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Greetings!

Welcome to CRGE’s annual publication Research Connections, this year entitled, Intersections and Inequalities! Inside you will find three main sections—one section highlights the intersectional research of promising, emerging scholars, the next section examines collaborations & connections, and the final section looks at issues of pedagogy & mentorship. We hope this new format will lead to an exploration of how intersectionality is impacting research, theory, and practice.

It has been another productive and exhilarating year for CRGE. During winter break, we were notified that CRGE was awarded a grant from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to support a study entitled Understanding the Relationship between Work Stress and U.S. Research Institutions’ Failure to Retain Underrepresented Minority (URM) Faculty. This mixed methods study investigates the relationship between occupational stressors, retention, and career path progression for U.S. born African American, Mexican American, and Puerto Rican Assistant and Associate faculty in Research 1 higher education institutions (see page 16).

In addition to this research, several studies in the area of racial/ethnic and Latino health have been initiated in collaboration with faculty in BSOS and the School of Public Health (see page 16 for a summary of CRGE’s current research studies). On page 19, we have featured an interview with Dr. Sandy Hofferth of the Maryland Population Research Center in which she discusses the strengths and struggles of interdisciplinary research collaborations like the ones we foster at CRGE.

In this issue, we are excited to feature research reports from the emerging intersectional scholarship of two recent graduates of UM, Dr. Barbara Boswell, Women’s Studies, and Dr. Patrick Grzanka, American Studies, as well as a report from a current graduate student in the College of Education, Tomoko Tokunaga.

We have continued with much enthusiasm and success our mentoring program for students and faculty on and off campus. I worked with a McNair summer fellow in 2010 and am currently mentoring a Baltimore Incentive student. On page 26, the newest members of our mentoring community, including Cristina Pérez, our 2010-2012 CrISP Scholar, are featured. Since the beginning of CRGE, we have provided mentoring to over 22 graduate students, 10 undergraduate students, and 5 junior faculty of color.

Over the last three years, from 2007-2011, CRGE in partnership with the Maryland Population Research Center (MPRC) has awarded $54,000 in seed grants to junior faculty as part of our Qualitative Research Interest Group (QRIG). These seed grants have supported 21 faculty members across 14 departments. The seed grant awardees for 2010-2011, with a short description of their projects, are included on page 23. Our faculty recipients have presented their work in semester colloquiums which have been enthusiastically received and well-attended (see page 22 for a report on one of the panels). All these efforts have made an important contribution to promoting a welcoming climate for both qualitative and intersectional research. In response to inquiries on pedagogy, we have included some multimedia resources for strengthening intersectional discussions in the classroom (page 27).

We wish to extend a special welcome to our new leadership, President Loh and Provost Ann Wylie. We look forward to working with them. Finally, we thank you, our UM community, for your continued support as CRGE continues to grow as a valued academic and pedagogical resource in intersectional research, mentoring and scholarship both on and off the University of Maryland campus.

Sincerely,
A moving scene opens Black South African writer, Lauretta Ngcobo’s debut novel, Cross of Gold (1981). Sindisiwe Zikode, a mother, a freedom fighter against the apartheid regime, and a former domestic worker, is on the run from South African police. When the reader first encounters her, Sindisiwe stalks the border between South Africa and Botswana, where she is exiled, and from which she tries to facilitate the safe border crossing of her young sons from South Africa. The novel’s opening pages make palpable the danger the family faces in its bid for freedom from a politically oppressive regime.

Early in the first chapter of the novel, Sindisiwe is shot by South African police across the border. She secures a safe crossing for her sons to Botswana, but unable to get to a hospital, dies an excruciating death under a searing Southern African sky. Sindisiwe is buried in a shallow grave by strangers as her sons try to process the loss of a mother they hardly knew. She has, however, left a legacy that her sons discover in a suitcase after her death: a long, lyrical letter, describing the change in her subjectivity from apolitical domestic worker to a militant, anti-apartheid activist. The letter describes, in great detail, Sindisiwe’s transformation into a political subject. In its pages, Sindisiwe bears witness to the Sharpeville Massacre of 1960, which killed 69 peaceful protesters in the township on the outskirts of Johannesburg. Determined to frame the political event from her own perspective as a Black woman, Sindisiwe emphasizes her intent to “recount to you here events as I saw them, and as they have affected me and brought me here” (Ngcobo 20). In this way, Sindisiwe bears witness, producing for her sons a counternarrative of the political uprising and ensuing deaths that differs from the official, apartheid discourse on the massacre.

Sindisiwe’s fate can be read as allegoric of the state of Black South African women’s literary writing at the time of Cross of Gold’s publication in 1981. At this time, only three Black women had published novels in English: Bessie Head, South Africa’s most prolific and only published Black woman novelist, who would prematurely die in exile in Botswana the very year of Cross of Gold’s publication; Miriam Tlali, who became the first Black woman to publish a novel, Muriel at Metropolitan (1979), within the borders of apartheid South Africa one year before the appearance of Cross of Gold; and Ngcobo herself, who had written and published Cross of Gold from the safety and loneliness of exile in England. The similarities between these authors’ and Sindisiwe’s lives are striking. Like Head and Ngcobo, Sindisiwe is immediately marked in the text as an exile, situated outside the bounds of the nation. Her words come to her children and to readers from beyond “those few strands of barbed wire fence [standing] between her and her children, her home, her husband and her country” (Ngcobo 1). As a writer and Black woman she is spatially and discursively displaced from the country about which she is writing. She is an outsider, trying to enter national political discourse, but succeeding only minimally because of structural constraints placed upon her by apartheid, and ultimately, her death.

Like Sindisiwe’s letter, which is smuggled back into the country by her son and furtively disseminated there, these writers’ literary output was forced underground almost immediately upon publication by banning orders from an apartheid government which deemed it politically incendiary. Like her letter, the novels of Head, Tlali and Ngcobo were stealthily read and
circulated at high personal risk. In this way, Sindsiwe’s writing and her premature death at the hands of South African police comes to stand for the predicament of the Black woman author in apartheid South Africa. Through censorship, banning, imprisonment, harassment by the security police, exile, and disenfranchisement, Black women writers were effectively sentenced to a metaphoric death which threatened to extinguish their attempts at creative expression.

South African Women Writers Constructing the Nation-State

My research agenda is an attempt to uncover the works of Black South African writers such as Ngcobo, Tlali, and Head. My dissertation, Black South African Women Writers: Narrating the Self, Narrating the Nation, addresses the ways in which these writers construct and reimagine both the apartheid and post-apartheid nation in their fiction. Interdisciplinary in scope, it combines literary criticism with life review histories of selected authors. This project views Black women’s writing as a form of activism and resistance to apartheid, and situates their literary production within the larger political context of twentieth century South Africa. In order to accomplish this, I critically examine selected novels by Black women writers in relation to the nation-space and, for the first time, put these works in conversation with each other. I then use life history interviews with Black women writers in order to explore how the authors enacted agency through their writing.

Writing a New South African Nation

My work examines Miriam Tlali’s Muriel at Metropolitan (1979), Laureretta Ngcobo’s And They Didn’t Die (1989), Zoë Wicomb’s David’s Story (2000), and Sindiwe Magona’s Mother to Mother (1998), in order to consider the ways in which these texts write into being the idea of a new South African nation and undermine unitary, masculinist forms of nationalisms – be these apartheid or emerging, post-apartheid African nationalisms.

In examining the fiction of the pioneering writers Miriam Tlali and Laureretta Ngcobo, I argue that they were able to insert a counter-hegemonic vision of the nation into political discourse in their respective novels by critiquing the construction and use of apartheid space and offering an alternative vision for the reconfiguring of space for a more just and equitable social order. Using Katherine McKittrick and Clyde Woods’ (2007) concept of oppositional Black geographies as a set of theories for understanding both the spatiality of race and the ways in which Black subjects respond to and resist the oppressive geographies produced through racialization, I analyze the critique of apartheid spatiality in two novels. I look at Tlali’s Muriel at Metropolitan, which centers around the experiences of a Black women working for a furniture store in downtown, apartheid Johannesburg, and Ngcobo’s And They Didn’t Die, a novel about a woman’s struggle for survival in her designated “homeland”. Miriam Tlali demonstrates the unworkability of the apartheid system, which needs the Black bodies it continuously objects in order to maintain itself, and points in the direction of a different world without the dreaded pass laws and artificial boundaries within which the protagonist, Muriel, finds herself. Laureretta Ngcobo, in her imaginative, feminist utilization of space in And They Didn’t Die, shows a model for Black women’s resistance by demonstrating how Black women have literally reconfigured the oppressive spaces in which they find themselves, by working collectively and using their bodies to shelter each other.

In the post-apartheid, transitional period, Zoe Wicomb and Sindiwe Magona have used the discursive space opened up by the transition to democracy to interrogate androcentric nationalist rhetoric by calling into question the patriarchal, unitary nature of emergent South African nationalism in their novels.

In a chapter titled “Interrogating ‘Truth’ in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Zoë Wicomb’s David’s Story, Narratives of Rape, and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission,” I offer an intertextual reading of Wicomb’s David’s Story (2000) and testimony submitted before the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). The novel represents an important intervention into TRC processes which constructed the women who testified before it as secondary victims of apartheid atrocities. Focusing on narratives of rape as produced by the TRC and the novel, this chapter demonstrates how Wicomb’s text interrogates and challenges the silences surrounding the treatment of women guerrillas by the ANC during the anti-apartheid struggle, effectively drawing attention to the omissions in public discourse around the ANC’s treatment of women within its own military ranks. Wicomb points to the dangers inherent in inaugurating a new nation upon the foundation of a stable, unitary understanding of the concept of “truth.” She also demonstrates how national unity is built upon the bodies of Black women guerillas whose stories of rape and abuse were ultimately subsumed by nation-building discourses at the TRC.

