

By sharing an honest, thoughtful dialogue about how their different identities affect their experience of feminism and feminist spaces, Z Nicolazzo and Crystal Harris model duoethnographic dialogue—a type of dialogue across difference that has the potential to be a catalyst for transformative student learning.

By Z Nicolazzo and Crystal Harris

This Is What a Feminist (Space) Looks Like: (Re)conceptualizing Women's Centers as Feminist Spaces in Higher Education

ONGOING BUDGETARY AND POLITICAL pressures are leading some to question the value of maintaining identity centers (e.g., women's centers) and academic departments focused on marginalized populations (e.g., Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies). Despite these concerns, explored by Kristen A. Renn and Wendy Brown, respectively, Lori Patton Davis argues that these spaces and disciplines remain vital to the fabric of institutions of higher education, specifically in their ability to confront and redress the inequity that is always already present on college and university campuses. However, is it possible these spaces may actually further some of the oppressive ideas they are attempting to deconstruct? For example, what happens if a women's center ceases to provide a liberatory space for those seeking to escape the presence of sexism and genderism? Furthermore, what does the term "feminism" really mean, and how does a women's center go about enacting feminist values in its space as well as across campus?

In this article, we as authors enter into duoethnographic dialogue in an attempt to (re)conceptualize

feminism and its ability to transform student learning and development. We locate our dialogue by discussing the often-competing views of feminism that arise within women's centers. We then extend our dialogue by elucidating ways in which educators across college and university campuses (e.g., faculty, student affairs professionals, classified staff) can work alongside students to promote their espoused values. Specifically, we highlight how critical pedagogy, intergroup dialogue, and reflective practice provide opportunities for all members of campus communities to encourage liberatory practices in education, as described by bell hooks (in *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*) and Ira Shor.

DUOETHNOGRAPHIC METHODOLOGY AND METHODS

REFLECTING ON RESEARCH ENDEAVORS in their book *Duoethnography*, Richard D. Sawyer and Joe Norris state, "Questions grounded in the generative and narrative core of humanity—the naked 'I,' the

Published online in Wiley Online Library (wileyonlinelibrary.com)

© 2014 by American College Personnel Association and Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

DOI: 10.1002/abc.21138

Our conversations promoted a deep sense of shared trust, which, according to Norris and Sawyer, is itself a guiding principle of duoethnography.

contradictory, marginalized, resistant—are usually missing” (p. 1). Responding to this lack, duoethnography has emerged as a methodology in which researchers enter into a dialogue through which they arrive at a new understanding of shared experiences. According to Sawyer and Norris, duoethnography is rooted in social justice and, as such, has been used intentionally to promote social change. Unlike autoethnography (per Heewon Chang and Carolyn Ellis) and scholarly personal narrative (described by Robert J. Nash and D. LaSha Bradley), which focus on groups with whom researchers identify or the researchers themselves as potent sites for research, duoethnography recognizes the potential for new meaning to be made—and to have that new meaning effect change—as a result of the interaction between researchers who embody different identities, have different experiences, and make different meanings of their worlds.

In their chapter “Toward a Dialogic Methodology,” Norris and Sawyer state that data collection for duoethnography is “always emergent and uncertain. Its tenets serve as dispositions to guide the research, but each duoethnography will chart its own course” (p. 25). Therefore, in developing our own approach as researchers, we (Z and Crystal) decided to engage in dialogue by writing back and forth to each other in a shared document. Our choice to write allowed us to invest fully in the process of thinking about and responding to what we were each sharing. We decided writing would also increase the amount of time we were talking *with* rather than *at* each other. In this sense, we modeled Martin Buber’s notion of genuine dialogue, which he asserted happens “where each of the participants really has in mind the other or others in their present and particular being and turns to them with the intention of establishing a living mutual relation between himself [sic] and them” (p. 19).

Z Nicolazzo is a doctoral candidate in the Student Affairs in Higher Education Program at Miami University.

Crystal Harris is a master’s student in the Student Affairs in Higher Education Program at Miami University.

We love feedback. Send letters to executive editor Jean M. Henscheid (aboutcampus@pdx.edu), and please copy her on notes to authors.

