Collaboration and Duration:

A celebration of the research and practice of Janet Holland

Edited by Rachel Thomson and Rosalind Edwards

With contributions from Robert Albury, Robert Bell, Lesley Caldwell, Pat Dyehouse, Rosalind Edwards, Tuula Gordon, Sheila Henderson, Dave Hill, Mary Jane Kehily, Elina Lahelma, Natasha Mauthner , Sheena McGrellis, Mica Nava, Ann Phoenix, Sara Rance, Sue Sharpe, Tarja Tolonen, Rachel Thomson, Gella Varnava Skoura and Jeffrey Weeks

Collaboration and Duration:

A celebration of the research and practice of Janet Holland

Table of contents

Foreword

When Rachel suggested that we have a conference/seminar to celebrate my collaborative and collective approach to research I immediately refused. As she attempted to persuade me I wondered if it would be possible to do it without me being there. Meanwhile I was of course extremely flattered and extremely troubled, not seeing myself as having accomplished enough to be given such recognition. The whole idea threw me into a panic. And the image of myself I see emerging in the comments of my collaborators in many areas of my life on the day and here in this paper certainly reflects these responses. How strange and moving to see yourself as others see you.

But of course Rachel was right, it was a wonderful and very special day, with so many of my colleagues, collaborators and friends coming from far and wide to talk about our work together, about collaborative, collective and of course feminist research, about politics, publishing and about friendship and fun. The papers and talks were fascinating, starting with the academic, and moving through politics, practice, and the personal, often of course intersecting. It was absolutely great to see everyone, and I am so grateful for Rachel and Ros for organising the day, and for getting together this record, which I will surely treasure. I hope you enjoy it too.

Janet Holland

April 2010

Notes on contributors

Robert Albury has spent the last thirty five years trying to persuade Janet not to work so hard and is now planning on persuading her to travel to far flung parts of the world.

Robert Bell is Manager of the Paul Hamlyn Foundation's Social Justice Programme, which aims to support the most marginalised young people in the UK. Before that he was Director of the Carnegie UK Trust's Youth Programme for four years, following time spent as a social researcher in the Cabinet Office and Department for Education and Skills, the Universities of Edinburgh, Cambridge, and London South Bank.

Lesley Caldwell is a psychoanalyst working in London, and her research, teaching (at UCL) and writing interests include psychoanalysis, the Italian Cinema and Rome. She has been a member of the Women's Group with Janet since its inception at the Institute of Education.

Pat Dyehouse is a psychotherapist working in Devon, in the NHS and in private practice, for the last 21 years.

Rosalind Edwards is Professor in Social Policy, heading the Weeks Centre for Social and Policy Research at London South Bank University. Previously she has shared management responsibilities and offices with Janet Holland.

Tuula Gordon is a Dosent of Sociology in the University of Helsinki, Finland. She has worked with Janet Holland and her other collaborators, particularly Rachel Thomson both in Finland, Helsinki, as well as the UK. Tuula Gordon is a member of Board of EUROQUAL, a programme series chaired by Paul Atkinson. Tuula is particularly interested in young people's transitions and in qualitative and feminist theories.

Sheila Henderson is a freelance researcher who has collaborated with Janet Holland on a longitudinal qualitative study called *Inventing Adulthoods* since 1996. Still ongoing and involving a core research team of five women, this study of young people growing in England and Northern Ireland is based at London South Bank University www.lsbu.ac.uk/inventingadulthoods.

Dave Hill co-founded and chaired the Hillcole Group from 1989 to 2000. He was Professor of Education Policy at the University of Northampton and now teaches part-time and hourly paid at Middlesex University. He edits the free online radical left academic journal, *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, at www.jceps.com.* He is currently (Winter 2009-2010) looking for work).

Mary Jane Kehily is Senior Lecturer in Childhood and Youth Studies at The Open University, UK. She has a background in cultural studies and education as a former postgraduate student at Birmingham Cultural Studies. Mary Jane is forever indebted to Janet for her energy and support over the years and, above all, for being a constant source of inspiration whatever the weather.

Elina Lahelma is Professor of Education at the University of Helsinki, Finland. She has collaborated with Janet Holland in a joint ethnographic study in the 90s and continued in other interlinked studies.

Natasha Mauthner is a Reader in the University of Aberdeen Business School. Her work examines the constitution of academic subjectivities and practices under neo-liberal regimes, including analysis of the science, ethics and politics of team and collaborative research as a

normative mode of knowledge production. She is a distant admirer of Janet's work, and of her feminist and collective research practices.

Sheena McGrellis is a Senior Research Fellow at London South Bank University, She was introduced to Janet in 1993 on taking up a short term temporary contract at the London University Institute of Education. She has worked with Janet since then, primarily on the longitudinal *Inventing Adulthoods* project.

Mica Nava is Professor of Cultural Studies at the University of East London. She has been in the same women's group as Janet Holland since 1977.

Ann Phoenix is a Professor and Co-Director at the Thomas Coram Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London. She has been friends with Janet since the mid 1980s, when they both worked at the Institute of Education. She has benefited enormously from numerous discussions with Janet on life, work, research and analyses as well as convivial occasions that now span three decades.

Sara Rance works in the NHS as Head of Child and Adolescent Psychotherapy in Newham. She has been a member of The Women's Group with Janet since its inception at the Institute of Education.

Sue Sharpe is a freelance social researcher and Visiting Fellow at London South Bank University who has written books and worked on various projects, mainly relating to young people, motherhood, and family life. Following a personal friendship of some years, she has worked in research teams with Janet on a significant number of projects, starting with the Women, Risk and AIDS Project at the University of London, Institute of Education in 1988 and currently continuing with the Maki*ng the Long View/ Inventing Adulthoods* project within the Timescapes Programme.

Tarja Tolonen is an Adjunct Professor, affiliated to the Department of Social Sciences at the University of Helsinki, Finland. She currently works as a Research Coordinator at the Finnish Youth Research Network. She has been a student of and collaborated with Tuula Gordon, Elina Lahelma and Janet Holland from 1990's, and she was a Visiting Scholar at London South Bank University in 1998.

Rachel Thomson is Professor of Social Research in the Faculty of Health and Social Care at the Open University. She has collaborated with Janet on research, writing and life projects in one way or another since becoming involved in the WRAP project in 1988.

Gella Varnava Skoura, Professor of Education in the Department of Early Childhood Education, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. She met Janet Holland at LSE in 1968, and they collaborated on a number of projects for ILEA (1969) and at the Institute of Education London, with Basil Bernstein in the 1970s. Their friendship is close and longstanding, and Janet has spent very many happy holidays with Gella in Greece. After her return from the UK, Gella made an important contribution to education in Greece, and has worked in recent years on a series of innovatory programs in public schools, under the auspices of the European Union.

Jeffrey Weeks is Emeritus Professor of Sociology at London South Bank University. He worked closely with Janet Holland for over ten years at LSBU and co-edited two books with her. He is the author or co-author of more than twenty books, and over 100 articles, chiefly on the history and social organisation of sexuality and intimate life. The most recent books are *The World We Have Won: The Remaking of Erotic and Intimate Life*, published 2007, and *Sexuality*, 3rd edition, which came out in 2009.

Introduction

Rachel Thomson & Rosalind Edwards

This working paper brings together a set of papers and presentations that formed a one-day event held in December 2009 at London South Bank University, celebrating the work and research practices of Professor Janet Holland. The day was entitled 'Collaboration and Duration' capturing the two of the most distinctive characteristics of Janet's intellectual project and contributors were invited to elaborate on these themes as well as commenting directly on Janet's work.

