightened and intimidated:

Words don't come easy to me....Part of it is, and this may be speaking to my newness as a scholar, is that I'm scared, just scared that I won't be able to do it right, or I won't do it in such a way that it will honor the material....When I'm collaborating...it seems like what we're doing is just talking. And there's none of this anxiety around "Can I do this?" and "Will I be able to say this right?"

My interviews with the women in this study suggest that many feminist women faculty would welcome a "rethinking of the doctoral and junior faculty experiences as a time of individualistic challenge and competition to a time of mutual investment in talent development, generativity, and collaboration" (Moore & Sagaria, 1991, p. 196). Furthermore, many would benefit in ways that influence the constructing of their identities as competent scholars. Tenured faculty often reflect upon collaboration as something they would have found particularly attractive and useful as they were beginning their faculty careers. A full professor in a humanities discipline where coauthored work is still rare, Marjorie Baker admits, "I would have valued
it early on. I really would have. And I think I would have learned a lot. I would have made fewer mistakes, fewer enemies."

In this chapter I provide a third angle of vision on the intersection of feminism, scholarship, and collaboration by focusing on the construction of the scholarly identity. More specifically, I ask: How does working in collaboration with other women both encourage and inhibit women faculty's construction of their own scholarly identities? Junior faculty, perhaps because of their more recent entry into the professorate, appear to be more immediately aware of and concerned with the process of constructing their own identities as capable and competent scholars. In pursuing these concerns in conversations with the participants, five themes emerge: affiliation; rebellion and resistance; synergy; pragmatism; and confirmation and empowerment. Each theme is discussed and illustrated in the following sections.

Affiliation

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

Phyllis Brown describes her first team research experience as "unsettling." Because of her particular expertise, she was invited as a doctoral student to collaborate with two young faculty members and recalls, "That really wasn't such a satisfying research experience. I wasn't far enough along to really know what I was doing. What if someone asked me details about this paper?" In contrast, Lisa Gamble was offered the opportunity as a doctoral student to join a team of women faculty and students whose numerous projects often resulted in conference presentations. She explains, "We met on a regular basis and we did things together. And we created all kinds of projects. We did a lot of neat stuff. So I had that in my doctoral education and realized what a benefit that was." Describing how she was prepared to do independent work in a community environment, Dr. Gamble
remembers, "Each individual cared about her own work and the joint project she had with the other person. But we also cared about everybody else's work and helping them get that done as well."

Affiliation with other scholars does not mean uncritical endorsement of their work. Nor does it assume that feminist values are modeled in all relationships. In fact, hierarchical relationships between junior and senior faculty members, women and men, and doctoral students and faculty are much more typically modeled in collaborative relations than democratic relationships between equals (Wilkie & Allen, 1975). Participants in this study who had collaborative research experiences where there were significant differences in status or power often found it difficult to overcome those differences. Professor Ross notes, "With students it's very hard to have an egalitarian kind of relationship when they're still students--I don't think I should [collaborate] cause we're not equal. I know that the power's in my corner." As a doctoral student who worked with senior faculty on a research team, Dr. Line also remembers the status difference and confesses, "I didn't think I deserved any better....We [graduate students] all were the peons."
Lisa Gamble also thinks that students expect to be told what to do. Fighting that tendency, she encourages them to speak out and not be intimidated by faculty. Although she finds collaborative research to be meaningful both for herself and for her students, she laments, "It would only be better if it were another faculty member and we were on a more equal level educationally so that we could be contributing more."

Marian Thomas describes her collaborator as a supportive feminist and her senior in rank, national reputation, professional networks, and number of publications. Marian admits that she found the relationship to be both flattering and intimidating initially and describes her own behavior as deferential, "feeling like a grad assistant at first and not an equal partner." Her colleague, however, "immediately and consistently took steps to make sure we were working together equally....She was trying to help me feel we were both participating at the same level." Despite her colleague's efforts, however, it was not until they presented a conference paper and Marian began to receive public recognition that she "began to feel more engaged in the process" and that she could "question and contradict." She adds, "then your collaborator starts to treat you a little different and to see that you have ideas of your own."
Like Marian, Jill Hastings' first research collaboration involved a senior colleague, a woman Jill had known at a previous institution and whom she had respected as a teacher. Jill confesses, "I initially found it intimidating" but explains:

I respected her so much it was nice to be respected back...that underlay everything that was a benefit of getting involved in that project--to feel that I was her equal. I guess I was being mentored unintentionally and collaborating at the same time.

Rebellion and Resistance

Affiliation with a supportive colleague in a collaborative project can provide the impetus to tackle topics and to take stands in one's scholarship that one might not risk if working independently. For participants like Karen Bell, Lori Boothe, Maggie Grant, Marjorie Baker, and others in the study whose scholarship follows the humanities tradition, to coauthor a scholarly paper or book is to challenge the norms of acceptable academic scholarship and to risk resistance to and even rejection of one's ideas. Women faculty who work in history, English, philosophy, classics or other humanities-based subspecialties frequently comment that collaboration "just isn't done" or "we don't really talk about it." Not atypically, Maggie observes, "If you share your argument, that means you haven't done anything. If they see two names, they want to see who did
Karen Bell approaches collaborative work as "a way of innovating, taking intellectual risks, and modeling possibilities." Still believing that "collaboration really ought to be the wave of the future" and a way "to really make our voices heard," Karen finds that her coauthored work, a conference paper which developed into a book, has been dismissed as unscholarly. Because of its experimental form as well as its focus on the coauthors' experiences as Black women, Karen laments, "People were not willing to process the possibility of collaboration, to allow the experiment to be an experiment, to give us positive, sensible, intelligent feedback." Yet she does not regret having written the book and feels that its African-American focus is important despite its flaws. "It raises the next crucial question for me--and that's the value of my place in the academy at this point in time vis-a-vis the deterioration of my community."