Sindiwe Magona, in her novel Mother to Mother, similarly points to the reductive nature of the type of reconciliation forged within the South African nation by the TRC. By writing a fictional account of the murder of American
exchange student Amy Bhiel from the perspective of the killer’s mother, Magona shows how the failure to account for the structural violence committed against Black South Africans during apartheid circumvents the chance to produce meaningful reconciliation.

Life History Interviews with Four Black Women Writers

A second aim of this dissertation is to examine Black women’s agency as writers through an analysis of interviews conducted with Miriam Tlali, Lauretta Ngcobo, Gladys Thomas, and Sindiwe Magona. Drawing theoretically on Mamphele Ramphela’s conceptualizations of space, Carole Boyce Davies’ formulation of Black women writers as “migratory” subjects, and life course theory, I analyze life history interviews with the four writers in an attempt to map the ways they transcended their “received” identities as laborers and reproducers of labor for the apartheid nation, to become authors of their own lives and works. I expand traditional feminist definitions of agency, arguing that, for these women, writing became an act that was cumulatively agentic, instilling in them increased personal agency. This outcome was the opposite of the apartheid’s state intended goal of oppressing and silencing these writers. In daring to write creatively, the authors were engaged in what I call creative re-visioning - a subject’s ability to re-envision or re-imagine what is possible for her to achieve within her lifetime.

I conclude by proposing a Black South African feminist literary criticism -- distilled from my analysis of Tlali, Ngcobo, Magona, and Wicomb’s work -- as a means of producing literary texts about Black women and as a methodology for interpreting such texts. A Black South African feminist criticism operates on two levels: in the production of fiction which theorizes Black women’s lived experiences and strategies for emancipation, and in offering entryways into reading aforementioned texts.

Black South African Feminist Criticism: Fiction as Theory

Black South African women’s feminist fiction writing should be reconceptualized also as a form of literary criticism. Fiction which qualifies as Black South African feminist literary criticism is characterized by narrating experiences and events from the perspectives and interiority of Black women. Black women are portrayed as thinking subjects, not mere ciphers or bodies. In this way, writers of such texts foreground the subjugated knowledges of Black women, suppressed by hundreds of years of colonialism, and later, decades of apartheid. Black South African feminist criticism, in fiction, locates Black women historically, allowing insights into the forces of oppression that operate against them, as well as the opportunities they are able to take advantage of within the matrix of power in which they find themselves situated. In representing Black women in fiction, a Black South African feminist criticism thus historicizes and situates Black women as subjects constrained by the politics of their respective social locations. Yet, significantly, Black women are also represented as agentic beings, able to navigate and negotiate the constraints they face.

“I expand traditional feminist definitions of agency, arguing that, for these women, writing became an act that was cumulatively agentic...In daring to write creatively, the authors were engaged in what I call creative re-visioning - a subject’s ability to re-envision or re-imagine what is possible for her to achieve within her lifetime.”

In writing Black women characters who are thinking subjects, who are located within the historic constraints of their social location, and who provide alternative forms of consciousness and counter-narratives to dominant modes of knowledge, Black South African feminist literary critics additionally bestow creative re-visioning of the self upon the subjectivities they bring to life within their fiction. The Black female subjectivities that are created in Muriel at Metropolitan, And They Didn’t Die, David’s Story and Mother to Mother are constantly engaged in renegotiating the bounds of what is possible for them to achieve within the systems in which they are located. Using their agency, they interrogate and push against the structures that hold them back within South Africa, a process, which in turn, engenders further agency. While the women in these narrations do not end up in a world with a restored, more just, social order they nevertheless continue to fight against discourses and practices which deny them agency and humanity.

An additional characteristic of a Black South African feminist literary criticism is found in the way such criticism responds to and positions Black women in relation to oppression. It recognizes that Black women experience intersecting forms of oppression: that their situation cannot be accounted for by merely considering the
effects of one system of oppression upon them. As is made clear in the novels examined, the Black women protagonists who inhabit the worlds created by Tlali, Magona, Wicomb, and Ngcobo, negotiate overlapping forms of oppression, including oppression by white supremacist ideology and by indigenous patriarchies. The authors position their women characters between these systems, often offering, through their characters’ struggles, models for simultaneously negotiating the discourses and practices of both systems of oppression.

A final characteristic of a Black South African feminist literary criticism is its insistence on imagining different social worlds, where justice, humanity, and agency are available to all oppressed citizens. Through critiquing dominant structures within their society, and using their creative fiction to imagine alternatives, these authors are engaged in a transgressive process of reshaping the world from a subjugated perspective.

**Black South African Feminist Criticism as a Method for Reading and Interpreting**

A Black South African feminist criticism lens offers, to literary critics, modes of interpreting Black women’s fiction and other writing that refuses to reduce such writing to mere description. As an analytical and theoretical practice, it is the antithesis to modes of knowing and knowledge production which enables the esteemed South African writer, Nadine Gordimer, for example, to preface the autobiography of Ellen Kuzwayo, *Call Me Woman* (1985), with the following opening remark: “Fortunately, although she is not a writer, she has the memory and the gift of unselfconscious expression that enable her to tell her story as no-one else could” (Gordimer 1985, xi). Gordimer conceives of Kuzwayo as a stenographic recorder of her own life, reliant on memory, not artistry or creative agency, for constructing her own life story. Her book-length work is “unselfconscious expression,” not a thoughtful, crafted body of writing, but an almost reflexive blurring out of her story. For Gordimer, Kuzwayo is not a writer.

A Black South African feminist criticism as a method of engaging with Black, women-authored texts, takes as its point of departure the intrinsic worth of a Black woman – shaped by oppressive forces such as slavery, apartheid, colonialism – sitting down to write and producing a text from her uniquely gendered, classed, and racialized position within Black South Africa and its diaspora. Whether fiction, autobiography, or poetry, such work should be approached as potentially containing insights and perspectives not available elsewhere. Additionally, it attends to the political discourses that shape Black women as speaking subjects, noting the dominant discourses of the time and location in which a text is situated, while locating the Black women textually represented within this time. It notes that power structures often intersect, so that apartheid and patriarchy, for example, can work together to shape Black women’s lives. It is excruciatingly attentive to these forces, the ways in which they operate, and the ways in which they are depicted textually.

A Black South African feminist criticism is attentive to the historiography of Black women’s existence within past and present South African societies, and notes the ways in which historical constraints have impeded the lives of Black subjects represented in texts it seeks to elucidate. It carefully seeks, and attends to, the subjectivities of Black women within texts it analyzes, utilizing, again, the unique subaltern vantage point afforded by Black women’s subjugated knowledges. It searches for these knowledges where they are present, notes the absence of such unique ways of knowing where these lacunae exist, and embeds interpretations of presences or absences of Black women’s subjectivities in its critique of the work under scrutiny. It is similarly attentive to formulations of Black women’s agency in relation to oppressive structures, as portrayed in literary texts. It extrapolates meaning from the presence or non-existence of Black women’s agency within literary texts. Viewed in this way, a Black South African feminist literary criticism can be used as a method for reading and evaluating any body of South African fiction, biography, or autobiography, regardless of the race and gender of the author. Inferences can thus be made about the inclusion and omission of Black women’s subjectivities and agency in literary texts that extend beyond the subjectivities of their authors. Where these are absent, the silences around Black women’s interiority, thought processes, and agency, in themselves “speak” volumes about the authors’ intentions and aesthetic. Foregrounding Black women’s subjectivities in this way, in a country with a majority Black and female population, will open up new ways of seeing the nation of South Africa; novel ways of reconceptualizing formal knowledge, and what stands for knowledge. Most significantly, in centering the knowledge and subjectivities of those most oppressed by different structures of power, will open up unprecedented ways of refiguring the nation as a more just, equitable place, where Black women will finally be able to feel at home.

---

Barbara Boswell obtained her Ph.D. in August 2010 in Women’s Studies at the University of Maryland and teaches at the Gender and Women’s Studies Program at UMBC. She is the recipient of the prestigious American Council of Learned Societies Postdoctoral Fellowship starting in Fall 2011.
 distinctions between “aversive,” “modern,” and “colorblind” forms of racism have helped scholar-activists to identify and critique complex racial formations in the early 21st century United States. Though these theories of racism have offered critical insights into the attitudes, behaviors and consequences of discrimination and inequity, they have not fully accounted for the emotions of racism. Feminist theorist Sara Ahmed has argued that emotions are discursive formations created through politicized interactions between people and things. Affect, according to Ahmed, is literally how we come to know others and ourselves. Nonetheless, in sociological and cultural accounts of contemporary racisms, the role of affect -- in other words, “feelings” -- is underexplored and largely un-theorized.

Accordingly, this mixed-methods project refocuses analytic and empirical attention on the emotional contours of White racism. Through three interdisciplinary and intersectional studies, I investigated the phenomena of “White guilt” in both a) media discourse about race in the United States, and b) the lived experiences of young White-identified adults, in order to discover how White people feel (not just “think”) about the perpetuation of racism in American society.

Guilt is a complex and elusive psychological construct because it is so deeply embedded in cultural beliefs about responsibility and blame, and because it always implicates the self. Moreover, guilt is a highly gendered and sexualized emotion. Even when compared to other feelings, which are usually implicitly feminized, guilt and its more severe ‘cousin,’ shame, are especially inextricable from ideas about femininity and masculinity, heterosexuality and homosexuality. Indeed, guilt and shame occupy the intersection of heteronormativity and hegemonic masculinity, because women and queer people are often ‘taught’ to internalize and rehearse these feelings.