The contributors – and the audience – represented the many facets of Janet Holland's practices: criss-crossing and interconnecting across collaborative and collective research, research management, publishing, post-graduate supervision, as well as friendship, hospitality, and a lot of laughter. No single speaker could have reflected on and represented all of these rich activities, other than Janet herself.

This working paper follows the organisational structure of the day. It begins with an exploration of traditions of collective scholarship. First Natasha Mauthner explores the research team as a mode of knowledge production, counterposing the reflexive and feminist approach of the Women, Risk and Aids Project team active in the 1990s with contemporary forms of team research built on natural science models for teams that separate data from those that generate them. Mary Jane Kehily then explores a tradition of collective scholarship associated with the Birmingham CCCS of the 1980's and 1990's, which gave rise to a huge catalogue of unpublished research. Kehily reviews key examples as well as outlining the 'canon' of this collaborative and creative tradition. The final contribution to this mapping process is provided by Ann Phoenix who reviews the changing landscape for feminist collaboration within academia, highlighting the politics and practices of commitment and the ways in which Janet Holland's work reflects and contributes to important developments within feminist engagements with difference and subjectivity.

The second part of the working paper considers Janet Holland's research collaborations in more detail. It begins with a contribution from Finnish scholars Tuula Gordon, Elina Lahelma and Tarja Tolonen who reflect on a cross national collaboration exploring young people's experiences of schooling. The practices and places of collective scholarship are brought to life through examples of memory work in a contribution on their long term research collaboration with Janet Holland, by Rachel Thomson, Sue Sharpe, Sheila Henderson, Sheena McGrellis and Robert Bell. This is followed by accounts of two of Janet's longest collaborative ventures: the 30 year Women's Group and adventures in publishing that include the radical education collective the Hillcole group and the independent publishing house the Tufnell Press.

The final section of the working paper and of the day addresses Janet Holland practice of collaborative leadership within the University. Here Jeffrey Weeks and then Ros Edwards address the theme of 'Sharing the load and the glory' in their reflections of Janet's unique and generous management style. We have not been able to include a record of every contribution

from an extraordinary day, including the contributions of Swedish collaborators Gunilla Dahlberg and Marie-Anne Coliander on work, friendship and Foucault (including why feminists don't do research on young children), Bren Neale on sharing the load and the glory of the Timescapes research project, and Jin Haritaworn who spoke on behalf of Janet's many PhD students about the modesty, respect and irresistible 60's spirit of their supervisor. Others also played a key role as chairs, discussants and audience including Julie McLeod, Sue Scott and Gella Varanava and absent friends contributed in kind, in spirit and by email – including Caroline Ramazanoglu and Lynne Chisholm.

Jeffrey Weeks described Janet as having a 'representative life', capturing the personal and social history of her times including social mobility through education, feminism, and a DIY ethic. The overall aim of the day and the working paper is to recognise this life and to acknowledge the importance of her research practices, including her gift for 'structuring intellectual engagement through friendship' (Gunilla Dahlberg's words). Over the course of the day we became aware of the true extent of Janet's collective work. Noticing how she moved between so many groups, quietly and consistently shaping the work through her open house, documentation practices, stamina, spontaneity and instinctive perfectionism. Jin Haritawan captured the feeling of the day when she explained her initial excitement in early supervisions observing that Janet would jot down her words. Her pleasure was not undermined by her subsequent realisation that this constant note taking was a habit. By then she understood the habit as a manifestation of Janet's ability to listen and an expression of her respect for what others had to say. The day and this collection are for you Janet, and we hope that you recognise yourself in it. The working paper is also a record of a tradition and community of practice that is largely undocumented, yet extraordinarily important and productive. In contemporary neoliberal times this work may be looked to as a 'counter-practice' that exists within yet goes beyond the academy.

Breaking the mould: Feminist research collaborations and their scientific, ethical and political counter-practices

Natasha Mauthner

My first encounter with the work of Janet and her colleagues was in 1990, as a first year PhD student, when I came across a series of little purple booklets about WRAP – the Women Risk and Aids Project. Although I was interested in the topic of their research, it was their *ways of working* that really caught my attention – and it was the WRAP Paper 3 - *Methods of Working as a Research Team* - that made a particular impression on me. This paper was written by Caroline Ramazanoglu (1990), but she emphasised its collaborative genesis in her first footnote when she writes: "This paper arises out of collective work, and includes specific points from Janet Holland. It has been commented on by team members, but its final form is my responsibility" (p. 28). These other team members were Sue Scott, Sue Sharpe, and Rachel Thomson.

As a newcomer to the social sciences, having just completed an undergraduate degree in natural sciences, with a specialisation in experimental psychology, which had left me disenchanted with the theories, methods and practices of the discipline, and the broader tradition within which it was embedded, I was drawn to the work of the WRAP team and their approach to research for a number of reasons. Their critical examination of the research process and its associated practices; their insistence on the relationship between knowledge and the conditions of its production; and their adoption of an explicitly political – in this case feminist – approach to their research, challenged the kinds of orthodoxies I had been trained in and was seeking to unlearn. While these themes were being voiced by other feminist and non feminist social scientists at the time, it was the WRAP team's *commitment to putting these theories and principles into practice* – and their articulation and illustration of these processes - that marked them out as distinctive in my eyes. For example, they discussed political, ethical, emotional and epistemological dimensions of the research process that were rarely written about at that time, and that *remain* largely unspoken within contemporary research narratives; and they wrote about their attempts "to deal with the exhaustion, stress, discouragement, resentments, irritation with colleagues, and other negative emotional aspects of the research process which are not usually attended to by methods textbooks …" (p. 15).

At this early point in my career, it was the honesty of the WRAP team's research account, and their attention to the detail of research *practice*, that had an impact on me. The fact that they were writing about *team* research and *collaborative* processes was marginal to my interests at that time. And so, having inspired me through its unconventional approach to the conduct and narration of the research process, the little purple booklet got put away --- buried amongst *many* other papers in one of *many* box files labelled 'feminist methodology'. I largely forgot about it…… until about 4 years ago when I started researching teams and collaborations as *modes* and *forms* of knowledge production. My interest in this area arose directly out of my own experiences of having spent over a decade working in different types of collaborations – from long standing writing partnerships with a colleague or friend; to large scale, multidisciplinary, multi-institution, cross-paradigm, international team projects. My experiences, as contract researcher and grant holder, were very mixed – some collaborations were intellectually rewarding, stimulating and productive; others left with a sense of unease; with concerns about what appeared to be increasingly normative understandings of team research and how it should be practiced in

contemporary academic contexts; and with questions about the epistemological, ethical and political dimensions of these practices.

I was most troubled by the segregated and hierarchical divisions of labour that seemed to be standard practice within research teams in which research tasks were largely undertaken on an individual rather than collective basis; and were allocated according to the institutional and intellectual status of the researcher and the intellectual status of the research task. Typically, high-status team members such as grant holders were expected to carry out what were regarded as high-status research activities such as project design, funding applications, data analysis, writing and dissemination as well as deal with the political and public relations aspects of the project. As low-status team members, contract researchers were expected to carry out what were implicitly, if not explicitly, regarded as low-status research activities such as fieldwork, interviews, observational work and literature reviews, with little or minimal involvement on the part of the grant holders. Although there were no clear or consistent expectations about the extent of contract researchers' and grant holders' participation in data analysis, it was almost always the case that researchers analysed data on their own rather than collectively. Grant holders were therefore often analysing interviews they had not carried out, and without drawing on the interviewer's knowledge and insights. Consequently, the fieldwork experience and encounter were reduced to textual transcripts which became the main, and often only, form of 'data' analysed and used in the writing of publications. Most puzzling to me was that these practices were taken for granted – there was an unstated assumption that this is how team research is done; and it was clear that doing otherwise would have required additional time and financial resources that had not been factored into the grant application (see Mauthner and Edwards, 2007, 2010, Mauthner and Doucet, 2008).