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

Women who work in fields in which collaboration itself carries fewer risks describe their work with women colleagues as giving them support to take risks in other aspects of their scholarship. Pat Carter, for example, admits to sending her work to a former collaborator "every time I've written something where I thought I was hanging myself out to dry." Nina Caruso frequently works with other women, often other women of color, on her large, grant-funded projects. She describes a current project as appearing mainstream in many ways; it is an extensive study using quantitative and qualitative methodologies that are widely accepted and widely used in her field. To do scholarly work that is highly valued is particularly important to Nina who, as a woman of color, feels that she already faces additional layers of stereotyping and prejudices against her work. Caught between conflicting pressures—to do work which is relevant to her ethnic community and to produce scholarship which is highly valued in her field—Nina collaborates with carefully selected partners on topics of mutual interest in order to do research which is ethical, important, and viewed as valuable in her ethnic community and in the academy.
Working closely with her feminist collaborator gave Marian Thomas the courage to proclaim her own feminism in an environment that is hostile to feminist politics, scholarship, and pedagogy. Working with a feminist partner and using feminist methodology helped Marian to realize how she had been shaped by all the men with whom she had worked. Furthermore, the experience made her conscious of the kind of scholar and person she wanted to be. "Now when my work is reviewed, it is reviewed as feminist research...so that's a transformation that occurred." She continues, "I think I really learned a lot about being a feminist by collaborating....[It] gives you more strength to be a feminist when you see someone else who is one who is very successful at it."

Descriptions of themselves as rebels and as "strong-willed" appear frequently in the stories which feminist women tell about their scholarship. When asked if they had ever been told not to collaborate or to avoid collaborating with another feminist, a frequent response was, "They wouldn't dare tell me that" or "They know it wouldn't do any good." Jill Hastings laughs at her resistance to the received wisdom that cautioned her against collaborating, against doing qualitative research, and against publishing a coauthored book early in her career. Similarly, Jane Kelley was advised not to become involved in a research partnership
that she attempted when she was "new and untenured and
developing." The plan involved sharing a data base with
three other women, each taking the lead on one coauthored
article. Jane, the only team member to publish her article,
admits:

I think I wanted the other publications so I could
prove to the person who told me not to do it that
he was wrong. If he hadn't said that, I suppose I
would have cared, but I wouldn't have cared as
much.

Synergy

Three words that appear as women faculty describe
collaborative research, their scholarship, and the
construction of their identities are "expansive,"
"enlarging," and "synergy." Some participants use these
words to describe collaborative research as a unique
process. Others refer more specifically to a product that
is larger, better, or more creative than one they could have
done alone. Still others seem unable or unwilling to
separate collaborative scholarship into product and process.
Their language suggests that they approach scholarship and
collaboration holistically, and that they are very much
attuned to affect as well as intellect.

Describing the advantage of a collaborative approach to
a book she wrote with her partner, Lori Boothe explains,
"The big benefit is the product. You just know it's better
because it has two people's thinking and training and
disciplines in it." Nancy Connor agrees, "Instead of the
best of one, you get the best of two. It ought to increase
the success of the project." Isabelle Antonio elaborates:

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

For senior faculty like Lori, Nancy, and Isabelle, the
project or product is indeed "better and brighter and
clearer" because it represents the thinking, knowledge, and
effort of more than one individual. For other participants,
the scholarly product is better because the process itself
is qualitatively different and, as Isabelle notes, it
represents real collaboration. Phyllis Brown asserts that a
real or "true" collaboration is "truly creative in a
symbiotic kind of way, or a synergistic way...where the
ideas, I think, are coming from both of us." The notion of
mutuality, reciprocity, and creativity are essential to a
portrayal of collaboration as a synergistic experience.
Karen Bell's description of a brainstorming session with her
collaborative partner hints at the creativity and energy
that characterized the moment:

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

Karen's "wild thinking" and Isabelle's "spark and spirit" are attempts to capture in words the excitement and uniqueness of a meaningful collaboration. Pat and Jill also describe their collaboration experiences with words that express physical and emotional as well as intellectual connections. Pat explains how she feels in a successful collaboration: "Everything is flowing and moving well--sympatico--this energy builds. And you do more than you can imagine and you see more. Learning is affective. When I'm really learning, it is an emotional thing for me."

Jill experiences a similar feeling of creative connection with her research partners:

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

To communicate clearly how a "real" collaboration is different than other forms of scholarship and how they are personally changed by it--something Jill describes as "becoming more"--is difficult for most participants. Describing collaboration only as a process or a final product falls far short of an adequate description. Neither
description captures the energy, creativity, and the synergy that supports the construction of the scholarly identity.

Pat tries to explain how a research collaboration with a group of feminist scholars both reflected and strengthened her own scholarly identity. Beginning with an idea for a conference and a book, Pat developed "a process which reflects me." She explains: "The conceptualization of the book and the interplay we had and the learning what went on among the authors...it's a collaborative volume. It's something other than an edited volume." Dismissing the book as "just another edited book" also fails to capture the learning that took place and the knowledge that was created. Pat concludes, "Collaborating--being able to work with these people and to learn from the other people has been the most beneficial for me....I'm beginning to feel like I can stand on my own."

**Pragmatism**

Although all the women in the study enjoy certain aspects of their collaborative research projects and relationships, not all describe collaboration in such glowing terms. Some approach it as an effective strategy for busy faculty to employ in order to generate the large numbers of publications demanded in research universities. A growing list of publications helps the beginning faculty
member to develop confidence and to affirm her identity as a scholar. Phyllis, for example, admits that collaboration allowed her to build a very strong vita. She reflects, "You get all these things listed on your dossier....The more you have, the more confident you feel." Nina, like many of the participants, is also aware that "numbers count." She observes:

I think that the nature of the academy has gotten to the point where in many disciplines, including ours, given the expectations they have, the kinds of publications they want...it would be very, very difficult for sole authors to generate three, four, five articles a year individually. In our discipline we see sole-authored work, but we see more and more collaborative efforts. And I think some of us are taking the lead from the natural sciences where you have this string of authors. They know that if you really want to punch out work in a hurry, get a group together and then you take the lead on different things so that you can publish what the expectation is.

Participants in social science areas and in many of the professional schools agree with Nina's assessment. Collaboration and coauthored publications, modeled after the highly-valued and heavily-funded teams in the physical and life sciences, are not only becoming more common but are setting a standard for quantity that many, if not most, scholars are finding difficult to achieve. Kate Washington, like Nina Caruso, is committed to doing policy-based research that benefits the ethnic populations she studies. She collaborates in her research because she simply cannot do all the field work alone, teach regularly, work with
graduate students, write grant proposals, write reports for
use in the community, and publish her findings in refereed
journals. Collaboration is a way to divide the work load
and to publish more articles faster. Furthermore,
collaboration with community policy specialists means that
she can divide the writing responsibilities and focus more
on her own scholarly articles.