White guilt, in particular, has long circulated in popular discourse, and it has preoccupied social critics because of its ambiguous relationship with antiracism. White guilt may be a fundamental antecedent of substantive antiracism, but it may also re-center White subjectivity and inhibit a more substantive, structural critique of privilege. Its implications for contemporary racial politics are compelling: how can someone feel White guilt today if structural racism is supposedly over? If dominant discourse asserts that racism is only historical, then how do young White people account for present racial inequalities and their own place(s) within American race relations? If people do feel White guilt and/or shame, how do race, gender and sexuality intersect to shape these emotional experiences?

Covering “Crisis”
Cultural theorists identify mass media as a critical site for the production of emotions and identity. The first study employed qualitative discourse analysis to examine how print journalists produced ideas about identity, responsibility and blame in recent emotionally charged episodes of social conflict. I analyzed 120 news articles and commentary in major U.S. newspapers and magazines about the following: Anderson Cooper and other White journalists’ reporting on Hurricane Katrina’s aftermath; shock jock Don Imus’s firing from his radio show for racist and sexist comments about the Rutgers University women’s basketball team; and African American actor Isaiah Washington’s termination from the television series Grey’s Anatomy after allegedly calling co-star T. R. Knight a “faggot.”

The intersectionality of these “crisis” moments is simultaneously made obvious and elided by journalistic discourse. Functioning as one among many of what philosopher Michel Foucault called “discursive regimes,” the news media produced and reflected dominant ideology by constructing a primary marker of difference as the lens through which to understand each conflict (e.g., Katrina=race, Washington=sexuality, Imus=race or gender). However, multiple, intersecting dimensions of identity and oppression shaped the events themselves and their diverse responses in the popular, mass-mediated imaginary. Axes of interpretation emerged in the data whereby journalists differentially asserted a) the centrality or marginality of identity in the “crisis,” and b) the culpability or innocence of various social actors who may or may not be blame-worthy (see Figure 1).

For example, the Don “I-Mess” scandal was typically
framed as an extraordinary moment of sexism or racism that reflects the attitudes of an exceptionally racist or sexist person. Imus was generally not deemed representative of a culture of misogyny or racial discrimination. On the other hand, some journalists argued that Washington’s gay slur may reflect pervasive heterosexism in the Black community, but failed to question how Washington’s firing may have been mediated by his Blackness or the Whiteness of his alleged target. Overall, attributions of systemic blame (i.e., something is wrong with our culture) were avoided in favor of individual and temporary assignment of guilt. This type of attribution was echoed in the assignment of guilt on FEMA for the failures in post-Katrina New Orleans. This logic reflects how the most pervasive forms of contemporary racism, sexism and heterosexism operate “invisibly,” because their effects and consequences are shielded by neoliberal rhetoric about multiculturalism and so-called “postracial” or “postfeminist” American society, which alleges that identity-based inequality no longer exists or matters. In the affective economy of neoliberalism, guilt is assigned to individuals, such as FEMA head Michael Brown, not to systemic social problems, such as economic disinvestment in racial and ethnic minority communities.

Guilt Versus Shame
Psychologists generally define guilt as negative feelings about an incident, whereas shame refers to a more painful, critical evaluation of the self. For example: “I feel bad about what I did,” as opposed to “I hate myself.” The second study centralized this distinction in order to better define White guilt psychologically, to distinguish White guilt from White shame, and to assess both more effectively. “Measuring” emotions is especially challenging, because all people understand emotions differently. In contrast to tests that ask respondents to indicate the extent to which they feel “White guilt,” I developed a scenario-based survey instrument that directs respondents to rank their potential reactions to a racially charged incident. This approach is designed to minimize miscommunication between researcher and respondent by describing a realistic situation and various feelings that may result -- without priming the respondent with words such as “guilt “ and “shame,” or requiring that they share a common definition of these terms (see Figure 2). This approach also allows respondents to indicate their propensity for simultaneous and even contradictory feelings, which better reflects the complexity of emotional experience.

After an initial study with 500 randomly selected White undergraduates at the University of Maryland, 2,200 White students were randomly recruited to take a survey about racial attitudes that included this new instrument. These 36 items (nine scenarios; four responses each) were generated to correspond with the four common reactions to guilt: guilt, shame, externalization of blame (e.g., “It’s your fault; not mine.”) and detachment (e.g., “I don’t see anything wrong here.”). Complete survey responses (n = 260; 130 women and 130 men; 95% identified as “heterosexual/straight”) were analyzed using exploratory factor analysis. Psychometric testing was conducted, which is a requisite step in instrument development and helps researchers to determine which underlying variables are being “tapped” by specific items within the larger instrument.

Factor analysis revealed three factors or “subscales,” which together constitute the Test of White Guilt and Shame (TOWGAS). The 11-item “White guilt” subscale (Cronbach’s coefficient $\alpha = .86$) included items such as, “You would wish there was a way for you to make up...
In a diversity workshop at school/work you have a conversation with a Black peer/colleague about White privilege.

a) You would feel miserable because of all your privileges. 1 - - 2 - - 3 - - 4 - - 5
not likely          very likely

b) You would think: “I can’t be held responsible for being born White.” 1 - - 2 - - 3 - - 4 - - 5
not likely          very likely

c) You would wish there was a way to make up for all your unfair advantages. 1 - - 2 - - 3 - - 4 - - 5
not likely          very likely

d) You would think: “Race doesn’t matter as much as people say it does.” 1 - - 2 - - 3 - - 4 - - 5
not likely          very likely

Figure 2. Sample scenario and potential responses from the Test of White Guilt and Shame (TOWGAS). Respondents are instructed to rank how likely they are to respond to the scenario in each of four ways.

Interestingly, items designed to “tap” feelings of externalization of blame and detachment from conflict coalesced into a single factor (α = .82), which I named “negation.” These 13 items, such as “You would think: ‘Slavery was awful, but people need to get over it and move on,’” and “You would think: ‘That’s not a race issue; that’s a social class issue,’” describe the emotional and cognitive strategies White people may use to avoid or deny feelings of White guilt. By attributing fault to others while rejecting the idea that race matters, these responses resist White guilt as a reasonable reaction to social conflict or the observation of racial inequality. Negation fills in the space created by the denial of White guilt: an other-focused expression of anti-guilt. I found, for example, that people who are prone to negation also generally endorse more prejudicial attitudes than those who are less prone to negation; similarly, the people most likely to feel White guilt were the least likely to negate or exhibit racist attitudes. Those prone to White shame were not, intriguingly, less likely to endorse prejudicial attitudes, which may indicate a connection between racism and White shame. This finding suggests that White shame-proneness may be less likely to predict antiracist attitudes or endorsement of diversity programs and initiatives than White guilt. I also observed a significant interaction effect between gender identity and White guilt, which suggests that men who conceptualize their gender as central to their identity may be less likely to feel White guilt than men who less strongly identify with their gender.

The Absence of Affect

The results suggest that while White guilt and shame are distinct, negation – the denial of White guilt – is equally prevalent. So, in the absence of guilt, what do White people feel about racism? Qualitative interview data reveal that a lack of emotionality itself also protects White people from the dysphoria associated with recognizing one’s connection to and implication within systemic social problems and unfair privileges. I also conducted two in-depth interviews each with 10 students (five men, five women; one gay man and one bisexual man) who were purposefully recruited from the White survey respondents. I applied a modified grounded theory approach to explore how gender, sexuality and race influence how respondents a) perceived Imus, Isaiah Washington and Anderson Cooper, and b) conceptualized their own Whiteness, gender and sexuality. The concept of “inaffectivity” emerged in data analysis to capture the ‘performance’ of apathy and lack of empathy that many of my participants felt toward: the predominantly Black victims of Hurricane Katrina and the federal government’s failed response to the storm; the mostly Black Rutgers women’s basketball team; and actor Knight, a White man, who came out of the closet after Washington’s alleged anti-gay epithet made headlines.

Whereas “negation” suggests the implication of guilt or shame and is motivated by a desire to defer these feelings, “inaffective” processes are similarly rooted in neoliberal ideology but take such logic to the proverbial extreme. When negating (i.e., externalizing blame
and/or detaching), my participants routinely resisted attributing blame or guilt to social actors, even when they concurrently perceived behavior as racist, sexist or homophobic. Moreover, race was always the least preferred explanation for social problems and conflict, foreclosing on the possibility of White guilt. However, many participants denied “feeling” anything about these social conflicts and some questioned the efficacy of emotion -- as opposed to logic -- in negotiating any conflict. Furthermore, they viewed identity as entirely irrelevant. Because neoliberal rhetoric minimizes and trivializes the role of identity in shaping experience, expressions of inaffectivity are thereby already detached from the very real identity politics of everyday life. Inaffectivity makes negation unnecessary, because the (White) subject is removed a priori from the situation or scenario that might otherwise provoke identity-based guilt and shame, such as systemic racism, sexism or heterosexism.

These responses challenge a one-dimensional, linear framing of guilt as either present or absent. Instead, my participants show how multiple elements of their selves – including social identities, perceived proximity to a given social conflict, and life history – influence their diverse (un)emotional reactions to discrimination and prejudice. My goal was to allow these students to further qualify and articulate what ideas and feelings might accompany or displace White guilt in their lives. Their responses remind us how emotions do not always operate with logical consistency or fit within psychologists’ frameworks for studying affect or identity. When placed in conversation with the quantitative data and media discourse analysis, this ethnographic material reinforces the idea that White racial affect is a landscape of feeling in which guilt and shame are just two among many emotional responses to racism.