Our dialogue took place over the course of six weeks, during which time we also met in person every other week to check in about the research process. These check-ins quickly became another space to explore the content we were discussing through our dialogue. They also tended to stray from our primary focus of feminism and feminist spaces on college campuses. Topics for these conversations ranged from the mundane to the sensational, but each interaction allowed us a chance to invest in each other as more than just co-researchers. As such, our conversations promoted a deep sense of shared trust, which, according to Norris and Sawyer, is itself a guiding principle of duoethnography.

DIALOGUE

CONSISTENT WITH SAWYER AND NORRIS’S duoethnographic methodology, we began our dialogue by focusing on an artifact relating to our shared interest in feminism. The artifact we chose is a pink button with white text that read “This is what a feminist looks like.” The dialogue, reprinted below, moves from a discussion about what a feminist looks like to the possibilities for feminist spaces, specifically women’s centers, on college campuses. We then end our article by discussing the implications of our dialogue on student learning.

What Does a Feminist Look Like?

Z: The more I think about this question, the more I become convinced there is no one way a feminist looks. In fact, I worry that inscribing feminism on the body privileges essentialist notions that mark some as insiders and all others as outside. Historically, this has meant that certain people (e.g., trans* people, women with subordinated racial identities) were not seen as able to be feminists. Moreover, this outsider status has been used against certain groups. For example, some radical feminists believe transwomen are “really men” who, by virtue of being “men,” can never be feminists. Therefore, transwomen are ostracized from feminist circles while also being portrayed as deceptive, narcissistic, and endangering the entire feminist project, or so radical feminists would have one believe.

As someone who identifies as trans* myself, I tend to be wary of visual representations of feminism and feminists. Must feminists look a certain way, or is there an ethos of feminism that binds feminists? For me, this is the tension implicit in the question posed by the button you have on your bag, Crystal. I appreciate there is a liberatory reading of the button, one that suggests whoever wears the button is indeed what a feminist looks like. Unfortunately, another way to read this button suggests that to focus on looks also serves as a way to regulate communities and police those who are gender non-normative, a concept Dean Spade has discussed at length in his 2002 essay “Dress to Kill, Fight to Win.”

C: In agreement, I do not believe in one representative feminist look. A feminist does not need to hold specific social identities and mores, so increasing inclusion of multiple and representative voices and experiences is preferred. I wear this button as a symbol of an important component of my identity, as a tool to connect to other feminists, and in efforts to spark conversation about what it means to be a feminist while denouncing the stereotypes of what a feminist is “supposed” to look like. However, I hope that what binds individuals as feminists is not necessarily what they look like but more what they believe.

My personal ideology of feminism is based on interconnectedness and a desire to create communities promoting personal and collective growth. This personal growth means community is built in everyone’s best interest, seeking for current circumstances to be equitable in relation to access to resources, opportunities, etc. I see collective growth as the development of a larger connection to humanity and seeing our impact on larger systems while striving to eradicate issues of power, privilege, and oppression.

The exclusion of trans* individuals not only does not fit with my idea of feminism but is quite contradictory to the values I hold as a feminist. You mentioned the “historic way this has played out against bodies,” could you tell me more about that?

Z: I like your thinking about feminism. Reading your comments, it seems to me that feminism is transformed from a “look,” or a set of visual cues, into being a way of developing community in an attempt

to deconstruct hegemony, privilege, and oppression. This feels liberatory to me in a way that thinking about feminism in terms of a look—a sort of embodied feminism—cannot capture. I want to come back to this idea of community, as I think it will help us think through how we (re)envision feminist spaces.

But before I head down that road, I want to answer your questions, and maybe ask one or two of my own. One example I have about the historic marginalization of some women in feminist movements centers around race. Audre Lorde, bell hooks, Cherríe Moraga, Gloria Anzaldúa, and other womanists and black feminists have called attention to the way the feminist movement of the 1960s and 70s excluded women of color. This example seems especially poignant given the recent 50th anniversary of the publishing of Betty Friedan’s *The Feminist Mystique*, originally published in 1963, which sought to pave the way for “women” to enter the public sphere. However, what Friedan neglected in writing this book was that some women—namely, black women and other women from subordinated racial groups—were already a part of the public sphere, many working in the homes of white women. This is why hooks and others critique Friedan’s work, as her call for women’s liberation was really a call for white, upwardly mobile, college-educated, heterosexual women to join the workforce while, at the same time, giving the impression that the category of “woman” was uniform and all women had these same needs, desires, and demands. Unfortunately, while Friedan’s call for “women” entering the public sphere was important for some, it also had the unfortunate effect of further marginalizing many women in the process.