In seeking to make sense of these experiences, I turned to the literature for empirical studies of collaborations, and for critical and reflexive accounts of team practices and dynamics, only to find that very little has been written about teams as modes of knowledge production within the social sciences. It was in this context that I *remembered* the little purple booklet and started searching through my collection of box files, hoping that it had not fallen victim to one of my many successive waves of increasingly ruthless purging over the intervening years. For since the early 1990s, I had worked on 2 continents, in 4 universities, and in 6 departments; and I had moved offices 8 times. But WRAP Paper 3 had miraculously survived the purges! And there it was, patiently waiting to be unearthed and rediscovered.

My new research interest focused my appreciation on WRAP Paper 3 as a rare example of a *reflexive* research narrative about *collaborative* processes and practices. Reflexivity, and the recognition that knowledge is contingent on the conditions of its production, has long been recognised in the social sciences. But accounts of how this reflexivity is put into practice remain elusive. The WRAP team were distinctive in identifying *team processes* as sites for reflexive scrutiny, insisting that "the functioning of research teams can affect the production of social science knowledge" (p. 1). They translated this reflexive stance into concrete research practices through the bringing together of researcher subjectivities, respondent subjectivities, and sociological theory, and by attending to the power relations that cut across these sets of relationships. For example, they recognised that conventional and hierarchically organised divisions of labour mean that the relationship between data generation and theoretical conceptualisation is compromised because those collecting data have little influence or power to modify the team's theoretical framework in light of the data. As a result, the knowledge that

emerges from team research is likely to represent the perspectives of those with most power rather than the multiple standpoints of the researchers involved because, they write, "it is the project director[s] ... who are designated as repositories of superior scientific knowledge" (p. 4). Instead, the WRAP team adopted a collective and cooperative approach that harnessed and valued the knowledge of *all* team members by seeking to ensure that "each member of the team contributes to all parts of the research process" (p. 13). They analysed transcripts collectively, and generated interpretations through interactions with the transcripts and debates with each other. At the heart of this process were discussions with the interviewer, and analysis of their field notes and *their* accounts of the meaning of the interview exchanges, including implicit and embedded meanings.

The WRAP team recognised that a commitment to putting feminist, philosophical and social theory into practice required a *transformation* of practice - their approach to collaboration was a *deliberate* intervention that developed *alternative* sets of practices based on alternative sets of values. They explicitly prioritised collectivity, cooperation, trust, sharing and decency, over competition, self-interest, individual achievement and hierarchy. What is perhaps most remarkable is that Janet and her colleagues have *sustained* these reflexive and collective practices over the course of their careers. Writing recently about the *Timescapes* project that she is involved in, Rachel Thomson (2008) describes how their team practices privileged reflexive and collective forms of working and the use of their own subjectivity as a resource for the production of knowledge. She provides a detailed account of how these principles were put into practice through a series of *group* practices, including a reading group, memory work and analysis groups (see also McLeod and Thomson, 2009). These ways of practising collaborative research are significant and to be celebrated because they constitute what I am calling powerful scientific, ethical and political *counter-practices* --- practices that explicitly challenge, resist and subvert dominant and normative assumptions about how team research should be practiced; and more generally how knowledge should be produced.

Collaboration, and its multiple organisational forms, has long characterised the production of academic knowledge in the social sciences. But what is new, I suggest, are the ways in which teams are becoming normative, first, as a *mode* of knowledge production --- so that whereas 50 years ago less than one fifth of papers produced in the social sciences was written by teams, today that figure is over half (Wuchty et al 2007); and second, in that particular organisational and political forms of teams are becoming normative, typically modelled on the natural sciences and characterised by the kinds of segregated and hierarchical divisions of labour that I have highlighted (Mauthner and Doucet 2008). Collaboration in the contemporary context is distinctive, I argue, because it is increasingly being shaped by a dominant set of normative scientific terms and socio-political conditions. The scientific terms are constituted by the *foundational norms* that are being used to define knowledge (science) and its production (teams) (Mauthner and Parry, 2010). Implicit within normative team models is a conceptualisation of data as external material, social or cognitive realities, which are separate from those who generate them, and independent of the relational and intersubjective contexts that give rise to them. Knowledge is understood as representative in character, and is seen to be produced through the ontological separation of the knower from the known. Within this framework, data are 'out there', carriers of inherent meanings, and building blocks that can be collected by one set of researchers in the lab or in the field and re-assembled into knowledge by another set of researchers in the office. Teams are conceptualised as groups of researchers working independently on different tasks, producing separate bits of knowledge that can later be put together. Data collection and fieldwork are understood as technical activities – the 'mere' collection of parcels of existing data – rather than

as knowledge-producing activities in which subjective knowledge-producers are engaging with research subjects and using their subjectivity to generate knowledge.

These foundational norms are problematic because of they are both *ideational* and *ideological*. Foundationalism is *ideational* in that it is based on an abstract idea or ideal of scientific practice which is never *realised* in practice. It is rooted within a Cartesian understanding of our relationship to the world, premised on separation and detachment, rather than relationality and engagement, as our ontological way of being. Experiences and accounts of research *practice*, however, indicate that the *actual* production of knowledge does not follow these foundational principles, and suggest that when attempts are made to put foundationalism into practice it leads to *epistemological* and *ethical* tensions. For example, both social and natural scientists question the foundational assumption built into normative team practices that distance from the field produces 'good', 'rigorous' or 'valid' knowledge. Elizabeth Gladfelter (2002), a North American marine biologist, writes about fieldwork as a *sensory* source of knowledge that she sees as critical to 'good' scientific practice and to producing 'good' science. She writes: "A natural scientist must learn to sense the environment that he studies, not by visual observation alone ... but also by all of the other senses a human possesses. Only then does one truly begin to gain an understanding of nature and allow oneself to be inspired by its magnificence. Only then can one study it effectively in a rigorous manner" (p. 5). She is critical of normative forms of team research because, "The busy senior scientist increasingly depends on students and technicians to collect the data to answer the questions he has formulated because he doesn't have time to go into the field. He must be successful at writing and administering grant proposals, securing funding… and in many cases administering a large lab. This distances him from the reality of the natural world he is purporting to study."

Foundational practices can also lead to *ethical* malpractices through the denial of researcher subjectivity and its role in the production of knowledge. For example, within normatively constituted research teams, the epistemic status of field or lab workers, and the epistemic value of their labour, is marginalised by positioning them as *technical* researchers undertaking *technical* work, rather than *intellectual* researchers using their *subjectivity* to produce *knowledge*. Sue Scott (1984), Diane Reay (2000) and Valerie Hey (2001) have written compelling accounts of the "invisibility and related denigration" (Reay, 2000) of both contract research work, and contract researchers. Their accounts suggest that not only is the subjectivity of contract researchers denied, but it is precisely the subjective and relational dimensions of their day-to-day work – as Diane Reay (2000:16) puts it "all those 'female' things – making contact, establishing relationships, talking and listening" – that is seen to downgrade its epistemic status as intellectual work and that leaves it open to exploitation by senior colleagues.

Controversies in science over recognition of scientific contributions similarly arise from a failure to recognise so-called technical or lab work as subjective knowledge producing work. Rosalind Franklin's contribution to the discovery of DNA went unrecognised at the time *in part* because all she was seen to be have produced was a technical contribution in the form of X-ray diffraction images of DNA. More recently, the controversy that developed in 2006 over the cloning of Dolly the Sheep by scientists at the University of Edinburgh centred around the lead researcher overstating his role in the discovery, and technicians making complaints that their contributions had been ignored.