**Feeling Better**

Future research will attempt to replicate these findings among diverse White people in a variety of social contexts. Despite the limitations of my samples and the specificity of my inquiry (namely, an exclusive focus on White racism toward Black people), the integrated findings of this project suggest important directions for further inquiry into identity, emotions and culture. White guilt is one among a range of affective strategies through which White people deal with racism. A broader framework of White racial affect is needed to study how guilt, shame, negation, inaffectivity and, undoubtedly, many other forms of affect shape expression of and responses to racism. An intersectional lens is necessary to highlight how these emotions are framed by multiple aspects of identity and intersecting systems of oppression, such as sex and class. Most importantly, understanding the empirical terrain of racial affect opens up space to intervene in racism on an emotional level by helping White people face their privileges and challenge inequalities in honest and productive ways. In other words, the goal is to actually feel better about race.

Patrick R. Grzanka earned his Ph.D. in American Studies from the University of Maryland and is now an Honors Faculty Fellow at Barrett, the Honors College at Arizona State University.
Learning from the In-between Spaces of Filipina Immigrant Youth in Japan

by Tomoko Tokunaga

Introduction

Often scholars in critical youth studies and the field of minority education focus on exposing the adverse circumstances in the lives of minority youth. To understand the marginalization of minority youth, scholars need to explore the ways in which marginalized young people, themselves, develop the ability, knowledge and skills to manage the struggles in their everyday experiences. Acknowledging these youth not only as victims of adverse circumstances but also as agents of social change leads us to move beyond an objectification where these youth are pitied and allows us to explore how these youth navigate and interrupt structural inequalities.

This article examines the experiences of first generation Filipina immigrant girls and young women in Japan (ages 13-22) and explores the ways in which they enact human agency while experiencing multiple dimensions of inequality. Specifically, this study focuses on the ways in which they experience “in-between spaces,” spaces, often outside of home, work, or school where they have more control over space and time. These sites potentially magnify their human agency, desires, knowledge and skills to negotiate daily discrimination and marginalization. Scholars have begun to argue the significance of less structured public spaces, such as streets, as autonomous spaces where young people enact agency and resistance. As young immigrant women in Japan, who often indicate that they are exceedingly displaced from home, school, and mainstream Japanese society, exploring the in-between spaces reveals otherwise unseen belonging, skills, and abilities and suggests ways to support the development of similar spaces in schools and communities where marginalized immigrant youth can thrive.

As part of a massive common migration history of Filipina women to Japan in the last thirty years, most of the mothers of these youth were single parents, who immigrated to Japan to work as “entertainers” in the Japanese “sex industry” and left their children to be raised by relatives in the Philippines for most of their childhood. In their early teens, the youth in this study were brought to Japan to live with their mothers. This migration has complex historical roots which can be traced back to the Japanese history of “sex tours” to the Philippines in 1970s and later a large influx of Filipinas into the Japanese “sex industry” during the 1980s/90s. Due to this specific transnational sex work flow, the Filipina body has been heavily hypersexualized in Japanese society because approximately 80% of Filipinos in Japan are Filipina women who entered Japan under the immigration status of “entertainers,” or as spouses of Japanese men. In Japan, therefore, due to this specific political and economic history between Japan and the Philippines, Filipina women’s bodies often are represented and culturally “read” as sexually available in ways that other racialized minority female bodies are not (e.g., Brazilian or Korean women in Japan). The Filipina youth in my study had to navigate this context in their daily lives.

Due to an intersection of their race, gender, age, and socioeconomic status, the youth in my study were automatically deemed to be sexually approachable. Japan then is perceived to be a uniquely hostile environment for Filipina immigrant youth due to instantaneous conclusions about their reason for being in Japan (assumed sex industry work) resulting in unwanted sexual advances, objectification, and attention, and beliefs by many of the adults around them about their worth, intellectual capabilities and chances for potential future employment. Similarly, due to their immigration to Japan, when they return to visit the Philippines, the mere fact that they have lived at any point in Japan culturally implies, often erroneously, that they were sex workers in Japan and leads to another set of adverse circumstances. The sudden thrust into an unknown country and into an unknown family, with ingrained and pervasive systems of discrimination, severely displaces these youth as they enter a complex intersection of inequality that often impacts, among many other things, their relationships, their employment, how they understand themselves, as well as their schooling.

Method

This study used ethnographic methods to interpret and understand people’s shared cultures within the context in which they were situated. The sample consisted of Filipina youth who were born in the Philippines and immigrated to Japan in their early teens (age 13 or 14) to be reunited with their mothers. I conducted participant observation and in-depth interviews with a group of Filipina immigrant youth (ages 13-22, n=20) in Japan from 2005 to 2008. While my fieldwork began at their middle school, as I developed rapport with them, I shifted my fieldwork outside of school, and visited their homes, met their families, and spent time with them in their neighborhoods. After they graduated from middle school, I continued to follow them, and attended high
school events, accompanied them to their jobs and church services, met their Filipino friends and youth network, and visited the Philippines with them on two occasions.

**Alienation from Home and School**

Once economically settled in Japan, and often married to Japanese men, the Filipina mothers brought their teenage daughters to Japan to live with them in a new blended family. For the Filipina youth in this study, migration to Japan therefore resulted in sudden and extreme changes including entering a country they do not know, reuniting with mothers they do not really know, meeting their new Japanese stepfather and often younger half-siblings, and entering unfamiliar school systems. Home and school often are understood as important institutions for young people, which may offer protection, safety, and nurturance. Yet, these Filipina youth often seemed to be displaced, marginalized, and isolated at home and school. Most of the youth were often silent, felt a sense of detachment, discomfort and fear in these places.

These youth experienced extreme discomfort when being at home with families that felt very strange and foreign to them. Some of these youth described difficulties with their stepfathers who sometimes strictly controlled their fashion, behavior, and language, often only allowing them to speak Japanese. For example, in echoing a common sentiment from many of the youth, one young woman often said, “When I am at home, I always stay very quiet and still in my room.” She struggled with her relationship with her stepfather; becoming invisible by staying silent on her bed in order to avoid conflict with her father and family. Juxtaposed with their experiences in the Philippines and their nostalgia for their childhood homes filled with laughter, large family gatherings, and perceived freedom, the home in Japan, was not a safe haven, but rather reinforced their sense of alienation in Japanese society.

Isolated in their mainstream classes and restricted from using Tagalog as well as their Filipino dialect languages, these youth also grappled with strict school rules, rules which were different than the school rules in the Philippines. Many of these youth struggled to learn Japanese, often their third or fourth language, which resulted in academic difficulties and made it harder for them to socialize with Japanese youth. Most of the students were silent and withdrawn in their mainstream classrooms. Just like in the home space, they retreated in settings they felt unwanted and uncomfortable. During my observations, I would see them sitting quietly by themselves or reading books during recess in their mainstream classroom, while many Japanese students were gathering and being loud. Sitting quietly does not inherently indicate an outsider status but these youth indicated that these behaviors signified their invisibility and marginality in school. While there seemed to be moments where they felt more attachment and comfort at school, such as in their Japanese language classroom, most of the time these Filipina youth were often alienated and isolated at school.

**Possibilities of In-Between Spaces**

While these youth often seemed to be dislocated, invisible and marginalized at school and home, in some in-between spaces these youth presented a profoundly different embodiment. When these youth gathered with other Filipino peers, at internet cafés, fast food restaurants, Filipino stores, stores selling hip-hop clothing and music, Karaoke bars, or even on the street near the train station or outside of department stores, they seemed empowered, liberated and visible. Based on my ethnographic work, these Filipina immigrant youth created in-between spaces where they 1) developed and embodied hybrid cultural identities, 2) claimed
power, ownership and exhibited unique forms of resistance, and 3) supported each other and created a sense of belonging. These in-between spaces, then, reflect important dimensions that appear to be missing from their home and school experiences.

Hybrid Cultures
In these in-between spaces, Filipina youth created and embodied their cultural hybridity in language, dance, music, fashion and food. I often observed these youth collectively talking loudly and lively in what Anzaldúa (1987) terms “border tongues.” They spoke interchangeably in Tagalog, their native dialects, English and Japanese during the same conversation. This language hybridity starkly contrasted with their home and school spaces where they were often required to only speak Japanese. They also performed different types of dance from the U.S., Japan, and the Philippines, especially hip hop. Some scholars suggest that hip hop is a form of resistance and affirmation for marginalized youth across the world. The Filipina youth seemed to be empowered by performing hip hop in these spaces and they often sang and listened to diverse hybrid types of music. One of their favorite places to hang out was Karaoke bars, because in the private Karaoke rooms, these youth could speak and perform in their border tongues by singing a blend of American, Filipino, and Japanese popular music. They were skilled and fluent in changing the language of the songs instantaneously and loved this blending.

In these spaces they were not forced to speak only one language, or choose one culture to represent them (e.g., a common requirement in school during school festivals was to only perform traditional folk Filipino dance), but rather they could represent their hybrid identities and express the multiple worlds they inhabited. They could go beyond the common cultural requirement of either full segregation (not acknowledging their connection to Japanese culture) or full assimilation (where they could only enact Japanese language, dress, behavior, etc.). They were not alone or marginalized in their cultural complexity but collectively affirmed each other’s ethnic and linguistic hybridity without being controlled, censored or regulated by others.