Given the ways the categories of “woman” and “feminist” have historically limited participation in the feminist movement, I am wondering how we then make sense of the statement on your button. Although I agree there is no one “look” a feminist must have, there also seem to be real effects to *not* looking a certain way as a feminist. So how do we make sense of these fractures? How do we move forward collectively when not all who identify as feminists and/or womanists are seen as legitimate members of the movement for equity and equality you so articulately described?

I see collective growth as the development of a larger connection to humanity and seeing our impact on larger systems while striving to eradicate issues of power, privilege, and oppression.

In a society oppressive to feminist ideology, how can we find a way to build community and means of connection for feminists without marginalizing those who have been historically left out of the movement?

What are the insidious ways that privilege operates to marginalize some in a movement that proposes to be liberatory? You mentioned identifying as white; how do you think about a feminist praxis given the power imbalances along racial (and other) vectors of identity? This has been really hard for me to work through myself, so I am curious about your thoughts.

C: The concept of a feminist praxis is one I struggle with on a daily basis. You mentioned that “privilege operates to marginalize some in this movement that proposes to be liberatory.” In considering ideas of everyday activism, I am constantly questioning the embedded marginalization of some in the efforts to liberate others and the role my privilege plays in doing so. Do I work within larger systems that feel unchangeable and seek practices that result in the least harm? For example, this could include supporting companies with fair trade practices, sustainability initiatives, or non-misogynistic advertising. Yet, this leaves me questioning, is this just “feel good feminism”? Or, do I identify how these systems of globalization and capitalism inevitably marginalize individuals and seek ways to dismantle these systems or not participate in them at all? In choosing the later, I am then left wondering if it is even possible to completely resist a system that we live in? At times, I am overwhelmed by deciding what is the best course of action when every choice feels like it will inevitably marginalize someone.

However, just as educators speak about students as always developing, I recognize that self-perfection and perfection in a movement is unattainable and may be unnecessary for achieving progress. I see feminism as an evolving movement that can strive to be better; and I can do my part to move it forward. In the process, it is imperative to recognize and seek to rectify injustices caused by systematic privilege. For example, in Janet E. Helms’ work on understanding whiteness, she outlines several strategies for taking responsibility of one’s privilege.

Helms specifically talks about (1) recognizing the ways in which we have perpetuated oppression (racism in the case of whiteness) and actively choosing to resist, (2) considering how this oppression exists in our

everyday lives, and (3) searching out ways to positively exhibit privileged identities. In considering these tasks in relation to the feminist movement, I see value in reflecting on the ways some voices have been marginalized and taking action to counter such silencing. For example, I am reminded of our conversation the other day about *The Vagina Monologues* as a feminist production and even as a creation of a feminist space on campus. Historically, this production seeks to have liberatory conversations surrounding the female body. However, your commentary and my reflections on Helms caused me to view this event in a new light. Clouded by many of the privileges I hold, I previously failed to consider how this event marginalized or completely omitted experiences by individuals who identified as trans*, disabled, or of African descent. In considering Helms’ work, recognizing the historical marginalization embedded in this production and advocating for the creation of more inclusive monologues would be a step in the right direction.

In response to your question, “Is there one way a feminist looks, or can we understand feminism (and feminists) to supersede visual representations?” I wonder if we could make these visual representations more inclusive. I see visual representations as a way to identify others within a community and as a way to challenge preconceived ideas of what a feminist is supposed to be. In a society oppressive to feminist ideology, how can we find a way to build community and means of connection for feminists without marginalizing those who have been historically left out of the movement? How can we create ways to connect individuals within the feminist movement without essentializing these members or seeing universal needs where there exists a diversity of needs? How can we change who represents this movement so that all who identify are seen as legitimate?