These accounts of research *practice* point to the centrality of subjectivity in knowledge production, and question the science, ethics and politics of knowledge production principles and practices rooted in foundationalism and its denial of subjectivity as a source of knowledge. But these principles and practices are sustained through foundationalism implicitly conferring upon itself a normative and hegemonic status through its claims to 'epistemic sovereignty' (Healy, 2004). Its controlling moral authority over knowledge, through its claims to provide a neutral, independent and universal template or gold standard for knowledge and its production, secures its preeminent position while concealing its status as ideology. Foundationalism is *ideological*, I suggest, because it advocates 'epistemic monism' over 'epistemic pluralism', and claims epistemic supremacy for itself while denying the epistemic status and legitimacy of other perspectives on knowledge and its production.

Foundationalism exerts a dominating influence not simply at the level of *epistemic ideology*, but also in material ways through its influence on policy and practice. Foundationalism has been *institutionalised* as the hegemonic paradigm for knowledge and its production through institutional and discursive processes that promote, sustain and reinforce its normative status. For example, Government, research funding agencies and universities predominantly work with foundational institutional understandings of knowledge. They are using these, in increasingly prescriptive ways, to guide their priorities, policies and practices in terms of resource allocation, thereby conferring moral and material privileges on foundational ways of knowing. These institutional objectives are in turn discursively justified by invoking 'science' and by claiming that these foundational approaches lead to 'good' or 'better' science. This use of science as a justificatory principle is problematic not only because science is defined in unitary foundational terms, but also because it conceals political and economic agendas under the guise of 'good science'. Specifically, neoliberal and new managerialist interests come to be aligned with, and redefined as, scientific interests. These processes create the contemporary *socio-political conditions* in which academics are working – conditions which erode their right to epistemic self-determination; weaken their right to exercise their professional autonomy and expertise in deciding what modes and forms of knowledge production are scientifically, ethically and politically appropriate in a given context; and undermine the legitimacy of using values other than economic ones - including ethics, morality, integrity, equity and justice – in the creation and production of knowledge.

The research practices that Janet and her colleagues have been engaged in demonstrate that it is *possible*, within the current scientific and socio-political context, to break the mould and be successful – to practice alternative epistemologies, methodologies, ethics and politics in the production of knowledge *and* be recognised and rewarded for doing so. This long-running feminist collaboration reminds us that, as Rachel Thomson (2008) writes, "collectively we are more than the sum of our parts". But to *realise* the full scientific potential of collaboration we need to reclaim it – we need to *redefine* and *practise* it *on our own terms and conditions.* This, as the WRAP team highlighted nearly 20 years ago, necessitates not only *being reflexive* about our research practices --- but also *being prepared* to *transform* our practices. I leave you with the concluding words of WRAP Paper 3:

> "the inseparability of objectivity and subjectivity in research needs to be recognised in the operation of research teams if the creative possibilities of team work are to be fully realised. Team research which ignores power in the research process, which ignores power within the research team, which ignores power (25-6) between the researcher and

the researched, and which does not recognise more than one standpoint from which to know the social world, subverts the validity of its own sociological knowledge". (p. 26)

References

Gladfelter, E. (2002) *Agassiz' Legacy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Healy, S. (2004) 'A post-foundational interpretation of risk: risk as 'performance''. *Journal of Risk Research*, 7 (3): 277-296.

Hey, V. (2001) 'The construction of academic time: sub/contracting academic labour in research'. *Journal of Education Policy*, 16, 1, 67-84.

Mauthner, N. S. and Doucet, A. (2008) '"Knowledge once divided can be hard to put together again": An epistemological critique of collaborative and team-based research practices'. *Sociology*, 42 (5), 971-985.

Mauthner, N. and Edwards, R. (2007) 'Feminism, the relational micro-politics of power and research management in higher education in Britain'. In: Gillies, V. and Lucey, H. (eds) *Power, Knowledge and the Academy*. London: Sage.

Mauthner, N. and Edwards, R. (2010) 'Possibilities and practices of feminist research management in higher education in Britain'. *Gender, Work and Organization*. In press.

Mauthner, N. S. and Parry, O. (2010) 'Qualitative data preservation and sharing in the social sciences: On whose terms?' *Australian Journal of Social Issues.* In press.

McLeod, J. and Thomson, R. (2009) *Researching Social Change: Qualitative Approaches*. London: Sage.

Thomson, R. (2008) 'Creating family case histories: subjects, selves and family dynamics'. In Thomson, R. (ed) *Intensity and Insight: Qualitative longitudinal methods as a route into the psychosocial*, Timescapes working paper3, [available from http://www.timescapes.leeds.ac.uk/assets/files/WP3_final_Jan%202010.pdf accessed05/03/2010]

Ramazanoglu, C. (1990) *Methods of Working as a Research Team*. WRAP Paper 3. London: Tuffnell Press.

Reay, D. (2000) '"Dim dross": Marginalised women both inside and outside the academy'. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 23 (1):13-21.

Scott, S. (1984) 'The personable and the powerful: gender and status in sociological research'. In Bell, C. and Roberts, H. (eds) *Social Researching: Politics, Problems, Practice.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wuchty et al (2007) 'The increasing dominance of teams in production of knowledge'. *Science,* 316:1036-1039.

Traditions of collective work: Cultural studies and the Birmingham School

Mary Jane Kehily

In celebrating the work of Janet Holland I want to say a few words about a tradition of collective work that is usually associated with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS) at the University of Birmingham. As an intellectual endeavour that was highly politicised and informed by modes of activism, I recognise Janet as a fellow traveller who was part of a broader project of knowledge production that was also radical in educational terms – not just producing new work and new ways of looking – but also finding new ways of working. These new ways of working were essentially collaborative and emerged as a kind of politics that were in keeping with the political aspirations of the time. It seemed important make a commitment to the group, to work together towards commonly held goals, to recognise that the collective was more powerful than the individual and that through group-work it was possible to blend the personal and political in productive ways.

I also want to add that I am a notoriously unreliable narrator of such events as I have a happy knack of arriving at institutions just as the party is coming to a sad and sorry end. I usually arrive to find the last few guests are shuffling round in the debris, sniffing the ashtrays and arguing about where the furniture gets put back. And I'm left wondering just how good the party was but what about the mess. I'm hoping that should my rump end narrative present an account hopelessly wide of the mark, I will be reined in by Maureen McNeil who was for many years a hard-core reveller and Janet as her good mate and party going queen. Now, of course, the Centre is closed but I want to suggest that the tradition of group-work continues in many different contexts and in many reconfigured forms. *Policing the Crisis* exists as a signature piece of the group work method. Published in 1978, the group studied law and order campaigns that focused on "mugging" (then shorthand for Black street violence). This work generatively anticipated many of the law and order themes of the Thatcher government of the 1980s. But there is another tale to tell. I realised in putting together this talk that collective work within the Birmingham School has produced a catalogue of largely unpublished material. For every landmark publication such as *Resistance through Rituals*, *Off-Centre* and *Policing the Crisis*, there is also a huge pile of work that didn't make it beyond the polo mint – the large desk where much of this activity took place. I was once at a conference where they were debating the legacy of the Birmingham School, where one of the speakers said that Birmingham Cultural Studies was just a bunch of cold rooms at the end of a corridor. Spatially, that's all it was but here I want to suggest that the working practices developed there have had a lasting impact that extends beyond Birmingham and in some cases beyond the published work that emanated from there.