Power, Ownership and Resistance
The youth seemed to exhibit power, ownership and resistance in these in-between spaces. While they were still subject to adult surveillance, given that these spaces were mostly located in public, these Filipina youth, as a collective, claimed power and ownership, even temporarily, in these spaces. For example, a group of Filipino youth often gathered at McDonald’s before attending middle school evening classes and claimed half of the second floor. They occupied multiple tables, spoke loudly, danced, listened to music, ate, took pictures, and used their cell phones. One young woman told me that they were cautioned consistently by the store manager to stop being so loud or they would be kicked out, but they refused to leave and insisted on claiming this space. While at home or school these youth tried to become invisible to everyone around them, here in this in-between space, they purposefully challenged any regulation of their behavior by “outsiders.”

After-school, many Filipina youth often stopped at the mall, played hip hop music, and practiced dance routines in front of a department store window that doubled as a mirror. They also created some poses as a group and took many pictures to upload them on their social networking sites. Although many strangers passed by them, these youth seemed not to care—perhaps some of them were even empowered by the gaze of these strangers —and engaged in their dance and music and claimed this space as their stage. They appropriated these public spaces and transformed them for “private” significance.

In these in-between spaces, their embodiments and behaviors seemed to not be as limited or controlled by teachers, parents or others. Their claiming of these spaces, though sometimes liminal or temporary, showed some of the resistance, ownership and power that they have. The joy and passion they exhibited in these spaces rarely was displayed anywhere else in their lives. While they might have enacted some form of nuanced, perhaps passive, resistance at school or home (e.g., staying in her room at home or reading books during recess in the mainstream classroom), in these in-between spaces, these youth appeared to exert power and resistance through voice, claiming of space, and declarations of belonging.

Support, Belonging and Affirmation
These Filipina youth seemed to feel a sense of belonging, affirmation, and safety in these in-between spaces. They often gathered in these spaces and shared personal stories about their experiences at school, home, or work, or in their friendship and romantic relationships. In addition, I often observed these youth exchanging school and job information in order to navigate the foreign and often hostile system in Japan. Many of the Filipina youth often told me how important their Filipina peers were to them as they had similar hardships with their families, struggles to perform well at school, and challenges to learn Japanese. These ritualistic gatherings seemed to be crucial for them to survive in Japan and also to develop a sense of belonging.
These spaces were not only physical but also virtual. For example, some youth often hung out at the internet café, sometimes spending the day at these cafés. The internet café is a physical place but these youth were engaged in on-line games, internet messenger services, personal homepages, social networking services, etc. One student who identified as a lesbian often visited LGBT Filipina virtual community websites and showed a strong sense of belonging to these virtual communities, saying that they are like her “family.” In these online communities, she could be open about her sexual orientation and learn about LGBT issues from her virtual family throughout the world. While cyber space might sometimes be harmful or dangerous to young people, this example illustrates how these virtual spaces offered a sense of belonging and also a support to some of the youth.

**Conclusion and Implications**

The possibilities of in-between spaces which Filipina immigrant youth declared, claimed and created by themselves, often overlooked in the literature, offers a distinct narrative about the lives of these young women. While they experienced a complex intersection of multiple dimensions of inequality including racism, sexism and xenophobia that impacted their daily lives in Japan, they had the will, skills and knowledge to maneuver these structural constraints. In the midst of their struggles with their families or academic, language and cultural challenges at school, they carved out in-between spaces where they collectively affirmed hybrid culture, showed acts of resistance, and supported each other in navigating foreign cultures, structures and systems.

While this article explored the possibilities of in-between spaces, it is important not to overly romanticize these spaces and also capture the constraints that exist in these spaces. For example, the youth were, of course, often vulnerable to oppression in these spaces (e.g., approached by Japanese men, profiled by police officers as undocumented or “unruly” youth). In addition, some Filipina youth policed their own borders of what was allowable or cool to do with their peers (in terms of gender, sexuality, class, “dressing too Filipino” or “not hip hop enough”) in these spaces in a unique way that differed from what they would say or do in other spaces.

This study offers some implications to policymakers, educators and community leaders who work with immigrant youth to develop empowering and affirming programs for marginalized immigrant youth. For example, educators may assist youth in creating in-between spaces at school, a safe space where immigrant youth could gather with their peers, use any language they prefer, and are encouraged to share their hybrid cultures such as music, dance and fashion which reflect their lived experiences. Most importantly, people who serve immigrant youth should recognize the dynamic nature of culture, value the hybrid culture these youth bring—a profound blend of multiple interests, values, and identities—and attempt to learn from the ways in which they manage their daily struggles.

We have much to learn from the ways in which these youth skillfully negotiate adverse circumstances while enacting some form of human agency in their daily lives. The less-discussed cultural ways of being and knowing that these youth possess reflect their profound and unique skills, knowledge, and abilities that scholars often overlook.

Tomoko Tokunaga is a Fulbright Scholar and doctoral candidate in Education Policy Studies, focusing on the anthropology of education.

---

**Want to access more intersectional articles?**

Check out the [INTERSECTIONAL RESOURCE DATABASE](http://www.crge.umd.edu)

An online searchable database of intersectional scholarship.
During the last three years, we have assembled research teams within and across schools and colleges (SPH, ARHU & BSOS) and initiated collaborations with principal investigators of major national research studies. Three of our most recent studies are described below.

**Differences in Risk Factors by Hypertension Status among Postmenopausal Women by Race, Ethnicity and Socioeconomic Status**

Ruth E. Zambrana (PI), Gniesha Dinwiddie (Co-PI), Guangyu Zhang (Biostatistician), Laura A. Logie (Research Coordinator)

Our overall goals are to investigate how various risk factors and mediating mechanisms may account for trajectories of hypertension risk and differences on hypertension statuses by socioeconomic status (SES) between and within racial/ethnic postmenopausal women. The research project seeks to examine the associations between SES, psychosocial and access factors with hypertension statuses and to test whether the associations are mediated by health behaviors and moderated by medical history for non-Hispanic White, African American and Latino women. Longitudinal analyses of 161,000 Non-Hispanic White, African American and Hispanic participants, ages 50-79, will be conducted using data from the Women's Health Initiative (WHI) Observational Study and Clinical Trial study.

The WHI is a long-term national health study that has focused on strategies for preventing heart disease, breast and colorectal cancer and osteoporotic fractures in White, Latino and African American postmenopausal women. Our national collaborator for this project is Sylvia Wassertheil-Smoller, Ph.D., Albert Einstein College of Medicine, New York.

**Biological Markers of Inflammatory Risk: Variations by Subgroup and Gender in HCHS/SOL**

Ruth E. Zambrana (PI), Gniesha Dinwiddie (Co-PI), Rob Santos, Urban Institute (Co-PI)

The purpose of this study is to investigate the pathways through which social status (subgroup, gender, age, SES) may influence cardiovascular disease risk factors via inflammation using data from the Hispanic Community Health Study/Study of Latinos (HCHS/SOL). The major research questions include: Are there differences in levels of inflammatory markers by access (health insurance coverage), health behaviors, SES, and Body Mass Index (BMI) by subgroup and gender? This study will make a significant contribution to understanding Latino men and women's health by providing some baseline data on inflammatory markers that are not well-established in the literature by Latino subgroup and gender.

HCHS/SOL is a multi-center epidemiologic study of Latino populations to determine the role of acculturation in the prevalence and development of disease, and to identify risk factors playing a protective or harmful role in the health of Latinos. The HCHS/SOL study is sponsored by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI) and six other institutes, centers, and offices of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Our national collaborators for this project include PIs: Gregory Talavera, M.D. San Diego State University, School of Public Health, and Martha L. Daviglus, M.D., Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine in Chicago.


Ruth E. Zambrana (PI), Bonnie Thornton Dill (Co-PI), Guangyu Zhang (Biostatistician), Laura A. Logie (Research Coordinator)

This study aims to identify the effects of occupational stress and coping strategies on physical and mental health conditions among URM tenure track Assistant or Associate professors in Research I institutions by gender, race, ethnicity. The study will examine the relationship between occupational stressors and the health and mental health of URM faculty and the impact of this relationship on career path and progression. This work is important because it can identify perceived barriers and institutional supports in higher education that can decrease or eliminate the leakage in the academic pipeline of URM faculty (U.S. born African American, Mexican American and Puerto Rican men and women), and propose innovative strategies to re-engineer existing institutional conditions, to assure URM retention, promotion and career path progression. These data will serve as baseline for a future follow-up longitudinal study.
Dangerous Discourses of Disability, Subjectivity and Sexuality, by Margrit Shildrick, explores the contradiction exemplified by the formal integration of disabled people into legal, educational, and economic processes even as the disabled body remains a source of deep psychocultural anxiety. In order to reveal the complexity of this anxiety, she reveals how sexuality and subjectivity are both constructed as positive in subjects deemed normative, and viewed as deviant, broken, or simply absent, in the non-normative subject. Her argument rests upon the contention that the disabled person exists outside of normative discourses that privilege autonomous, self-controlled, and self-contained embodiment. As such, embodiments of physical disabilities have been constructed as dependent, uncontrollable, and “leaky,” thus threatening to those considered “able-bodied” in so much as their existence highlights the vulnerability of all bodies and the fallacy of total autonomy. And while social and political movements have begun to iteratively gain rights for disabled people, she suggests that such a move for inclusion only captures these bodies into the highly regulatory regime of socially-constructed understandings of the “normative” body. Instead, Shildrick argues for a shift away from rights-based discourse to one rooted in postmodern and feminist work around human body variation with attention to the anxiety triggered by the variations of how individuals manifest and experience disorganization, connectivity, and desire.