Z: I appreciate your vulnerability in sharing your struggle with the concept of feminist praxis. I, too, struggle with this, especially in relation to encouraging polyvocality, or the recognition of many voices at the same time, and building coalitions within and across movements that seem, at times, to be highly

fragmented. I wonder, however, if fully investing in feminist praxis can help the movement itself beyond needing to rely on a “feminist look.” For example, instead of *looking* a certain way, one would be *doing* feminism. There may be many different (and overlapping) ways in which feminism is done (e.g., making conscious choices about what products one buys), but the primacy of *doing* feminism rather than *looking* feminist is exactly what hooks meant in *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center* when she stated, “To emphasize that engagement with feminist struggle as political commitment, we could avoid using the phrase, ‘I am a feminist,’ (a linguistic structure designed to refer to some personal aspect of identity and self-definition) and could state, ‘I advocate feminism’” (p. 31).

But even the turn from looking to doing has its shortcomings, as I do not see feminism as a look or something one does, but the way one lives. Feminism is not something one can pick up and put down, but is a way of being in the world that seeks to address, dismantle, and rebuild spaces in a way that promotes increased life chances for marginalized communities. Of course, there may be ways we look, things we do, or moments in our life when we may falter with feminist praxis. This is one of the ways I read hooks’ use of the word “struggle.” Not only is ending systemic sexist oppression a struggle, but it is also sometimes a personal struggle for us as feminists to live a feminist lifestyle.

The Potential of Women’s Centers as Feminist Spaces on College Campuses

Z: So if we are committed to promoting a notion of feminism as a diverse, polyvocal lived practice, then how do we come together as a group? If, as Spade claims, “we’re open to . . . promoting a possibility of us all looking very very different from one another while we fight together in a new world” (p. 15), then how do we work across differences to promote political action? Perhaps more interesting for the purposes of our dialogue, though, in what spaces do we come

together? What defines a feminist space? If feminists are always already diverse and disparate, how does one go about marking spaces as feminist?

C: Refocusing on a feminist lifestyle celebrates the value I saw in a visual indicator while addressing many of the faults. As I saw my pin as a way to build community and connect with other feminists, a lifestyle shift addresses the contradictory disconnection caused by how this look polices others. This particular visual indicator also served as a form of self-expression, but I am coming to understand that this expression has critical political ramifications. Through an everyday lifestyle, one would find a way to visually express themselves through their representation in a more fulfilling way. Furthermore, this avenue has immense potential for community building. In living a feminist lifestyle, our bodies can become a political canvas on which we paint our resistance that would inevitably connect us with each other.

In thinking about a focal shift to lifestyle: Can we bring this lifestyle into our spaces as a way of marking and defining it? I think about the development and physicality of these spaces with a universal design mind-set and a focus on community. However, I want to take this idea further than meaning just a space usable by the most possible but, instead, a space that supports, celebrates, and advances all identities, specifically marginalized identities. This makes me wonder: Who are our current spaces really serving? How does the intersection of marginalized identities impact individuals’ comfort within these spaces? How can we utilize the marking of these spaces to increase visibility and inclusion? What assumptions are our current spaces making about who uses them? How does the advertisement of these spaces or partnerships with other spaces define them? In (re)conceptualizing these spaces, we must think about ways to be more inclusive of the students who are marginalized within groups.

Z: You ask some amazing questions, Crystal. I agree educators need to think about ways to be more inclusive in (re)conceptualizing feminist spaces on

**Feminism is not something one can pick up and put down,
but is a way of being in the world that seeks to address, dismantle,
and rebuild spaces in a way that promotes increased life chances
for marginalized communities.**

As practitioners, we must challenge ourselves to acknowledge how privilege operates in the creation of our spaces through the mission of our organization, language of our advertisements, programming and celebration initiatives, and the selection of who serves as representation of the space.

campus, specifically women's centers. But what does this mean? For me, it starts with untangling the terms *sex*, a term denoting the biological sex one is assigned at birth, and *gender*, which is cultural and relates to one's attitudes and behaviors. In my experience, these terms are too often mistaken to be synonymous; while they can be related, they are not the same. From here, I think it is imperative for women's centers to figure out if they intend to be spaces that address issues related to the females (sex), women and femininity (gender), or both.

For me, women's centers focused on issues related to both sex and gender provide a broad base for liberatory practice. However, if women's centers spaces want to be spaces to examine gender and sex, they need to remember there may be feminists who do not fit assumed ideas of what females or women look like. This means that if a women's center is going to have a Women's Leadership Retreat, they need to be open to the possibility of having participants who do not have bodies typically defined as female. Or if women's centers have awards, their award criteria should be clear about what is meant by using the word *woman* (e.g., self-identified woman? Female? What about those individuals who were assigned a female sex at birth but do not identify as women, such as agender students?). I think we as educators are at our best when we ask questions like: What are we trying to express? Are the words we are using the best words to express our thoughts? Who are we excluding in our practice? How can we enhance our educational practices to become more inclusive?