Pat's initial reason for involving other, better-known
scholars in the development of her edited book was her
difficulty in finding a publisher. By involving others in
the project, she was able to maximize her own abilities and
capitalize on the strengths that others brought to the
project. Lori's coauthored book grew from a similar
recognition that a topic in which she and her partner shared
an interest could benefit from an interdisciplinary
perspective and their complementary research skills and
training. Ellen Frank agrees that collaborative work allows
scholars to work more efficiently by bringing together
people with complementary skills, work styles, and levels of
expertise. Despite taking time off to have a baby, she
finished two papers because she "had coauthors who could
take up the slack." She admits that collaboration has
helped her to feel more confident and competent in her
quantitatively-driven department "because I'm getting more
stuff out faster."
Confirmation and Empowerment

The close personal and professional bonds which characterize many of the collaborative partnerships described in this study can provide the support and courage that some beginning faculty need in order to trust their own experiences, feelings, and knowledge and to act on their feminist values. Fay Jones acknowledges that coediting an anthology with a colleague, "stretched me a lot, both intellectually and emotionally. How I think about my work, my relationship to other scholars--that's changed enormously." She adds, "I do feel more connected and also more confident."

Several participants report that working collaboratively with other women confirms the expressive aspects of their personalities, aspects which are often concealed in the construction of the scholarly self. Marian struggles to find the exact words to describe her feelings: "You get to a stage where you try to keep your feelings closed in, so to articulate them is a new experience." A feminist working in a department where "feminism is a dirty word", Marian protects herself in conversation with other faculty. However, she describes her collaborative research experience as "exciting...a very emotional experience." She explains:

I was reluctant to get involved in collaboration because I'd always done research singly, but after
I moved here and left my collaborator behind, we would spend a week together continuing our research. And that became very, very important, especially in this environment, to sustain me. And I have come to really appreciate the level of discussion and the support.

Participants confirm how difficult it can be to be oneself and to enact one's commitments in the absence of personal and professional support. Like Marian, they tend to protect themselves, often muting their feminist voices. Being a feminist is "this worrisome thing" in Phyllis's department, "So when do you make comments and when do you not make comments?... People are watching to see how you behave." Pat saw her departmental colleagues as "very supportive when I was a liberal feminist, [until] I crossed the line." Karen, also feels the pressure of being an "other" and admits that she reveals her feelings and frustrations only with carefully selected women colleagues:

I can literally as well as figuratively fall into their arms and say, 'I had a lousy day, week, month, semester. I would not say that to any of my male colleagues. I may say, 'I'm overworked or I can't catch up' but I would never say that I was challenged by a male student or that I feel the double whammy of being Black and female takes students out of their own orbits.

Jill, in contrast, sees emotional expression as a strength of her research and her teaching. A woman who once thought of herself as "too stupid" to take a class, Jill describes herself as assertive in telling others about her research, which often focuses on emotional topics. Similarities in their approaches to handling their emotions
was a significant factor in Jill's decision to work collaboratively with her research partner:

The ways she deals with a loss and with stress is exactly the way I do. This is part of the reason we work so well. We intellectualize everything, analyze, and come to understand it. Having that knowledge helps us to deal with whatever it is we have to deal with...and to understand why."

As Karen, Jill, Fay, and Marian reveal in different ways, collaboration is a way of personalizing the context in which research is done and a way of bringing the self back into one's scholarship. It allows the scholar to acknowledge her emotions, experiences, and values, and in many cases to express and enact them in her scholarship.

For many of these women, it is both confirming and empowering to work with a person who supports and respects those aspects of the self that are often minimized, controlled, and hidden in traditional scholarship. Maggie Grant explains:

What it [collaboration] does for me is to push my ideas away from that traditional view of scholarship towards a different sort of understanding about what it is, what the enterprise is all about. It's a different framework. And what it does for me at least, it makes it so much like a real thing, like an ordinary thing that people can do. Scholarship is a funny word to me. I've always been scared of that, it sounds very impressive. But when [my colleague] and I collaborate, I think it's scholarly like crazy but it's not scholarship with a capital S, in that way that makes you think it's important and imposing and intimidating and wonderful. This is much more like a conversation to me—that real people do to think. You don't put yourself outside your life to do it....I don't leave me behind at all.
Collaboration, as Maggie illustrates, can help a novice scholar to conceptualize scholarship as something that is accessible to women, something that "real people do." Furthermore, it can help her to articulate the conflicts she feels between the abstract notion of "Scholarship" and her sense of herself as a real, embodied person with doubts and fears. Although collaboration with a supportive woman colleague does not always eliminate those feelings of insecurity, it can help women like Maggie to accept them as a legitimate part of her reconstructed scholarly self.

Summary

The junior faculty years for many participants in the study are described as difficult and lonely years. Although young faculty are repeatedly warned not to work in collaboration with another scholar until their reputations as independent scholars are established, many admit that collaboration helped, or might have helped, them survive their competitive and stressful early years. The five themes which I describe in this chapter emerge in conversations with faculty about those early experiences and, in particular, in their descriptions of how working in collaboration with another woman both encouraged and inhibited the process of identity construction.
These themes—affiliation, rebellion and resistance, synergy, pragmatism, and confirmation and empowerment—are not unlike the descriptions of collaborative relationships that I describe in chapter five. The theme of pragmatism, for example, emerges clearly in participants' descriptions of their instrumental collaborations. Synergy emerges in participants' narratives as they describe collaborations that are emotionally and intellectually intimate. Affiliation is a characteristic of (but certainly not limited to) pedagogical relationships. These overlapping themes reinforce the holistic aspect of collaborative scholarship as it is experienced and described by the feminist women in this study. To examine collaboration only as a research strategy or as a relationship with other women scholars, or to ask a woman to describe how her collaborative experiences relate to her self-construction is to attempt to describe the elephant by touching only its tail or its truck. These questions, and the overlapping themes that appear in answer to them, allow a more compete picture of feminism, scholarship, and collaboration to be presented.
CHAPTER VII
DISCUSSION