As many of you will know, memory-work became a key feature of many of these groups at Birmingham. It was commonly seen as a research method that also served as a productive mode of analysis. As a method and a mode of analysis, it could be readily incorporated into the cultural studies notion of group-work as a *politics*. This group-work pioneered a particular cultural studies approach to memory. Firstly, it pointed to the ways in which memory is always partial and selective – inscribed in acts of memory is also the act of forgetting. In cultural studies approaches there is a concern with the politics of remembering and forgetting. Particularly, there is a concern with the power of dominant memories, how they are generated collectively and how they become imbued with ideological content. This approach highlights the unreliability of memory and the

ways in which acts of memory may also be imaginative projections of one sort or another.

I want to move on now to say something more specifically about groups at the Birmingham School and particularly collaborations that used memory-work. Usually memory-work involved individuals in the group generating a series of short autobiographical fragments around the active remembering of particular episodes chosen by the group for their relevance to a group theme:

- The Popular Memory Group (1980s), archival approach to memory that explored the links between individuals and society. Worked at retrieving memories of particular events to document the ways in which popular memory is constituted. Using memory invites and embraces the telling of stories. Concern with what can loosely be called narrative approaches. Why do particular narratives circulate at particular times? What is significant about them, Concern with issues of 'recognition' – ways in which stories confirm a sense of self, legitimate certain identities. Group themes – issues of nationalism, the heritage industry, versions of Englishness, statues/monuments. Graham Dawson *Soldier Heroes*, interplay between public and private narratives, autobiographical account of the ways he took on publicly available narratives through social practices e.g. play and identity work).
- Televisual Machinations (1990, television autobiographies, television and memory – social structures, family forms, 'work' of the family done through viewing television, popular culture as autobiographical markers for family events and practices)
- Cultural Forms and Social Identities (course ran by Richard Johnson former Director of CCCS, as part of the Masters programme). Richard began to use memory work as a resource in his teaching, group work within this course commonly included a memory work component – often using photographs, significant objects as well as textual material. Example 1: Richard's analysis of the Falklands War. Not sure whether he ever published it. Richard documented his feelings in relation to the emergent discourses around the Falklands and produced a wonderfully layered analysis of the interrelationships between public and private. First of all he documented the ways in which the Falklands represented a defining moment for the New Right. Thatcherism was presented as strong, solid and based on enduring Tory values in which they defined themselves against 60s permissiveness and the sloppiness of the present. He moved on to talk about the gendering of the war, the coverage of 'our' boys out there, the wives and girlfriends back home. Finally, he spoke about how he felt about this version of Britishness that was being created as emblematic of an earlier imperial past, a moment where the faded glory of Britain's colonial heritage could be revived. In documenting these themes Richard and the group produced counter memories that explored Englishness and Britishness in other ways. They asked, were there things about being English that it was possible to own and enjoy? Is nationalism always a bad thing? Is there a benign version of Englishness that might incorporate going on long walks and visiting country churches and what is the link between Englishness and middle-classness?
- Example 2: well-worn tales we tell about ourselves. In this group we were interested in tapping into the repertoire of ready made narratives that we related at appropriate moments. There was an acknowledgement that this was an active process, that we all had, at times, compressed a part of our lives into well worn tale that was told and retold at certain moments. We also recognised that these tales were prone to change and development over time and in different context with different audiences. We wanted to explore the tales and their changes over time. How did we develop them/censor them/embellish them/contort them into versions of the present? Some of my earlier work was based on group-work from this period.
- The Politics of Cultural Studies of Sexuality Group (mid 1990s, memory-work generated around 2 themes: our relationship to lesbian and gay identities and formative moments in

our own sexual identities. Reading and writing on sexuality resulted in the publication of *Border Patrols* (1997). Most of the memory work done as part of this group did not make it into the book. Some of Deborah Steinberg's poems and some of Richard's work on grieving did find their way into the book, but mostly the book adhered to the conventions of an edited collection by producing a range of essays on heterosexuality.

- The Narrative Group (early 1990s – 2004, fading without a party), reading group on narrative theory followed by memory work project. Did things the other way round from other Cultural Studies groups. The turn to memory work was part of a collective interest we had in exploring the relationship between narrative theory and questions of subjectivity. The question we posed was, What is significant about the stories that are significant to us? Our task was to write about and bring to the group a story that was significant to us. We defined these stories as publicly available texts, books, magazines, films, music. Of the 8 people in the group, 5 of us chose stories from childhood, 2 people chose texts from the late teenage years – a film and a record and 1 person chose a story they had read as an adult. We completed one round of analysis on all the stories and produced a range of diverse and contested readings. Our thinking for many years was to build on this analysis and move towards a publication that looks at each story – considers the cultural product in its originary moment and the autobiographical accounts that bring the text into being. Our aim was to encourage each author to look at the text and the memory work in the light of the group-work. If we were anticipating a publication, luckily none of us were holding our breath. A publication hasn't emerged and there may be important reasons for that.

The memory-work canon

Despite the use of a method that is supposed to be interdisciplinary and anti-canonical, the cultural studies approach to memory-work produced its own canon. Those texts that were central to the development of our own work and wove in and out of our analyses:

- Volosinov/Bakhtin, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (1973) All speech acts addressed to another even when you are talking to yourself there is an imaginary audience. 'A word is a bridge thrown down between myself and another. If one end of the bridge depends on me then the other depends upon my addressee. A word is territory shared by both addresser and addressee' – importance of audience, the social context.
- Barthes, Introduction to the structural analysis of narratives, in *Image-Music-Text*, (1977) Beneath every narrative there is a logic that makes it classifiable. Features of a narrative – function and action – narrative shares all the characteristics of a sentence. – can be analysed, broken down.
- Raymond Williams
- Richard Hoggart
- Haug and colleagues, *Female Sexualisation*, 1987.
- Labov, *Language in the Inner City*, 1972, Evaluation of personal narratives, Importance of audience and perspective, the crucial question, so what? Point of view.
- Steedman, *Landscape for a Good Women* (1986), interweaving of historical, cultural and psychological to comment upon the interrelationships that shaped her and her mother, non-linear narrative that creates a wonderful stream of consciousness effect that is rare in academic writing.
- Henriques et al *Changing the Subject*, (1984) Importance of multiple subjectivities, unconscious structures that shape the present.
- Plummer, *Telling Sexual Stories*, late addition to the canon, published in1995 For a story

to be told there must be an audience ready to hear it, and importantly to recognise it, legitimise the experience for the teller;

- Johnson *Safe and risky stories* – safe turns out to be risky. Cultural Studies group-work as badge of courage, daring to be risky.
- Stuart Hall – particularly his use of the autobiographical and the personal in his writing:

Conclusion

It's impossible for me to evaluate the legacy of the Birmingham tradition of group work. In summing up I want to move through a series of points suggestive of the traces that may be left:

- There was commonly a conflation of memory work with moments of story telling and narrative accounts. Cultural Studies rationale for this – publicly available stories give individuals access to the world outside themselves – these stories weave into our lives – they become our memories. The Cultural Studies interest is in why certain stories become significant to us and why particular stories get told.
- Memory-work/stories/personal narratives always about the struggle for meaning.
- The relationship between past and present never settled, one constitutes the other, in unpredictable ways. In Cultural Studies approaches (generally) this relationship is politicised in some way – attention is paid to social context and social structures, reaching out as well as reaching within.
- Group-work in the Cultural Studies tradition encourages and even demands strong forms of engagement. People emotionally invest in the process and that can be disruptive as well as productive. I would want to suggest that the fall-outs, mutinies and acting out of intense and difficult feelings are part of the tradition that should be spoken and not be bracketed out;
- Finally, it seems fitting to end with Richard's optimistic view of cultural studies approaches – ideas of a Centre may ebb and flow but the rich history of group-work has produced an intellectual diaspora that creatively reworks and reconfigures the traditions of the past in new locations.