As her argument unfolds, Shildrick takes on theories of embodiment, performativity, phenomenology, and postmodernism in order articulate the ways in which difference, as exemplified by the disabled body, disrupts not only notions of “normative” embodiment but also any self/other binaries. She considers the ways in which sexuality, as a site of “intercorporeality” is already a source of anxiety that becomes more intense when it is associated with what is considered a non-normative body such as the body labeled queer or disabled. Shildrick critiques the ways psychoanalysis may have contributed to larger cultural narratives about perversion and repression at the individual level for two reasons: it fails to understand queer sexuality, and falls short in providing a way of unsettling “normativity.” Her focus shifts toward understanding the ways a social imaginary rooted in a psychic fraught with the anxiety around both sexuality and disability leads to a highly regulated relationship with both. Shildrick then employs Foucault in order to consider the ways the disabled body unsettles a legal system built to enforce laws created for and by normative bodies.

Finally, Shildrick elaborates a theoretical framework based on Deleuze and Guattari’s ‘performativity of desire’ wherein bodies are seen as part of larger assemblages. Within such an assemblage, it becomes permissible for disabled bodies to utilize the technologies, assistants, or sex-workers sometimes necessary to make sexuality possible or more enjoyable, just as such aids are sometimes necessary/desirable for those thought “able-bodied.” Moreover, such a framework allows for an understanding of sexuality as that which “overcomes the binary of normal and abnormal and celebrates the energies and intensities of multiple transformatory conjunctions” as all elements self-become (14). In conclusion, Shildrick discusses the ways in which such a framework might be applied in an increasingly globalized world, and emphasizes the idea...
of a kind of corporeal generosity that recognizes the ways assemblages are being remade. Still, Shildrick finds the possibility for new ground as she considers the disabled body to be the potential site for a counter-globalization as it works to undermine Western notions of wholeness that are increasingly expanding.

Shildrick’s analysis proves incredibly valuable in (re) framing the discourse around and between disability and queer theory. However, her work leaves unexplored thinking on how race, gender, sexual identities, and socioeconomic status further or disrupt her argument. While Shildrick’s goal is to use the disabled body to complicate Anglo-American imaginaries and norms, her analysis fails to acknowledge the ways disability is itself complicated by other dimensions of identity and inequality. For example, her argument might be richer with a discussion of “normative” racialized sexual embodiment in someone who identifies as disabled. Her lack of entry into this type of conversation abridges the ability of activists and scholars to rupture the boundaries of normative understandings of what is common or possible. Her analysis of such discourse would be strengthened and more readily employed by a theory that grounded her analysis in intersections of lived experience. Ultimately, Shildrick clearly situates her argument outside common constructions of social identity categories, revealing simultaneously, the limitations of identity-dependent intersectional thinking and the confines of postmodern thinking in capturing concerns often considered rooted in identity.

Cristina Pérez is a CrISP scholar and a doctoral student in Women’s Studies. Her research interests include transnational discourses of human rights, social movements, and LGBT activism in México.

BOOK RELEASE:

Latinos in American Society: Families and Communities in Transition


It is well known that Latinos in the United States bear a disproportionate burden of low educational attainment, high residential segregation, and low visibility in the national political landscape. In Latinos in American Society, Ruth Enid Zambrana brings together the latest research on Latinos in the United States to demonstrate how national origin, age, gender, socioeconomic status, and education affect the well-being of families and individuals. By mapping out how these factors result in economic, social, and political disadvantage, Zambrana challenges the widespread negative perceptions of Latinos in America and the single story of Latinos in the United States as a monolithic group.

Synthesizing an increasingly substantial body of social science research much of it emerging from the interdisciplinary fields of Chicana/o studies, U.S. Latino studies, critical race studies, and family studies the author uses an intersectional lens as a means of understanding the broader sociopolitical dynamics of the Latino family, considering ethnic subgroup diversity, community context, institutional practices, and their intersections with family processes and well-being.
Q: Why should interdisciplinary collaborative research be a priority?

A: Research collaborations are essential because problems, in and of themselves, are not disciplinary. If you are trying to solve a problem, you can’t just attack it from one point of view or one discipline. Problems are more complicated than that. You need to attack a problem from all different levels and perspectives, and have lots of various expertise come to the table. Disciplines are good because they train people in specific ways to think about a particular discipline. But if you are really serious about solving a problem, then it takes people with lots of different perspectives addressing the issue. I come from the interdisciplinary N.I.H. perspective, which is a perspective that is becoming pervasive across all fields. This is where all research is going.

Q: Do you have suggestions for how to work in interdisciplinary teams?

A: Well, I think this work is very rewarding but it is also time-consuming. It takes a lot of time to develop the associations that make this collaborative research work and also time to learn each other’s language. I attended one meeting in which a participant said that in developing these research teams they have adopted a protocol in which they wave white flags during team meetings and say, “Okay. Stop. Tell me what you are talking about. Give me the language and context to understand what you are referring to.” You have to develop some common vocabulary. It is a big barrier for some people. You can overcome it and learn the language, but to see the value of other people’s perspectives when you are trained for a certain perspective takes some adjustment.

Within any collaborative work, you need to have people you can trust—people who will do the work that they say they are going to do. I have developed over the past fifteen years a top-notch set of collaborators. We have worked together on a variety of projects and we know each other and we know that if something needs to be done, somebody will step in and do it. Nobody is a prima donna. Everyone collaborates, humbly shares their knowledge, and works together. That sort of trust takes a lot of time. Another approach to
identify collaborators includes: attend different meetings and conferences to see what type of people are interested in similar problems and ask questions like: Are they collaborating with others? Are they totally isolated out on their own? Do they work or listen to or cite people who are in different disciplines? Do they work with graduate students? All of those are good indicators of a person who would be a good collaborator.

Q: How does UMD support collaborative research?

A: I think that interdisciplinary collaborations occur everywhere, but there has to be some reason to step outside the box and some serious incentives to do it, like funding. In the past five years since I have been here, President Mote and the Vice President of Research commissioned a report on incentives they could provide to foster collaboration. One of the conclusions was that you need to get new people in who are used to collaboration. It is very difficult to change the culture of an institution, but through new people coming in who want funding, things will change. A second conclusion was that it is essential to provide infrastructure support for research, which is what places like the Maryland Population Research Center (www.mprc.umd.edu) do. You need support and feedback when you undertake this kind of work. Additionally, the university and the colleges can offer more seed grants for collaborative research. For example, the Behavioral and Social Sciences College and the ADVANCE program have offered seed grants specifically to encourage cross-disciplinary collaboration. Seed grants that are not just for individuals but instead for collaborations are very important so that people can try out these collaborations and realize their value.

Q: How are the disciplines responding to this type of interdisciplinary collaboration?

A: I’d say the disciplines are responding but it is a struggle. There is a reason to do some discipline-based research; sometimes you have questions that a discipline perspective can answer. However funders of research and those who seek out our research are pushing us a lot to get out of our disciplinary boxes. So I have to thank them, even though a lot of us dragged our feet, kicking and screaming into this new century of interdisciplinary work. As with Microsoft Word, we have to keep upgrading every couple of years. This is an important part of our upgrade. It is fun too—unless you don’t like to learn or expand your thinking. We sometimes forget that learning is our business, whatever stage of our career, and interdisciplinary collaborations are a very smart way to learn.

“If you are trying to solve a problem, you can’t just attack it from one point of view or one discipline. Problems are more complicated than that. You need to attack a problem from all different levels and perspectives, and have lots of various expertise come to the table.”
As part of the QRIG lecture series, Dr. Jennifer Reich, Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Denver, presented her ethnographic data on how parents make decisions about immunizations for their children. The study has been conducted over the past few years using methods such as participant interviews, participant observation, and artifact analysis (e.g. books about opting out of immunizations and current and historical flyers/images in the anti-vaccination or public health movements). Her study participants include a 29-person sample primarily of White, seemingly upper middle class educated parents (27 mothers, 2 fathers) who live in Colorado and have rejected specific or entire immunization sequences for their children.

**Methods: Study Sample**

Most of the participants were identified through snowball and purposive (modal instance) sampling techniques. She lightheartedly referred to her participant sample as “the inconvenient sample,” in order to reflect her frustration with the difficulty of being able to find participants willing to speak with her about their immunization choices. She believes that this hesitation to be a participant or recommend further participants reflects a distrust within this population of any form of “research” as well as perhaps not feeling a need to voice their concerns or desire to talk to a stranger about these issues. In addition to in-depth interviewing with the parents, pediatricians, lawyers, and alternative medicine practitioners were interviewed and participant observation was conducted in various settings such as an anti-vaccine conference, community education events, and a federal court hearing.

Multiple methodological concerns were discussed including the possibility that she was not reaching a different subset of parents—such as parents who do not have the political or economic capital to refuse immunizations for their children. For example, low-income people may not have the same choice not to immunize their children due to the state and federal laws that closely govern their lives such as school and welfare laws that require immunizations. To illustrate this point, Dr. Reich contrasted under-vaccination statistics which often reflect a lack of access to health care by low-income, primarily Black and Latino families with the middle/upper-income White families in her study who reflect the un-vaccination statistics of not vaccinating children due to choice. She furthered this line of reasoning by discussing the possibility that socioeconomic privilege embodied in private or home schooling, accessible health care, and geographic location (e.g. suburban neighborhoods without the population density that may impact health), allowed these parents to take the risk that their children would not encounter some of the illnesses or diseases that immunizations sought to prevent. She also spoke of her positionality as an outsider to this population as someone who chose to vaccinate her children and whose spouse is a pediatrician as a potential barrier to access as well.