As the narratives in the previous chapters illustrate, women faculty's commitments to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration are indeed interrelated, sometimes conflicting, and often reinforcing. By hearing women talk about the collaboration strategies that they are using to achieve their professional goals, the relationships they form with their collaborators, and the ways that collaboration helps them to construct their scholarly identities, I have gained insight into some of the ways that feminist women's professional, personal, and political commitments merge. Lisa Gamble, for example, talks about her inability to separate her identity, her feminism, and her scholarship "because they are all a part of what I do, what I am." She sees working collaboratively with other women as part of her feminist commitment: "I guess it's the same kind of thing--working together makes things better for change. One person can't do much alone, so we have to work together."
In the previous chapters, I have presented and interpreted participants' narratives and I have constructed a framework for presenting what "working together" means to feminist women who are scholars in a variety of fields and who are associated with research universities. This study provides a contrast to the research on collaboration that has attempted to assess and predict the effects of collaboration and multiple-authored publications on faculty careers and knowledge construction. Other studies of faculty collaboration have not focused specifically on women's studies faculty in research universities in order to explore the connections between feminism, scholarship, and working in collaboration with other women. The participants' narratives reveal that working together--collaborating--is a simple idea that contains a wide range of complex issues, processes, and attitudes. Furthermore, the meanings of feminism and scholarship are also multiple and personal, reflecting each participant's disciplinary background as well as her life history.

Collaboration As a Research Strategy

Collaboration is not a singular process that leads to a predictable result. The advantages and disadvantages of collaboration as a mode of research and scholarly writing depend greatly upon the evolving norms of the field with
which the individual faculty member is affiliated, her research strategies, and the quality of the resulting product. Lori Boothe's experience illustrates that a coauthored book may be well received and rewarded in the humanities, but Karen Bell's experience of having her coauthored book dismissed by her colleagues shows that violating community norms can have adverse consequences. In collaborative work as in all scholarship, there are no absolutes. It is clear, however, that collaboration is an appealing concept to the feminist women faculty in this study for some research and writing projects. Also the norms that determine scholarship are powerful and rarely static or unambiguous.

Previous research into the norms and the values of academic work has emphasized the importance placed on research and publication (Hagstrom, 1964, 1965; Zuckerman, 1967 for example). Participants in this study acknowledged and consciously comply with those norms and values to a great extent. They are committed to their faculty careers and are working as insiders to change the academy. They recognize the importance of tenure and promotion as necessary to achieving power and influence in research.

---

4 The quality of the resulting research product or publication is obviously an important factor in evaluating faculty scholarship, whether it is produced individually or collaboratively. The design of this study precludes a careful consideration of the quality of academic scholarship.
universities. All of the participants are either working toward a promotion to associate or full professor or have already achieved the rank of full professor. Although some of the participants do not enjoy writing and publishing as much as their other faculty responsibilities, such as teaching and mentoring, they nevertheless engage in those activities to the extent necessary to continue in their careers. Very few of the participants indicate that they were initially attracted to faculty careers or to research universities because of a desire to conduct research. More often they were attracted to teaching at the college level or became interested in a particular substantive area. For many of them, however, there is no clear separation between their scholarship and their pedagogy. They describe their teaching as a way to "do new work" and research as a way to mentor young scholars.

All the participants acknowledge the research university as being composed of many fields and communities, each with its own norms and characteristic scholarship. Furthermore they describe and frequently experience conflict between their particular research interests and methodologies and those dominating the field, the school or college, and the university as a whole. While striving to establish national reputations in their fields, they also attempt to develop effective local research strategies to
combat the biases of institutional colleagues from other fields. Aware that committee membership and evaluation criteria can change from year to year, participants attempt to build dossiers strong enough to withstand close scrutiny from scholars in a variety of fields. Women below the level of full professor readily acknowledge that they seldom feel that they have the luxury of doing the type of scholarly work that they most enjoy. Sensitive to the political context in which they work, they pursue research programs that reflect their personal strengths and interests while also attempting to accommodate the prevailing norms of the institution and field.

One picture that emerges in this study is of women whose commitments to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration can easily come into conflict with the dominant norms of the academy. Therefore they develop strategies for combining their commitments in ways that minimize career risks while still allowing them to honor their commitments to women and to social progress. A commitment to scholarship and to publication is a necessary and fundamental personal and organizational expectation of their academic careers. For most women's studies faculty in the study, acting on their feminist commitments is also a personal expectation. Faculty who perceive collaborative research as risky, however, often choose to collaborate
"behind the scenes." Their commitments to collaboration are enacted privately in informal relationships rather than publicly in formal collaborative writing partnerships.

Collaborations that do not manifest themselves in coauthored publications have largely been ignored in the literature on academic collaboration because of its reliance on bibliometric methodologies. Mackie's (1985) study of female sociologists' productivity, collegial relations, and research styles is fairly typical of bibliometric studies of faculty collaboration in operationally defining collaboration as coauthorship in published journals. Recognizing however that research collaboration is frequently practiced in ways that are more difficult to measure, Mackie writes, "Research collaboration (informal discussion of ongoing research, exchange of literature references, advice on drafts of papers, formal cooperation on research projects, co-publication) is a particularly critical form of colleagueship in academia" (p. 191). Frequently observed but rarely studied systematically as collaborative scholarship, these informal professional relationships are often subsumed under other collegial relationships. Many of the participants in this study, however, distinguish between formal and informal collaborations and "simply being a good colleague."
This study suggests that collaboration in the research and scholarship of feminist women faculty may be much more widely practiced than previous studies have indicated. Informal collaboration is a way scholars can work collectively in a variety of fields without experiencing the adverse consequences of coauthorship. And because informal collaboration also supports their teaching and mentoring commitments, it is consistent with their feminist values and with the scholarly role.

Formal and informal collaborations have benefits and risks in all disciplines. Women in the social sciences admit that they may receive less credit for each coauthored article but are able to produce more articles faster. Furthermore they are frequently able to publish work produced by graduate students under their supervision, which increases their own visibility and documents their pedagogical commitments to students. As Phyllis explains:

I feel that I've been rewarded by the system salarywise for my writing and not really for collaborating. But collaborating is a part of that. If I write five articles--if I don't collaborate, I can write three...or some of them would never get written....I emphasize the fact that I've written articles with students that are published because that is valued as an aspect of my teaching.