References

Barthes, R. (1977) *Image-Music-Text*, Michigan: University of Michigan Press

Dawson, G. (1994) *Soldier Heroes, British adventure, empire and the imagining of masculinity*, London: Routledge

Franklin, S., Lury, C. and Stacey, J. (eds) (1991) *Off Centre, feminism and cultural studies*, London: Routledge

Hall, S., et al. (1978) *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order*. London: Macmillan Press

Hall, S. and Jefferson, T. (eds.) (1976) *Resistance through Rituals, youth subcultures in postwar Britain*, London: Hutchinson

Haug, F. et al. (1987) *Female Sexualisation, a collective work of memory*, London: Verso

Henriques, J. et al. 1984) *Changing the Subject: psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*, London: Methuen

Kehily, M.J. (1995) Self narration, autobiography and identity construction, *Gender and Education*, 7, (1), 23-31

Labov, W. (1972) *Language in the Inner City*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press

Plummer, K. (1995) *Telling Sexual Stories*, London: Routledge

Steedman, C. (1986) *Landscape for a Good Woman*, London: Virago

Steinberg, D.L., Epstein, D. and Johnson, R. (1997) *Border Patrols, policing the boundaries of heterosexualit*y, London; Cassell

Volonsinov, V. (1973) *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, London: Seminar Press

Changing landscapes for feminist collaboration and duration

Ann Phoenix

The academic landscape has long been riven by contradictions that have implications for feminist collaboration. On the one hand academia is a collaborative occupation where understandings are produced incrementally and citation practices are designed to ensure that a body of work develops over time and acknowledges the work previously done in a particular field. On the other hand, universities are competitive enterprises, in which claims of individual distinction and leadership are central to career progression and 'objective,' distanced scholarship is often privileged (Haraway, 1991). In that context, it is not surprising that there are also sharply differentiated views of the role and function of public intellectuals between 'divided and duplicitous' intellectuals (Firat et al., 2009), and committed outsiders, representing those routinely forgotten or swept aside (Said, 1994).

In Said's formulation, feminists such as Janet Holland are public intellectuals, not representing, but literally *re*-presenting those generally overlooked. Firat et al's (2009) notion of doing commitment as practice is helpful in suggesting that:

> The strength of a committed scholarship then, lies in the scholar's capacity to historicize and localize, events, ideas, and concepts, to track down their complicities and to illuminate how they travel, adapt, translate, and transform... a shift of attention is required from commitment as *being* to commitment as practice. (Firat et al., 2009, p.7).

Firat et al's question 'how do you do commitment?' is central to the consideration of feminist legacies and feminist futures in the academy and to Janet Holland's work. In particular, Janet's work has been characterised by representation, deconstruction and a commitment to intersectional thinking (before Kimberlé Crenshaw coined the term in 1989) as, for example in her then cutting edge PhD on '*Gender and Class: Adolescent conceptions of the division of the labour'* in the early 1980s.

This brief paper first considers that background to feminist work in the universities, a landscape that has changed over the last two decades in ways that appear to militate against feminist activity. Yet, as the second section illustrates, there are many ways in which feminist commitments and innovation continue to play central parts in the academy.

Landscape for feminist intersectional commitments

The landscape for feminist intersectional commitments has clearly changed over the decades in which Janet has been in the academy. Four issues are of particular note. First, many current intellectual traditions destabilize claims to the categorical identities that have commonly been used to underpin progressive politics. There is, currently, debate about whether, and if so how, it is possible to think of categories without structures.

> The word ''structures'' is useful as it allows us to keep our attention on how the social coheres in specific ways. Racism is a word that I use to describe a certain kind of effect. I think that what we need actually to find the best language to describe how the world takes shape in very particular ways, which involve systematic regularities, and patterns or distributions, as well as inequalities. So I do not think we can start by talking about acts as things that just happen (Sara Ahmed, 2007).

Second, since feminism is necessarily concerned with difference, the question of how to treat categorical differences in social research continually arises. This question is also central to other academic fields (such as Conversation Analysis), where the focus is on the issues that participants makes salient, rather than researchers' concerns. In the quotation below, Ros Gill summarises the issues this raises for feminism:

> The question raised repeatedly by feminists and others concerned with power inequalities is whether all features relevant to understanding and interaction will be made relevant or oriented to by participants. Many are sceptical of the idea that all the dimensions relevant to understanding a piece of interaction – such as participants' shared whiteness or heterosexuality – will be interactionally displayed or made explicitly manifest… (Ros Gill, 2005: 696).

As Margaret Wetherell (1998) demonstrates, the ways in which people orient to gender can be subtle, multidimensional and co-constructed in interactions. It is, therefore, important to consider participants' orientations, but also to analyse other ways in which gender is salient and/or has an impact. A conceptual commitment to avoid starting from assumptions about pre-established categories, therefore, need not entail an avoidance of power relations and difference.

The question of how to deal with the analysis of categories is central to intersectionality, the perspective that focuses on people's simultaneous positioning in multiple categories and has proliferated within feminisms. Leslie McCall (2005) identifies three approaches feminists commonly take to intersectional research: the 'categorical', which is characterised by quantitative work; the 'anti-categorical', which avoids imposing categories on data in advance of detailed analysis; and the 'intra-categorical', which focuses on intra-group commonalities and differences.

Third, current academic practices place a high value on new ideas and theories. As a result, there are fashions in academic work that frequently privilege new publications over older ones. This may seem surprising since recognition within the academy requires some conformity to pre-established parameters and priorities, However, an important part of pre-established parameters requires the paying of attention to 'the dictates of academic fashion' (Winter, 1997: 211). The high premium on innovation (Ladyman, 2006) may partly result from the way that prolonged periods in education produce cognitive flexibility and receptiveness to new ideas (termed 'psychological neoteny' by Charlton, 2006). One effect of changing theoretical fashions and a fascination with the new is that 'old' political commitments can seem obsolete. Feminism and anti-racism, for example, now have a more precarious position in universities than they did fifteen years ago and are more subject to economic rationales, of student numbers or business cases for inclusion on curricula and for the employment of academics. Speaking of US universities, bell hooks (2000) suggests that:

> BELL HOOKS: One of the major differences I see in the political climate today is that there is less collective support for coming to critical consciousness--in communities, in institutions, among friends. For example, when I was coming to feminist consciousness--as one aspect of my political consciousness--at Stanford University, there was a tremendous buzz about feminism throughout the campus. Women were organizing in the dorms, women were resisting biased curriculum, all of those things. So, it really offered a kind of overall support for coming to consciousness, whereas what so frequently happens now in academic settings is that people feel much more that they don't have this kind of collective support.
> INTERVIEWER: What …contributed to that change?

BELL HOOKS: The institutionalization of Black Studies, Feminist Studies, all of these things led to a sense that the struggle was over for a lot of people and that one did not have to continue the personal consciousness-raising and changing of one's viewpoint.

Fourth, while bell hooks is talking about the United States, similar currents are evident in British universities. In addition, as Sara Ahmed (2009: 23) points out, British universities treat 'commitment as a nonperformative'. Ahmed uses the example of the ways in which universities deal with diversity and equality legislation to suggest that that universities' commitment can be viewed as 'speech acts', which do not commit them to action on diversity and equality. In making her case, Ahmed draws on Judith Butler's (1993) notion that performativity requires reiterative and citational practices that produce the effects they name. In contrast, however, speech acts that commit the university to equality work 'precisely by not bringing about the effects that they name' and so are nonperformative (Ahmed, 2009: 24). Universities are, therefore, more concerned with diversity management than with effecting equality with the result that their enforced commitment to diversity and equality is complicit in maintaining the status quo with regard to power relations.