C: I would agree that disentangling sex and gender is a vital step in (re)conceptualizing the mission of feminist spaces on campuses. In our efforts to do so, we must examine how these spaces represent biases and make assumptions about the gender and sex of others. Do our spaces assume individuals to be cisgender, meaning that their gender identity and sex assigned at birth align? You mentioned this playing out in retreats. I would also see cisgender privilege

being reinforced through programming initiatives that are advertised to target women but really target females such as breast cancer awareness programs or events where all speakers or authors selected are cisgender women. Furthermore, in the efforts to distinguish between cisgender and transwomen, I have made and witnessed the mistake of actually reinforcing cisgender privilege through language. Exemplifying this, Julia Serano argues that cisgender individuals naturalize sex by utilizing words to describe it such as "biological" or "genetic." In initiatives or educational conversations with students, practitioners must be sure to examine how their language privileges one identity over another. Furthermore, as practitioners, we must challenge ourselves to acknowledge how privilege operates in the creation of our spaces through the mission of our organization, language of our advertisements, programming and celebration initiatives, and the selection of who serves as representation of the space.

I also see the (re)conceptualization of feminist spaces requiring a focus on the development of community. In *All About Love: New Visions*, bell hooks defines community as a sense of togetherness. This togetherness consists of honest and authentic communication, compassion and mutuality, celebration, and a genuine desire to understand and work through the conditions of those within the community. hooks argues that living in community allows us to engage in difference through compassion and openness without fear of difference. Therefore, in the development of feminist spaces, we must consider how we are fully engaging in the conditions of all of those within our community (e.g., Do these spaces have gender-inclusive bathrooms? Does the artwork and literature reflect the diversity of identities that utilize the space? What marginalized identities can truly utilize this space as a safe haven? Does this space serve as a base for advocacy on campus? For whom? What is this space's relationship to other identity centers on campus?)

CONCLUSION: HOW CAN EXPLORING IDENTITIES ENHANCE STUDENT LEARNING?

IN HER 2005 ARTICLE “IDENTITY AND LEARNING: THE INEXTRICABLE LINK,” Kelli Zaytoun proclaims, “As educators and researchers, we will discover a great deal by studying the impact of culture and identity on how students know and learn” (p. 14). In so stating, Zaytoun calls upon a genealogy of thought generated from feminists with subordinated racial and ethnic identities, including bell hooks (*Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*), Patricia Hill Collins, and Gloria Anzaldúa. These scholars elucidate the importance of foregrounding one’s identities as a lens through which to understand personal and community-based learning and development.

Locating the exploration of one’s identities and affiliations in higher education, Zaytoun Byrne discusses the importance of women’s centers as a generative site for student learning via feminist praxis. She suggests that women’s centers, which act as hubs of feminism on campus, “are consistent with depictions . . . of what researchers of cognitive development define as the most effective strategies for fostering intellectual development” (p. 48). Zaytoun Byrne also highlights the deconstruction of oppression along various and intersecting vectors of identity as a major goal of feminist praxis, placing college women’s centers squarely in the center of this activity.

Our dialogue furthers this tradition of feminist thought, suggesting that student learning could be enhanced by constantly asking the questions “Who am I?” “How does my environment influence my learning?” and “How do I, in turn, influence my environment?” Thinking about feminism and feminist spaces by way of our various intersections of identities as researchers, our dialogue provides a glimpse of how to expand these concepts in a way that fully supports students’ various identities. By encouraging students to reflect on their identities in the context of the collegiate learning environment, educators also promote these students’ holistic learning and development. Students also have the opportunity to transform their

learning environment through critical reflection and thinking, thereby encouraging other students to think differently about themselves and their surrounding environment.