Informal collaboration is clearly less visible and presents less of an overt challenge to the humanistic, single-authored scholarship that is valued in many fields. However, it may also lead to adverse consequences in that it
consumes time and energy without leading to publication and recognition in the field. Its value is seen in mentoring and in building professional ties with future scholars. In the short term, this may penalize some women as much as formal collaboration and coauthorship, but it is a practice rooted in feminism that all participants in the study seem to endorse. Concerned that the pressure to publish as a single author will take its toll on her work with students, Pat admits:

I used to be willing to say, "Oh, come on. I'm willing to tell you everything I know about feminist scholarship. It's wonderful and I want you to know about it." I think we're going to find that nurturing is more and more difficult.

The Value of Meaningful Relationships

Research into the advantages and disadvantages of women faculty's relationships with other women has been mixed. Kaufman (1978) and Reskin (1978a) have interpreted women's professional ties to other women as potentially disadvantageous in perpetuating their isolation and exclusion from important male communication networks. Other social scientists (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Hunter & Kuh, 1987; and Long, 1990) have suggested that women's lack of access to senior women as mentors limits their opportunities to collaborate as students and may result in their becoming less productive faculty members. Supporting the latter
theory, feminist historians (Cott, 1977; Freedman, 1979; and Rosenberg, 1979) have argued that nineteenth century women's networks, friendships, and a shared culture were advantageous and served as a precondition for the development of a political consciousness based on gender.

This study suggests that women faculty who are feminists seek membership in a supportive community. They experience a lack of close relationships with other women scholars as a professional disadvantage, and they are committed to countering that disadvantage in their work with other women. Moreover, this research supports Wilkie and Allen's (1975) finding that women prefer to collaborate with other women as coequals.

Four patterns of relationships, which I have labeled as intimate, pedagogical, instrumental, and professional, were described by the participants in this study. The latter three patterns—pedagogical, instrumental, and professional—display characteristics and structures observed by other researchers. Eaton (1951), for example, distinguished between a hierarchical structure found increasingly in multi-professional teams in industry and a democratic, unstructured form of collaboration more typically found in university settings. Hagstrom (1964) later differentiated between "modern" bureaucratic, industry-based research teams and two "traditional" forms of freely collaborating academic
teams more often associated with university research--
colleagial and professor/student or professor/technician.  
Wilkie and Allen (1975) identified three forms which they
labeled complementary, supplementary, and coequal, and later
Smart and Bayer (1986) divided Hagstrom's traditional
partnerships types into complementary, supplementary, and
master-apprentice.

It is significant that intimate collaborative
relationships, characterized by an emotional and
intellectual closeness between partners, have not been
identified and described in the published studies of
academic collaboration reviewed in Chapter II. This study
illuminates the close personal ties that characterize many
productive faculty collaborations. The affective qualities
of the relationships which I have labeled as "intimate"
have not been captured by quantitative research methods.
Although a scholarly interest in the qualitative aspects of
women's research relationships has emerged in feminist
research (Oakley, 1981; Reinharz, 1984) a majority of the
studies of collaboration and coauthorship in university
scholarship have been conducted by and have focused on
academic men (Long & McGinnis, 1981; Bayer & Smart, 1991,
for example). Descriptions of intimate collaborations such
as those described in this study are absent.
The desire of the women in the study to function as democratic, equal partners rather than as hierarchical team leaders was consistently expressed. Even in pedagogical teams consisting of junior and senior faculty or students and professors, feminist women resisted the notions of hierarchy and authority implicit in the masculine "master/apprentice" relationship. Instrumental teams consisting of specialists who might be viewed as "supplementary" collaborators were also described as operating according to a democratic, egalitarian model.

Although their valuing of close professional relationships with other women emerges as an important finding, one should not conclude that women's academic careers are of less importance that their relationships, another stereotype with which professional women in all fields have been burdened. In fact, findings from this study regarding the friendships which women faculty form with their collaborators in professional, pedagogical, and instrumental relationships are mixed. As their narratives reveal, some women prefer to maintain a professional distance from their academic colleagues, even those with whom they socialize. They describe their professional lives and work as separate from their personal lives. Others prefer to combine work and close friendships. No participant felt that she compromised her work product in
order to maintain a friendship, although several admitted that they chose not to collaborate with other women if they felt that such an involvement would harm the relationship. To illustrate, Nancy Connor describes her decision to discontinue plans for a collaborative project with "a very dear friend:"

In the process of even just talking about the book, writing the book together, it was clear to me that there was a portion of that that was going to have to be very clearly hers. That's when I knew it was not going to work. We're going to butt heads the whole time and it's just not worth it to me.

As feminist women who are building careers in research universities where the majority of faculty are white men, the enactment of their commitments to feminism and scholarship demands both emotional and intellectual resources. Despite the fact that many women faculty either lacked the opportunity or chose not to collaborate formally until later in their careers, the participants in this study find that collaboration with other women is a powerful way to create and to share those resources. They are however selective in their choice of partners, just as they are selective in their choice of projects. Reskin (1978a) and Kaufman's (1978) early admonitions that developing female networks and, by implication, collaborating with women, may lead to further disadvantage seems to be of little concern to participants in this study. With the numbers of senior women increasing in most of the fields, feminist women may
simply be finding it easier to build professional relationships with insiders who are also women. Far from viewing their collaborations with other women as disadvantageous, most women in this study prefer them.

Collaboration and the Construction of Identities

Most participants acknowledge that their early years as graduate students and untenured faculty were or are isolating and stressful. Like Judy Hedge, many felt unprepared to write for publication. Others came into faculty careers with little exposure to women scholars and having received little encouragement--and often discouragement--from their male faculty. Those who learned on their own and made mistakes admit that they would have welcomed the opportunity to collaborate with and learn from supportive and experienced colleagues. To become part of an open and sharing community, to receive confirmation for their ideas and feelings, and to receive encouragement for taking risks in their scholarship would have helped a number of the participants to feel more confident and competent as novice scholars.

Connections between the construction of their scholarly identities and collaboration with other women were observed and articulated frequently by women in the study. The themes that emerged--affiliation, resistance and rebellion,
synergy, pragmatism, and empowerment--are familiar ones. They echo the words and phrases used by participants in describing their relationships with students and colleagues, their research strategies, and their feminism. The recurrence of these themes suggests that the three angles of vision that guided this inquiry are overlapping rather than distinct and that collaboration in scholarship is not easily divided into component parts.