**Preliminary Results**

Preliminary findings discussed included: the relationship between the state and parental rights in the healthcare of their children; role of unqualified “experts” in furthering
anti-vaccination movements; and the questioning of some Western medical interventions by all participants.

The relationship between the state immunization policies and practices and parental rights in the healthcare of their children reveals the tensions between the public health concerns of the state and the rights of a parent to select how, when and why a child is immunized. Her data suggest that parental resistance to immunizations seems to be due to distrust in the medical system, the pharmaceutical industry and/or the state. Additionally, a very small subset of her participants, who identified as Christian Scientists and Evangelical, said religion also mattered in their decision not to vaccinate their child. All participants seemed to believe that some specific vaccinations are unnatural, and can lead to, for example, autism, and that the body’s own immune system is more powerful to fight disease than the vaccination-industry would have people believe.

Another important finding discussed was the role of unqualified “experts” in furthering anti-vaccination movements such as the role of celebrities Jenny McCarthy and Jim Carrey, or Dr. Andrew Wakefield. Dr. Wakefield is the widely discredited researcher who suggested a connection between autism and the vaccine for measles, mumps and rubella. He has since been found guilty of excessive professional misconduct and lost his license to practice medicine (The New York Times, May 24, 2010). Yet, Dr. Reich insisted that it would not be sound reasoning for researchers, practitioners and policy-makers to see these parents’ as uneducated or ignorant of the risks of vaccines or preventable disease—the data reveal otherwise.

All participants questioned the use of Western medical interventions. They seemed to engage in multiple forms of rejecting the medical establishment such as using homeopathic medicine or considering home births. This parallel interest in non-Western medical interventions reflect an important underlying concern of this population—a distrust of the pharmaceutical and medical industrial complex. This distrust seems to be grounded in a belief that medical intervention has preemptively and detrimentally gone too far, such as in the over-medicalization/pathologization of childbirth or vaccinations for unlikely or “natural” child illness (e.g., chicken pox). Compounding this distrust was a belief that government and public health officials are part of this perhaps financially-motivated interventionist trend.

Participants were described as having a strong sense of what they want for their children, which illustrates a complicated and nuanced decision making process in determining not to vaccinate a child. Still, the data suggest that the parents’ defense of their choices often ignored larger community health needs, the history of vaccinations saving lives, as well as scientifically-grounded research that empirically reveals the risks and benefits of specific vaccinations. For example, the recent outbreak of whooping cough (pertussis) in California, the largest outbreak in 55 years, was the result of parents choosing not to vaccinate their children and led to the death of nine infants who were too young to receive the vaccination.

In summary, the data revealed a unique tension between different perceptions of health risk and health protection by states and individuals. Many of the parents’ quotes seemed to disclose a deep anxiety or fear of the unknown (or unsubstantiated) risks associated with specific vaccinations. The parents seemed to see their vaccination choices as primarily an act of risk assessment and protection of their child. However, Dr. Reich concluded with a discussion of the role of socioeconomic privilege in leading the families to be able to take the risk not to vaccinate their children, perhaps at the expense, in some cases, of community health and the protection of others’ children.

Dr. Reich’s first book, Fixing Families: Parents, Power, and the Child Welfare System (Routledge 2005), explored how social workers, attorneys, and parents whose children have been removed from their homes by the child protective services system negotiate power to determine if and when children can return home. Similar to her current study, Fixing Families looked at the relationship between parental rights and the state.
The 2009 QRIG Seed Grant awardees from Public Health, Education, and American Studies, came together to explore the possibilities and limits of qualitative research across disciplines at the seminar entitled “Qualitative Inquiry into Action: Exploring Education, Ethics and Care-giving in Research Methodology.” Dr. Lori Simon-Rusinowitz, and Kathy Ruben, Ph.D. Candidate (Public Health) reflected on their first time using ethnography as scholars within the field of Public Health. For Simon-Rusinowitz and Ruben, “narrative stories” functioned as a way to provide the fullest possible context for an analysis of how patients and their caregivers navigated consumer-driven home-hospice programs developed by Medicare. Ethnographic methods, like Geertz’s thick description and photo-ethnographic methods, were employed in order to evaluate the impact of programs and policies on patients and caregivers. The use of personal stories functioned as a way of revealing the personal interactions and power relations that may become obscured by the jargon of consumer teams, paid and unpaid caregivers, budgets, personal options and medical equipment supplies.

Dr. Connie North from the College of Education described the kinds of multidisciplinary methods necessary to conduct action-based research which seeks to challenge neoliberal approaches to education. Working with sixth graders and teachers at a local school to develop a “vision of ideal education,” Dr. North discussed the kinds of methods researchers and subjects created in order to develop counter narratives to “policy talk” and “efficiency speak.” While speaking back to school administrators, the researchers, students and teachers infused their qualitative methods with spirituality, a commitment to connectivity and creativity. In order to change the relationship and flow of power between researchers and subjects, the team of scholars, students and teachers created a “found poem” from their session notes. The found poem, performed by Professor Jeffrey McCune and a doctoral student in Education, Elke Chen, was one example of the many products that resulted from this research that sought to both provide pragmatic responses to current educational policy while also creating a radical vision for education.

Dr. Christina Hanhardt from the Department of American Studies grappled with some of the ethical and methodological questions that frame processes of working with and writing contested histories. Specifically focused on LGBT histories, Dr. Hanhardt reflected on the dilemmas that emerge when challenging already marginalized histories (like LGBT histories) to reconfigure their boundaries in ways that take up alternative genealogies. For example, when seeking to include the histories of queer people of color organizing, not only new questions and new ways of thinking about what “queer organizing” means, but also new methodologies need to be developed. Qualitative methods that rely on archival research need to consider whose histories are retained and whose histories are ignored or over-
looked by archival politics. Groups with more access to institutions, capital and what Hanhardt called “technologies of history-making” are able to assert more archival power than groups without this same kind of institutional power. Additionally, when charting the histories of intersectional organizing, looking for queer communities may entail investigations into nationalist, labor, and other movements often positioned outside of queer politics. These conceptual and analytic shifts require new questions and qualitative methods.

The research presented by the panelists illuminated the ways that shifts in public health policy implementation, subjects of study who are also researchers and the writing of new histories require the development of new qualitative methods. Qualitative methods are constantly under revision and being created for new research challenges. The panel introduced us to just some of the innovative qualitative methods that will chart new directions for interdisciplinary research in the social sciences and humanities.

Tiffany King is a Doctoral Student in American Studies. Her research interests include colonial studies, US settler colonialism, and Black Diaspora studies.

### 2010-2011 QRIG SEED GRANT AWARDS

The Qualitative Research Interest Group (QRIG) at CRGE, in collaboration with the Maryland Population Research Center (MPRC) (see www.merc.umd.edu) is pleased to congratulate the following faculty community of qualitative researchers for their innovative research!

**Melinda Martin-Beltrán**  
Assistant Professor | College of Education | Department of Curriculum & Instruction

**Engaging our Linguistic Resources in Secondary Schools: How Minority-Language and Majority-Language Students can Learn from each other**

This project investigates the ways that English-language learners and Spanish-language learners may mediate each other’s language learning through collaborative activities in a unique program that brings together students who would otherwise be separated in a mainstream high school. Grounded in sociocultural theory, this study uses microgenetic discourse analysis of audio-recorded student interactions during collaborative literacy activities to investigate how students exchange and co-construct language expertise.

**Faedra Chatard Carpenter**  
Assistant Professor | School of Theatre, Dance, and Performance Studies

**Whiteface to Postrace: Understanding Whiteness in Contemporary African American Performance**

This study interrogates traditional expectations and assumptions regarding trans-racial mimicry by focusing on embodied, thematic, and aural portrayals of whiteness in African American performance. The study will explore the use of white makeup as well as the ways in which the privilege and power associated with “whiteness” has been expressed and staged.

Continued on next page.
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Noah D. Drezner
Assistant Professor | College of Education | Leadership, Higher Education & International Education

Queering Philanthropy: Understanding Alumni Giving in the LGBTQ+ Communities

This study aims to examine the constructed realities of philanthropy within the LGBTQ+ communities as it relates to their experiences and characteristics specifically within the context of giving to higher education. It is hoped that this exploration will illuminate specific student and alumni characteristics, constructed college environments, and relevant outcomes related to LGBTQ+ alumni giving.

Matthew J. Miller
Assistant Professor | College of Education | Department of Counseling & Personnel Services

Elucidating the Acculturation Experiences of Asian American Elders

This study will use consensual qualitative research methods to gain a deeper understanding of how Asian American elders construct meaning from their acculturation experiences. Seeing whether, how, and under what conditions these acculturation experiences might be salient across a number of relevant life domains.

Stephen John Quaye
Assistant Professor | College of Education | College Student Personnel Program

Engaging College Students in Difficult Dialogues: A Multi-Institution Study

This study will assess if there is an increase in college students appreciation of differences (e.g. race, gender, and religion) by engaging them in structured dialogues. Intergroup dialogues will bring together two groups that have a history of conflict (e.g. people of color and White people) in face-to-face dialogues to explore the sources of conflict and build alliances. Using qualitative methods including semi-structured interviews, focus groups, observation and document analysis, a multi-institution case study of five intergroup dialogue programs will be conducted to explore in-depth what happens during these dialogues that might help students engage diversity on their campus.