Through our engagement in duoethnography, we have modeled a type of dialogue that has the potential to be a catalyst for transformative learning: intergroup dialogue. According to Kelly E. Maxwell, Biren Ratnesh Nagda, Monita C. Thompson, and Patricia Gurin, intergroup dialogues offer interactions through which students can gain a better sense of themselves and other students who have differing vectors of identity. Because we (Z and Crystal) have differing vectors of identity (e.g., gender identity, sexual orientation, ethnic identity), and we foregrounded our identities throughout our dialogue—both in terms of our individual perspectives and in terms of our shared analytical process—we re-created an intergroup dialogue, albeit on an individual level between two people rather than between two groups. While such dialogues across difference can be difficult to start and maintain, they also have the ability to change profoundly those students who invest in them. For example, Z, who has facilitated race- and ethnicity-centered intergroup dialogues, saw firsthand the positive impact these dialogues can have on students’ ability to understand themselves, their peers, and the world in which they live.

While our dialogue focused on women’s centers, we contend the implications are far-reaching, extending to curricular spaces via feminist pedagogy (e.g., hooks’ *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom* and *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*), other spaces traditionally thought of as feminist (e.g., sororities), and spaces some may suggest are value-neutral (e.g., residence halls). In fact, we believe these spaces are the very places where dialogues across difference *must* be happening, as they are also sites where students interact in an attempt to resolve differences about what these spaces should mean, and, as a result, what practices should be forwarded. Furthermore, rather than assuming there is a unified understanding of the values upon which these spaces are built, it is important that values (e.g., feminism) are interrogated fully to promote the most inclusive environment possible. By working to recognize all voices and life

By encouraging students to reflect on their identities in the context of the collegiate learning environment, educators also promote these students’ holistic learning and development.

By working to recognize all voices and life experiences, students will engage in a dialogic practice that has the ability to transform their own learning.

experiences, students will engage in a dialogic practice that has the ability to transform their own learning. Although students may not agree fully as a result of these interactions, sustained dialogue across difference has the ability to change the students' learning environment, which has the potential to positively influence the learning of future students to come.

NOTES

- Anzaldúa, G. (2007). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new Mestiza* (3rd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Aunt Lute Books.
- Brown, W. (1997). The impossibility of women's studies. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 9(5), 79–101.
- Buber, M. (1955). *Between man and man* (R. G. Smith, Trans.). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as method*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Friedan, B. (2001). *The feminist mystique*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Helms, J. E. (2008). *A race is a nice thing to have: A guide to being a white person or understanding the white persons in your life* (2nd ed.). Hanover, MA: Microtraining Associates.
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminist theory: From margin to center* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- hooks, b. (2001). *All about love: New visions*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Lorde, A. (1984/2007). *Sister outsider*. New York, NY: Crossing Press.
- Maxwell, K. E., Nagda, B. R., Thompson, M. C., & Gurin, P. (2011). *Facilitating intergroup dialogues: Bridging differences, catalyzing change*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (1981/1983). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical women of color*. New York, NY: Kitchen Table: Women of Color Press.
- Nash, R. J. (2004). *Liberating scholarly writing: The power of personal narrative*. New York, NY: Teacher's College Press.
- Nash, R. J., & LaSha Bradley, D. (2012). The writer is at the center of the scholarship: Partnering me-search and research. *About Campus*, 17(1), 2–11.
- Norris, J., & Sawyer, R. D. (2012). Toward a dialogic methodology. In J. Norris, R. Sawyer, & D. Lund (Eds.), *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research* (pp. 9–39). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Patton, L. D. (2011). Promoting critical conversations about identity centers. In P. M. Magolda & M. B. Baxter Magolda (Eds.), *Contested issues in student affairs: Diverse perspectives and respectful dialogue* (pp. 255–260). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Renn, K. A. (2011). Identity centers: An idea whose time has come . . . and gone? In P. M. Magolda & M. B. Baxter Magolda (Eds.), *Contested issues in student affairs: Diverse perspectives and respectful dialogue* (pp. 244–254). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Sawyer, R. D., & Norris, J. (2013). *Duoethnography*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Serano, J. (2007). *Whipping girl: A transsexual woman on sexism and the scapegoating of femininity*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.
- Shor, I. (1992). *Empowering education: Critical teaching for social change*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Spade, D. (2002). Dress to kill, fight to win. *LTTR*, 1, 15.
- Zaytoun, K. D. (2005). Identity and learning: The inextricable link. *About Campus*, 9(6), 8–15.
- Zaytoun Byrne, K. (2000). The roles of campus-based women's centers. *Feminist Teacher*, 13(1), 48–60.