Universities have, in addition, adopted features over the last 15 years that make them neoliberal. Bronwyn Davies (2005) suggests that an illusion of individual autonomy is created within neoliberal systems. By this, she means that academics are required collectively to invent the neoliberal systems they are part of, continually reconceptualizing what they do in a context where they are subject to surveillance and where consumption is foregrounded (with students, for example, constructed as consumers). The result is that the self is cut adrift from the social and from values while being expected to take individual responsibility.

Continuing feminist innovation in academia

These conditions could be argued to make universities difficult, or even impossible, sites for innovative feminists. Yet, feminism and anti-racism are imbricated in universities even if they cannot always be spoken. For example, since second-wave feminisms developed, feminists have struggled to bring about conceptual redefinitions and changes in university and wider academic practices, sometimes at great cost (e.g. Ahmed, 2009; Gill, 2009; Wilkinson, 1997). While it is the case that feminists tend to engage in less campaigning and overt challenge as they become more senior (Stevi Jackson, 2010), many continue to speak out against inequities and to produce carefully nuanced, complexly psychosocial feminist work. Such work is characterised by three features amongst others: an engagement with ambivalence ; nuanced and sympathetic interrogation of intersectional meanings and a complex and critical politics of location. An example of each of these three characteristics can help to make this clear.

Engaging with ambivalence

Gail Lewis's (2009a, b) 'Animating hatreds: research encounters' and 'Birthing racial difference: conversations with my mother' are rare examples of feminist engagement with ambivalence. In the example below Lewis stages an imagined conversation in which she confronts her white (and now dead) mother about the ambivalence she displayed to her daughter's mixed parentage. The article is sympathetic to both the mother's and daughter's contradictory and painful positioning and ambivalence. The article helps to take forward feminist understanding of the relation between intimate citizenship, mother daughter relationships and racialisation in familial, household and social spaces. It demonstrates Firat et al's (2009) conceptualisation of the linkages between commitment as complicity and the inextricable linking of the political and personal (as, for example, in the extract below).

So I guess what I'm saying Mum is that their circling penetrated our life-world: entered my psyche and I think in part gave contours and content to your maternal ambivalence. And Mum, the impact of a mother's relationships – with partners, family, friends – and her social experiences do produce an ambivalence in her toward her children...

So it wasn't about separation, was it Mum. I mean you – we, were all living together but it didn't mean that all racial cleavage and antagonism disappeared from our lives, did it. And I don't mean just antagonisms that came from outside like when we were petrol bombed in the middle of the Notting Hill Riots in 1958/9 when white 'Teddy boys' had attacked black people in and around that area and Kelso Cochrane had been murdered by racists.

Nuanced and sympathetic interrogation of intersectional meanings

Within the academy many feminists have produced nuanced intersectional analyses that can be used to interrogate meanings sympathetically while contextualising understandings of everyday practices in feminist, anti-racist and social class politics. For example, Avtar Brah (1999) uses the biography of a white woman who found the change of Southall from being a white working class area to a predominantly Asian one unbearable, to imagine the contours of that experience, while analysing her interpellation, as an Asian woman, into racist discourses. The fact that she does this partly through using Urdu concepts related to inclusion and exclusion helps to produce analyses that are rich insightful and unexpected

Here we encounter feminized commonsense with its fantasy of tranquil and tidy rural domesticity which is 'mucked .up', disrupted by the 'intruders' with their alien foods and unfamiliar smells. …The 'intruder' is discursively embodied as a form of aggressive masculinity. This discourse constructs Southall in terms of a vulnerable feminized space and displaces female anxiety about Male aggression into a fear of the colonialism's 'Other'. This is partially achieved by transmuting colonial immigrant labour into the figure of 'colonizer': Asians come to be represented as having 'taken over', as the discourse converts the transgressed-against into the transgressors/…/

How far was the husband's 'lived' masculinity implicated in Jean's demise? This is not a question of apportioning blame, but rather a point about the psychological and emotional fallout of 'living' social relations of gender where the trope of 'good wife' works to make the woman feel so hopelessly inadequate that she must feel that she is 'in his way'. (Brah, 1999)

Both the examples above demonstrate curiosity and openness about a specific woman's psyche within the complex social contexts in which they lived. Both engage with the ways in which the authors (Lewis and Brah) are interpellated into the stories they tell. They treat people as complex and holistic, rather than as two dimensional and occupying binary the positions and in doing so, also demonstrate the inextricable linking of the personal and political.

Critical politics of location

The third and final example is of Kathy Davis's (2008) *The Making of Our Bodies, Ourselves: How feminism travels across borders*. Davis provides a careful analysis of how the long-established *Our Bodies, Ourselves* Boston Women's Health Collective deal with the issues raised by being the producers of a feminist self-help text that has travelled the globe. Davis's analysis interrogates questions about travelling theory and transnational feminisms, including issues of translation, racism and ethnocentrism; how commonalities and differences intersect and the ways in which feminist politics are historically and geographically specific. Perhaps more than any other feminist group they help to illuminate possibilities for collaboration and duration in feminist praxis

as well as what can go wrong in collaborations across constructed racialised, ethnicised and national boundaries.

Continuing feminist futures

The above examples of psychosocial feminist work are heartening as signifiers demonstrating that feminist theorisation and practices are alive in universities. They indicate that there continue to be collective spaces for feminist work in the academy and so, sustainable feminist futures, albeit ones that necessitate struggle to keep them alive.

Janet Holland's practices exemplify the ways in which such feminist spaces can be used productively over decades of collaboration. Her work is characterised by collaboration and engagement, collegiality born of feminist commitment, recognition of power relations, curiosity and openness about meanings and theoretical and methodological innovation. She has made enormous contributions to capacity building and to innovation in theory and in a range of substantive areas. Her work attends to feminist, intersectional perspectives (e.g. Holland, 2009) and addresses power relations and difference in non-essentialist ways, often demonstrating the efficacy of quiet, determined resistance. In keeping with feminist ambitions, she has helped to put experience into academic canon in new ways, particularly in her pioneering of qualitative longitudinal research, drawing on Haug et al's (1987) memory work.

Janet's long career in research has consistently served to make people's own meanings and agency central in ways that fit with psychosocial conceptualisations (e.g. Henderson et al., 2007). Yet, while she has contributed to changing the research landscape, she refuses the cult of the individual, taking pains to ensure that collective support and conviviality are available to those with whom she works. She provides at least partial answers to the question of how to do commitment and complicities in ways that do not reproduce (in)equalities, but rather promote intersectional equalities. Hers is undoubtedly an example of collaboration and duration in feminist praxis.

References

Ahmed, Sara (2009) 'Commitment as a nonperformative'. In Begum Ozden Firat, Sarah de Mul, and Sonja van Wichelen (2009) *Commitment and Complicity in Cultural Theory and Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan

Ahmed, Sara (2007) 'Feminist politics', an Interview with Sara Ahmed by Salla Tuori and Salla Peltonen *NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 15*(4): 257 – 264.

Brah, Avtar (1999) 'The scent of memory: strangers, our own and others'', *Feminist Review 61* (Spring): 4-26.

Butler, Judith (1993) *Bodies That Matter: On the discursive limits of 'sex'*. New York: Routledge.

Charlton Bruce (2006) 'The rise of the boy-genius: psychological neoteny, science and modern life'. *Medical Hypotheses*. 2006: 67: 679–81.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). 'Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: a black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics'.. *University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1989:* 139-168.

Davies, B. (2005) 'The impossibility of intellectual work in neoliberal regimes'. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 26(*1):1-14.

Davis, Kathy (2008) *The Making of Our Bodies, Ourselves: How feminism travels across borders*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Firat**,** B. O.; de Mul, S. and van Wichelen, S. (2009) *Commitment and Complicity in Cultural Theory and Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Gill, R. (2005) 'Conversation analysis'. Book review of Susan Speer, Gender Talk: Feminism, *Discourse and Society, 19*(5), 694-697.