Michelle V. Rowley
Assistant Professor | College of Arts and Humanities | Department of Women’s Studies

Queering Home: Exploring the Organizational and Communal Terrains of Sexuality Rights and Equity in the Anglophone Caribbean

This study provides a queer geography of the Anglophone Caribbean. In dialogue with sexuality rights activists and lesbian communities of practice it interrogates the ways in which sexuality rights advocates organize and advocate on behalf of queer communities in the midst of the region’s discriminatory practices. The study explores the ways in which lesbian subject’s structure their livelihood and social networks for the purposes of survival in the midst of socially hostile spaces.
A Reflection on the November 15, 2010 Provost’s Conversation:
What is Left Behind?
Conservative Ideology and Color-Blindness

By Ana Perez

The heated panel discussion on November 15, 2010, Left Behind? Conservative Ideology and Diversity, with panelists Gerald Alexander, Julianne Malveaux, Nadine Strossen, Trevor Parry-Giles, and moderated by Lee Thornton, engaged in a conversation on the status of conservative ideology in the United States and reflected on how experiences and representations of race and class profoundly shape our political landscape.

Drs. Alexander and Strossen, who identified as a conservative and a moderate, sought to challenge simplified understandings of the conservative/liberal “binary,” and attempted to show how diversity in terms of socioeconomic class or ideology/thought were under acknowledged in conversations about the diversity of the right. They emphasized that the diversity of conservative perspectives span religious, political, and economic perspectives. The liberal panelist, Dr. Malveaux, responded that while it is important to underscore that a diversity of conservative perspectives exist, it is also imperative to continually ask ourselves how dominant political practices and color-blind rhetoric, often associated with conservative ideology, creates a false sense of progress and equality.

As an audience member, it became clear that this panel reinforced an understanding of how “conservative” and “diversity” work as racial codes that simplify the complex racial landscape of the United States. These racial codes sometimes assume the “neutral” position of conservatism that racialized minorities must react to while simultaneously concealing conservatives of color who are then often perceived as tokenized subjects within the right. Consequently, racialized minorities often carry the burden of representing “diversity” in such discussions. The common presentist and color-blind analysis that inevitably arises when conservatives and liberals discuss diversity serves to further polarize debates about race and class. The panel, perhaps mistakenly, focused on what diversity representations should be valued and what the representation looks like (focusing race or class), versus why or why not representation occurs and the causes, implications, and consequences of representation. What was left out of these conversations seemed to be an understanding of the intimate and intersectional relationship between class, race, and ethnic power relations and a conversation about how to structurally redress the present-day legacy of institutional racism and classism.

The panel discussion mirrored how many Americans, conservatives and liberals alike, understand the repercussions of racism and classism: as only an individual set of beliefs that one must change and overcome. What is then left behind is an ongoing and honest reflection of the entanglements of race, ethnicity and class that influence every aspect of our society.

Ana Perez is a doctoral candidate in the department in Women’s Studies. Her research interests are in feminist theory, racial theory, and U.S. Latino studies; specifically exploring the intersections between constructs of mixed race and mestizaje. Ana’s dissertation explores the ways that U.S. Latinas are situated within multiple forms of racialization.
MENTORING @ CRGE

CRGE has an amazing team of students who we are mentoring this year. We are grateful for their commitment to the work of CRGE and their hard work as part of our team.

Cristina Pérez
Cristina is a first year doctoral student in the Department of Women’s Studies. Born in Mexico City, and raised in El Paso, Texas, Cristina completed her undergraduate degree in Politics and Women’s Studies at Willamette University in Salem, Oregon. She then became a special education teacher in middle school in Crownpoint, New Mexico on the Navajo Nation for four years. During that time, Cristina completed a Masters in Teaching Special Education at Western New Mexico University.

Cristina returned to graduate study in Women’s Studies in order to pursue her research interests in sexuality and social movements. She was drawn to the University of Maryland because of the interdisciplinary flexibility to explore these issues across and around disciplinary silos and explore these issues at the intersection of sexuality, gender, race, and socioeconomic status, on, around, and across borders. While her broader interests lie in interrogating transnational human rights discourse, her more specific research examines the way social movements in Mexico influence, employ, and translate transnational discourses around issues of gender and sexuality.

Working as a CrISP scholar has provided just such an opportunity. In her work at CRGE, she has begun to work in and across methodologies and literatures to explore the way intersectionality travels and takes shape across the varying approaches to address the problems of uneven distributions of power. She has spent the past academic year engaged in a wide array of projects at CRGE, from contributions to the Intersectional Research Database to work on papers about the ways Latinos and their clinicians navigate issues in health care.

Dr. Lisa Lapeyrouse
Dr. Lapeyrouse, currently a post-doctoral fellow in Public Health at the University of Texas, El Paso, was previously a post-doctoral fellow in the Department of Family Medicine, within the David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA. Lisa’s dissertation was entitled American Dreams, Latino Realities: Interrogating the Intersections of Race/Ethnicity, Gender, and Nativity on Select Acculturative Stressors and Risk of Depression among Mexican-Origin Adults. Lisa is a research fellow for CRGE’s latest research study, Understanding the Relationship between Work Stress and U.S. Research Institutions’ Failure to Retain Underrepresented Minority Faculty.

Queenita Barnes
Queenita is a senior and an Information Systems and Supply Chain Management dual major in the Robert H. Smith School of Business. She is from Leonardtown, MD. In her free time, Queenita enjoys playing Nintendo Wii, bowling, and going to the beach. In her second year at CRGE, Queenita supports various research projects as an undergraduate research assistant.

Margaret Loo
Margaret is a junior and an Economics major. Margaret was born in the U.S. and grew up in China. In her spare time, she enjoys swimming, jogging, listening to music, hanging out with friends and reading The Economist. In her second year at CRGE, Margaret supports the development of our publications and the administrative functioning of CRGE.

Olofunso Ojo
Funso is a sophomore and a Neurobiology and Physiology major and Human Development minor. From Queens, New York, Funso is a Resident Assistant and a mentor in the Big Sisters program. Funso wants to become a medical doctor focused on reducing urban health disparities globally. As a new member of the CRGE team, Funso supports the development of our publications and the administrative functioning of CRGE.

Djuan Short
Djuan is a junior Psychology and Human Development major. She is a Resident Assistant and a recipient of the University of Maryland Incentive Awards scholarship. Djuan is currently interested in factors associated with mental health disparities by gender, race, ethnicity and class. She is currently taking an independent reading course (WMST 499) with Dr. Zambrana.

Jae Yu
Jae is a Cell/Genetic Biology major. He is originally from South Korea and moved to the United States in 2003. Jae supports our administrative work as well as the development of the bibliography for CRGE’s latest research study, Understanding the Relationship between Work Stress and U.S. Research Institutions’ Failure to Retain Underrepresented Minority Faculty.
Prom Night in Mississippi (2009)

(race, gender, generation, sexuality, locality, religion, socioeconomic status)

A documentary film about the integration of the Charleston High School prom in Mississippi in 2008. The school was integrated in 1970 and since then has had two proms—one for Black students, one for White students. The documentary follows the students as they plan for their first integrated prom. To be successfully used in an undergraduate classroom in an intersectional way, would need to offer prompting questions (e.g. How does the racism of Charleston seem to affect the Black and White male students differently than the Black and White female students? How does the movie create a sense of a generational divide? How does race, gender, socioeconomic status impact how this divide is portrayed? Give specific examples.)

Available at Hornbake and full length movie available online at http://www.snagfilms.com/

Report from the Bahamas (1982)

a short essay by June Jordon

(socioeconomic status, nationality, race, gender, religion, colonization)

http://www.jstor.org/stable/40338566

Have intersectional resources to recommend?

Email bdc1@umd.edu
Want more intersectional resources?
Go to www.crge.umd.edu/resources
Slip of the Tongue (2006)

(race, gender, immigration, masculinity, femininity, ideological colonization)

A short video narrated using a spoken word poem about a young Asian American man who approaches an Asian American woman at a bus stop. Her response to his comments is an intersectional analysis of beauty standards in the U.S.

http://www.mediatthatmattersfest.org/films/slip_of_the_tongue/ (Media that Matters is a great resource of other short videos about inequality as well.)

UNNATURAL CAUSES...Is Inequality Making Us Sick? (2008)

(race, health, socioeconomic status, disability)

Unnatural Causes is a seven-part documentary film series produced by California Newsreel that explores racial and socioeconomic inequalities in health. The Unnatural Causes website is also an action center with tools, policy guides, classroom curriculum and other resources to help educate, organize and advocate for eliminating health inequities. Available at Hornbake.

Need Intersectional Articles?

Go to the Intersectional Research Database
(enter through www.crge.umd.edu, link off home page)

CRGE has an online searchable database of intersectional articles in multiple disciplines including education, public health, public policy, sociology, women’s studies, LGBT studies, and racial/ethnic studies. The database offers abstracts written by UM graduate students of a wide selection of intersectional articles. This database is both a resource for choosing articles for your courses and also a resource for graduate students. Please spread the word!
KUDOS + AWARDS

Former CrISP Scholars


Maria Velazquez (2007-2009 CrISP) is the recipient of the Winnemore Dissertation Fellowship for Spring 2011.

CRGE Faculty Community


Psyché Williams-Forson was promoted to Associate Professor in the Department of American Studies. Dr. Williams-Forson published an article in Feminist Studies entitled, “Other Women Cooked for My Husband: Negotiating Gender, Food, and Identities in an African American/Ghanaian Household” (2010) and *Taking Food Public: Redefining Foodways in a Changing World* is forthcoming (July 2011, Routledge).


CONTINUED...


Ruth Enid Zambrana has a forthcoming book entitled Latinos in American Society: Families and Communities in Transition (Cornell University Press, 2011) and was selected as an ADVANCE Professor for non-STEM women faculty of color.