Affiliation with other scholars can be both reassuring and intimidating, as Phyllis Brown and Marian Thomas reveal. Although women's experience with collaboration early in their careers are mixed, all participants appear to be sensitive to issues of power and authority. They believe that approaching students and junior colleagues as valued partners in a collaborative learning experience is a viable and ethical way to promote the development of young scholars. Furthermore they see collaboration as having the power to confirm and to empower women as whole persons with emotions, feelings, and ideas.

Risk is always a factor for people who attempt to do new intellectual work and to bring about social change. Feminist politics and scholarship, with their challenge of the status quo, demand resistance and rebellion either overtly or covertly. It is not surprising that participants in this study--women who have publicly announced an
affiliation with women's studies programs--see themselves as rebels and are willing to take risks in pursuit of their professional and political goals. They are not fool-hardy, however. They appear to evaluate the benefits along with the possible consequences of their actions and attempt to minimize career risks. Working collaboratively with others is perceived as a way to gain support for going in new directions and espousing unconventional and often unpopular ideas.

For some feminist women, collaboration and coauthorship are not only political acts but they are also viewed as pragmatic ways to build a strong vitae. Many feminist collaborators have found they can work more efficiently if they team up with others. Working in collaborative relationships, often several at once, they can work from their particular strengths and receive positive recognition for their scholarly contributions. As they publish more and more articles and their vitas grow, they begin to feel that they have "earned the right to be listened to." Feelings of competence and confidence come from knowing they are making progress toward tenure and promotion and are also getting recognition for their published work.

Instrumental collaborators commonly describe their collaborations as efficient and productive rather than expansive or enlarging. Even collaborators who have
pragmatic motives, however, differentiate between research and writing that is done in sections and those projects which emerge in a "real" or "true" collaboration. When collaboration with a colleague results in a product or experience that is bigger, better, or different than either contributor could have accomplished alone, many women describe feelings of synergy, of connecting with another individual as a whole person in a way that is creative and unique.

The published research on scholarly collaboration and coauthorship provides little insight into the role that collaboration plays in a woman's construction of her own identities. The five themes of affiliation, risk and rebellion, pragmatism, synergy, and empowerment and confirmation are not offered as an exhaustive listing of identity themes. However, they give structure and meaning to the experiences and feelings that women shared with me in the course of our conversations. And they suggest that scholarly collaboration with other women can and does influence the construction of scholarly identities. Furthermore, they provide support for Moore and Sagaria's (1991) claim that the academy could benefit from rethinking graduate education and junior faculty experiences "to a time of mutual investment in talent development, generativity, and collaboration" (p. 196).
Collaboration by itself, however, will not create the changes that are necessary to make academic culture more inclusive, humane, and collegial. Women who enter into collaborative relationships expecting synergy may come into conflict with collaborative pragmatists. Conversely, scholars who approach collaboration holistically may find it difficult to accept a structured process and more clearly defined roles.

Ways of collaborating that consciously encourage resistance to hierarchy, exclusion, and exploitation, that encourage creative rebellion, that lead to a synergy of ideas that enlivens scholarship may help to create the kind of environment that Pat Carter calls "a supportive environment where you're learning together." Affiliation, pragmatism, confirmation, and empowerment can also be practiced by faculty working with their students and colleagues in ways that reaffirm feminist values and help other scholars to construct identities as confident scholars. Faculty women who are committed to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration reveal in their words as by their example that their commitments do intersect in diverse and powerful ways. These are not however commitments which can be easily formed and sustained by individual women faculty working in isolation from others.
A theme which flows throughout these narratives is the importance of personal values. Participants repeatedly express the desire to integrate their feminist values into their scholarship by selecting topics and methods that reflect their commitments to other women, to their communities, to equality, and to social justice. Although women in this study rarely used the word "values" in their stories, they repeatedly used value-laden word such as "equal," "empowering," "democratic," "sharing," and "trusting" to describe the relationships and a culture they desire and the scholars they strive to be.

Feminist values--such as nurturance, mutuality, cooperation, and reciprocity--and scholarly collaboration are clearly linked in the stories of many of the participants. Lori Boothe observes that collaboration seems like a very feminist mode of work and feels guilty that she also enjoys working alone. Edith Ross describes working with a jealous and controlling faculty member as "the opposite of collaboration. It's a very hierarchical notion." Supporting that perspective, Appley and Winder (1977) have suggested that collaboration is a relational value system that can provide an alternative to our traditional system that is based on competition and hierarchy. With particular relevance to this study, Appley
and Winder's definition of collaboration emphasizes caring, commitment, and choice, values that are central in feminist ethics, pedagogy, and inquiry. Noddings (1986) also sees collaboration as inherently ethical. She describes collaborative research as a way of "meeting colleagues in genuine mutuality," supporting the growth of individuals, and maintaining a caring community.

Many of the participants have experienced collaboration as a way to resist hierarchy and minimize competition. They think of it as inherently caring and connected, nurturing, and feminist. Most of the collaborations between women that I have described in this paper reflect those values. Others espouse feminist values and strive to model them in their relationships, in their teaching, and in their scholarship, but contend that working in collaboration, even with other women, is not in itself feminist. They reject that linkage, noting like Fay, "It's a cliche to say that working together is more feminist than not."

Edith and Betty's experiences as doctoral students and Lisa, Phyllis's, and Maggie's skepticism toward faculty/student coauthorship illustrate that collaborative research groups can function in ways that resist feminist values. Many collaborative teams functioning in research universities are modeled on hierarchical relationships and promote such values as separation and segmentation,
compétition, authority, patriarchy, and even exploitation. These groups challenge Appley and Winder's claim that collaboration itself is a relational value system based on choice, commitment and care. They imply that collaboration is the vessel rather than the substance, that it is a form of social organization that has the capability to promote not only feminism but conservative masculine values as well.

Can the power of collaboration to promote feminist values be reconciled with its seemingly paradoxical power to undermine them? Does the confusion stem from too broad a definition of collaboration? Many participants have argued that collaboration is more than simply working together. Others have challenged that notion. One advantage of interpretive inquiry and of talking with collaborators about what they know is that there is no obligation to reconcile their differences and to explain contradictions. The purpose of this study is not to determine which view is best or most correct. No individual view of collaboration is right or wrong although it may be idiosyncratic. Each view, however, is meaningful and adds to a description of the phenomenon. The picture of collaboration that emerges from this research is contradictory. Collaboration is a value system which is based on an ethic of care that is traditionally associate with women and with feminism. It is also a powerful form of social organization which can be
used to promote other value systems. It is both vessel and substance.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Participants in a number of fields confirm that working, thinking, and writing in collaboration with other scholars is becoming an increasingly attractive and common way to approach academic research. Proponents tout it as a way to increase one's productivity, alleviate isolation, and create a personal environment that supports learning and achievement. Yet it still challenges accepted epistemologies and methodologies, bringing collaborative scholars into open conflict with the competitive and individualistic cultures that exist in many academic communities. Adding to the difficulties that women faculty face, the norms that govern academic scholarship and, in particular, the attitudes towards collaborative scholarship are ambiguous, evolving, and variable among and within the various academic fields and disciplines. Women who desire to work in collaboration with other women face uncertainty as to how their contributions will be received in the field as a whole, and equally as important, by their departmental and institutional peers.
There are few institutional policies and little research to guide interested faculty through the potentially dangerous collaborative waters. Few faculty members outside the natural sciences were trained as graduate students to work as team members and even fewer were given the opportunity to write and conduct research with faculty mentors. Most of the knowledge of collaboration that women faculty have accrued has come from working with others or was passed on to them as advice from well-meaning colleagues. Learning to work collaboratively with one's peers through trial and error can be difficult, time-consuming, and painful.

Women in this study have learned from their mistakes and successes as collaborators. Nevertheless, they frequently lamented their lack of training and experience as they entered or "fell into" their first collaborative relationship. They enthusiastically shared their learnings and offered suggestions. One participant suggested that this study be presented as a handbook that could be made available to future collaborators.

Because women conduct their research and their writing for many different communities, it is difficult to formulate recommendations that address all possible circumstances. However, I offer the following suggestions with the intent that they might be useful to those faculty, students, and
administrators who are concerned about collaborative scholarship and want to avoid the problems that many of these women faculty experienced:

1. Faculty members in all departments should engage in dialogue to clarify the meaning of collaboration and coauthorship within the fields and specialities represented in the department. Many participants in the study felt unsure about how their departmental colleagues defined the term and how they practiced it. Moreover, many women claimed that they have never heard collaboration discussed as an academic issue in their department or at professional meetings. In fields where team research is common, participants frequently disagreed with the hierarchical assumptions behind name order patterns. Open dialogue may help reduce ambiguity and risk.

2. Departments should develop policy statements and guidelines regarding faculty/student collaboration and coauthorship on faculty research projects and on students' dissertation research. These guidelines should address the pedagogical purposes of the collaboration as well as authorship issues. The potential for exploitation of graduate students' work by faculty advisors prevents many faculty from forming research partnerships that could help students develop as scholars. The absence of guidelines also leaves students and faculty members unprotected.
Scholars who value pedagogical collaboration should not be prevented from creating a milieu where students and faculty can work and learn together with the possibility of exploitation minimized.

3. Women faculty should be encouraged to share their collaborative research strategies with students and junior faculty members. In fields where formal collaboration and coauthorship are discouraged, informal groups can be formed to provide opportunities for novice faculty to learn with their senior colleagues.

4. Graduate students should be encouraged to collaborate as peers on classroom projects, conference papers and presentations, and journal articles. Women who come to faculty positions having had experience working successfully in a community environment will be better able to establish and maintain successful pedagogical collaborations with their students and peers.

Collaboration and coauthorship in academic research and scholarship raise important issues regarding how we construct and represent academic knowledge, how we educate future scholars, how we relate to others in the academy, and how we construct our own identities. Despite the pervasiveness and significance of these issues, collaboration and coauthorship are processes and practices that are rarely debated and investigated. In some fields
formal collaboration is practiced frequently. In other fields, it is so rarely practiced that it is not acknowledged as a legitimate option. The women in this study express a variety of attitudes and opinions about the way scholarship is performed and evaluated in their own fields and throughout the academy. Although they had all collaborated formally or informally, in general they knew very little about how collaboration is defined or performed by others. Most of their knowledge of collaboration came from their own experiences or from the well-meaning advice of senior colleagues. Few were encouraged by their peers or mentors to collaborate as a way to build confidence as researchers, to form meaningful relationships, or to improve the quality of their scholarship.

In the absence of formal policies and easily-accessible research to guide their decisions, faculty who are attracted to collaborative scholarly work have little recourse but to "play it safe" by following the advice of others or to risk acting on their own commitments. Too often, however, the advice of colleagues stands in conflict with the values that these feminist women faculty embraced.
AFTERWARD

Early in the study I defined collaboration as "a range of processes whereby two or more individuals work together in cooperation on an intellectual project or product for which both or all members assume some responsibility for its outcomes." Although I approached this topic resisting the tendency of some scholars to define collaboration either too broadly or too narrowly, I was satisfied that my definition was sufficiently precise to capture the key features of a collaboration and still leave room to explore the concept with the participants in the study. This study, however, is about definitions and meanings. As the study and my learning progressed, I became uneasy with the notion that collaboration requires that "all members assume some responsibility for its outcomes." My conversations with feminist faculty women who collaborate "behind the scenes" or who define collaboration as an "environment...where you're learning together" supported my growing appreciation of collaboration as a process that may lead to outcomes for which a single individual claims responsibility or receives credit. As one participant asked rhetorically, "Is there anything that isn't collaborative?"
If one ascribes to a social constructionist view of reality, all knowledge is constructed in a social rather than an individual context. Intellectual work is "always already" collaborative, regardless of how many people receive credit or assume responsibility. Although the scholar may struggle and reflect in solitude, I have learned from this study that faculty scholarship can never be truly solitary. One's intellectual labor can never be separated from the community-generated discourse that creates and sanctions it. Individual scholarship, indeed individual thought, is always influenced by one's community(ies). And paradoxically, community is always constituted by individual thinkers. Our knowledge, our thought, and our reality are never completely individual nor are they ever completely and totally shared.

I have taken away from this research experience a profound respect for the women scholars who participated in the study and a sense of privilege for having had the opportunity to talk with them about topics of particular importance to me at this point in my life. My feelings of gratitude and respect are surpassed only by my feelings of humility and wonder. The act of conducting research in order to learn more about a topic in which I am intensely curious has emphasized how little I know and can hope to
know and how dependent I am on others for my own individuality and sense of self.
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PARTICIPANT LETTER AND RESPONSE FORM
Dear Dr. XXXX:

I am writing to you because of my interest in learning more about women faculty in research universities and the ways in which their commitments to feminism, scholarship, and collaboration intersect. As a faculty member associated with Women's Studies, your experiences and views are important for describing collaboration among women.

Because you are one of a small group of distinctive faculty women, I hope that you will agree to participate in a study I am conducting on this topic. Should you be able to participate, I will ask to meet with you in the late spring or early summer for an open-ended interview. The interview will take approximately two hours and can take place anywhere convenient to you.

Although your participation is very important to this study, please be assured that I will not use your name without your permission and will take every precaution to protect your identity, including your discipline and institution. At the conclusion of the project, I will send you a paper which presents the findings of the research. I also hope that you will find the interview of value in generating further reflection and introspection on your life.

Please complete and return the response letter in the enclosed envelope to 7880 Asbury Hills Drive, Cincinnati, Ohio 45255. If you have any questions or would like to discuss the study, please telephone me at my home (513-232-2298). You may also contact Dr. Mary Ann Sagaria (614-292-7703), Associate Professor of Higher Education, under whose direction I am conducting this research as part of my doctoral dissertation.

I hope you will take part in the study. In any case, thank you for your help and cooperation. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely,

Cynthia S. Dickens
Ph. D. Candidate
Dear Cindy:

___ I would be happy to talk with you about becoming a participant in your study. The best way for you to contact me is:

___ by telephone at the following time and phone number:

______________________________

______________________________

___ other:

______________________________

___ I am interested in the study but have not collaborated with another woman on a research, artistic, or writing project.

___ I am sorry, but I will not be able to assist you in your research.

Sincerely,

Name

Please return in the enclosed envelope to:
Cynthia S. Dickens
7880 Asbury Hills Drive
Cincinnati, OH  45255
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDE
Interview Guide

Introduction:
Thank you for taking the time to meet and talk with me. As you know from our telephone conversation and the letter of introduction, I am interested in gaining a deeper understanding of feminism, scholarship, and collaboration as they intersect in the lives of women faculty who work in research institutions.

With your permission, I would like to begin tape recording our conversation. Are you ready to begin? For the record, today's date is _________________. Do I have your permission to record this interview?

A. The Research University Culture:
Could you begin by telling me your background and how you happen to become a faculty member at a research university?

Would you describe for me the type of scholarly activity you most enjoy doing? Is this the type that is most valued in your discipline?

Do you receive support and encouragement from your colleagues in your research? (What kind of support? From which colleagues?)

B. Collaboration
Have you been encouraged by your colleagues to work collaboratively? How?

How do you define collaboration? (What does the word "collaboration" mean to you?) Is this the way it is defined in your discipline? Do you agree with that definition?

How does your department/college encourage or discourage collaborative scholarly work?

Have you ever been told not to collaborate or coauthor a paper?
Have you ever been told not to collaborate with other women? With other feminists?

Have there been times in your career when collaboration seemed more attractive than other times?

Were you given opportunities to collaborate when you were a student?

Do you ever collaborate with your students now?

Have you had a collaborative research partnership which has been particularly meaningful in your development as a scholar? Would you tell me about it?

How did you happen to become collaborating partner(s)?

How do (did) you make decisions regarding who does what?

Did problems come up during your collaboration? How were they resolved?

Did you publish the results of the study? Was the paper coauthored and collaboratively written? How did you handle issues of authorship?

Have you ever experienced any feelings of competition when you are involved in a collaborative project? How did you manage those impulses?

What words would you use to describe your involvement in a collaborative project? (Fun?)

What are the benefits of collaborative scholarship from your experience? The disadvantages? Trade-offs?

Will you continue to do collaborative research and writing? (Why or why not?)

C. The Evolving Scholar

Have you changed as a result of your collaboration? Describe that change. (Probes: Do you feel more competent? More self-confident?)

Has the type of research and writing you do changed as a result of your collaboration?
Has your relationship with your partner(s) changed during the course of this research project? Describe how the relationship has developed.

Has your relationships with other women faculty been strengthened by working together collaboratively? In what ways?

D. Feminism

What does being a feminist mean to you? Has this meaning changed for you over the years?

In what ways do you see your scholarship as having a political motive or purpose?

How does your scholarship relate to your feminism?

How does collaboration relate to your feminism?

Has your association with the Women's Studies program influenced your scholarship? Your relationships with your colleagues in your home department?

How has your affiliation with the Women's Studies faculty changed you as a person?

E. Conclusion

Is there something more that you would like to tell me that would help me to understand collaboration, feminism, and scholarship?
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INFORMED CONSENT FORM
Informed Consent Form

I consent to participate in the research tentatively entitled: Feminism, Scholarship, and Collaboration: Intersecting Commitments in the Lives of Women Faculty. The research is being conducted by Cynthia S. Dickens in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree under the direction of Dr. Mary Ann Sagaria, Associate Professor of Higher Education, Department of Educational Policy and Leadership, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Ms. Dickens has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. I have agreed to be interviewed and tape recorded. I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to ask questions regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

I understand that my words may be paraphrased or quoted verbatim for any written documents produced for this study; however my name and other identifying characteristics such as department, discipline, and institution will be changed in order to protect confidentiality.

I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: __________________
Signed: __________________

(Participant)

Signed: __________________

Cynthia S. Dickens, Investigator
7880 Asbury Hills Drive
Cincinnati, OH 45255
(513) 232-2298
APPENDIX D

PARTICIPANT CODE NAMES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Name</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonio, Isabelle</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker, Marjorie</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell, Karen</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boothe, Lori</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Phyllis</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter, Patricia (Pat)</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caruso, Nina</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Soc. Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connor, Nancy</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, Ellen</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Soc. Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamble, Lisa</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant, Maggie</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, Lucille (Lucy)</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings, Jill</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Soc. Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedge, Judith (Judy)</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffer, Carol</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Soc. Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones, Fay</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly, Jane</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramer, Myra</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Soc. Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line, Betty</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller, Sally</td>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>Soc. Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, Edith</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, Mildred</td>
<td>Full</td>
<td>Soc. Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, Suzanne</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Thomas, Marian</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Washington, Kate</td>
<td>Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Woodrow, Taylor</td>
<td>Full</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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