Gill, R. (2009) 'Secrets, silences and toxic shame in the neoliberal university'. In Ryan-Flood, R. and Gill, R. (eds) *Secrecy and Silence in the Research Process: Feminist reflections.* London: Routledge*.*

Haraway, D. (1991) S*imians, Cyborgs and Women: The reinvention of nature.* New York: Routledge.

Haug, F.., Andresen, S., Bunz-Elfferding, A., Hauser, K., Lang, U., Laudan, M., et al. (1987). *Female Sexualization: A collective work of memory*. Translated by Erica Carter. London: Verso.

Henderson, S., Holland, J., McGrellis, S., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (2007) *Inventing Adulthoods: A biographical approach to youth transitions.* London: Sage.

Holland, J. (1986) *Gender and Class: Adolescent conceptions of the division of the labour.* PhD Institute of Education, University of London.

Holland, J. (2009) 'Young people and social capital: uses and abuses?' *Young 17*(4): 331–350

hooks, b. (2000) 'An Interview with bell hooks, author of Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics' by South End Press [http://www.powells.com/biblio/1-0896086135-0]

Jackson, S. (2010) 'Stevi Jackson', *Wikipedia*http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stevi_Jackson].

Ladyman, J. (2006) 'The fads and fashions of academic life'. 19 May 2006 http://www.bristol.ac.uk/news/2006/11480515327.html [Accessed 12 February 2010].

Lewis, G.(2009a) 'Animating hatreds: research, organisational secrets, emotional truths'. In R. Gill and R. Ryan-Flood (Ed.), *Secrecy and Silence in the Research Process: Feminist reflections*. London: Psychology Press.

Lewis, G. (2009b) 'Birthing racial difference: conversations with my mother'. *Studies in the Maternal*, 1(1), 1-21.

McCall, L. (2005) 'The complexity of intersectionality'. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 30*(3): 1771-800.

Said**,** Edward W. (1994) *Representations of the Intellectual*. New York: Pantheon.

Wetherell, M. (1998) 'Positioning and interpretative repertoires: conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue'. *Discourse and Society, 9*, 387-412.

Wilkinson, S. (1997) 'Still seeking transformation: feminist challenges to psychology'. In L. Stanley (ed.) *Knowing Feminisms: On Academic Borders, Territories and Tribes*. London: Sage.

Winter, B. (1997) '(Mis)representations: what French feminism *isn't'. Women's Studies International Forum, 20*(2), 211-224.

Found in voice, space and gaze: Cross cultural comparisons and translations

Elina Lahelma, Tarja Tolonen and Tuula Gordon[1]

Going international is currently the main focus at the University of Helsinki. It was not equally self evident in the eighties. When Tuula Gordon returned to Finland 1987, after having spent 19 years in London, she was international. When the research network *Gender and Education* was founded in Helsinki, our first international guest was Tuula's earlier collaborator Janet Holland. The network is now called *Education and Difference*, and it already has celebrated its 20th anniversary. Our co-operation with Janet has continued for these two decades in various projects.

In this presentation we do not only want to celebrate our warm and rewarding relations with Janet, but focus on methodological innovations in our cooperation. Some of the ways of working that were initiated jointly have remained within our Finnish networks and projects. In Finland the recognised and appreciated genre of feminist research on sociology of education has grown from this background. We mainly speak about *cross-cultural and comparative perspectives* in research that we elaborated through our Finnish-English co-operation. We will also speak about *voice, space and gaze* – these have been important observational as well as analytical themes in our work. In our joint work another important methodological innovation is *analysis through discussion.* In the conclusions we suggest what we have *found in the process of translations*. The paper draws from a couple of texts that we have written jointly (Lahelma & Gordon, forthcoming; Gordon, Holland, Lahelma & Tolonen 2005; and Gordon, Holland and Lahelma 2000).

Cross-cultural and comparative perspectives

When we have presented our joint work with Janet, we have called our ethnography *contextualised, collective, comparative and cross-cultural*. The term cross-cultural study is often used in literature as a synonym for comparative study. We have used this term differently. For us, a cross-cultural perspective means that analogical incidents are explored in various cultural contexts. The main focus is not on trying to find differences but, rather, to trace similarities in patterns or processes. The aim has been to increase our theoretical understanding through analysing cultural variation.

In the ethnographic project *Citizenship, Difference and Marginality in Schools – with Special Reference to Gender* we asked, for example, how gender is constructed in every- day life at schools, and how it is interlinked with cultural differences such as social class, ethnicity, age and sexuality. The study draws from a comparison of educational politics and policies in England and in Finland, and in cross cultural explorations in four schools; two of them in London and two in Helsinki. One school was in more middle class and two in more working class areas. At the level of policy documents, the study was comparative: we studied discourses in policy texts in both countries in order to trace similarities and differences in the new right emphases in policies in each country. The cross cultural element in our analyses meant that we combined and examined data from all four schools.

Here we give one example about explorations in the context of what we called the official, the informal and the physical school. We analysed time-space paths into which school students' and teachers' bodies are routinised in secondary school. Through the data we traced the various ways that time and space were linked to the social and cultural orders of the schools. We saw, for example, how boys negotiated with teachers about possibilities to get away from the necessities of certain spaces at certain times, for example trying to move from the compulsory desks or begging the teacher to finish the lesson a bit earlier. The next extract is from Elina's field notes of a lesson of the 7th grade in a Helsinki school.

Pete: Someone knocked [at the door].

Teacher: Still another picture.

Pete: I'll go and open the door.

Teacher: I didn't ask you to do it.

Pete: How can he get in?

Teacher: There is knocking all around here.

Pete: Hi, I forgot the folder [into the locker in the corridor], I'll get it.

Starts to walk towards the door

Teacher: No, you don't go!

Pete: It's just very close.

He gets the permission to leave. Heikki, another male student, starts to walk towards the door

Teacher [to Heikki]: YOU mustn't go!

Somewhat later Pete starts to walk again.

Pete: I took a wrong folder by accident!

The teacher does not allow him to go out. Pete still tries, but then returns to his desk.

Such incidents were regular in both Helsinki and London schools. They can sometimes be interpreted as resistance; sometimes as expressions of tiredness during what is considered a boring lesson by school students. Often they are boys' performances through which they compete with their male class mates about locations in the informal hierarchies. Often all these interpretations are interlinked.

It was after the empirically based theoretical analysis on time-space paths that we directed our attention to differences between the Helsinki and London schools and, reflecting on differences in educational policies as well, we paid further attention to the organisation of the school days. School days in Britain are longer than in Finland, including longer lunch breaks and other breaks. This gives school students more leeway to enjoy each other's company, for example, to go to hobbies, play football, chat or sit in school libraries etc. This also enables teachers to engage in informal discussions with the students. We have suggested that the short breaks between

lessons in the Helsinki schools were long enough for students to start arguments with others, but not long enough to settle them. This is one of the reasons why the informal relations of students tend to move from the times and spaces of the break into the times and spaces of teaching and learning, thus intervening into the official school.

Such interpretation was confirmed through other data. Among the several sets of data that we generated was a questionnaire for students and another for teachers. In the questionnaires we asked them to continue the sentence 'School is like …' Metaphors of students in Helsinki and London schools were different. There were several jailhouses or torture chambers in the Finnish data, not so often in the British data. The experience of being locked in a closed institution is obvious in a school that uses very tight time-space paths. Negative metaphors were also presented by some girls who were successful in academic as well as informal arenas, and who even in the interviews said that they liked their school.

Through these reflections we have reached comparative conclusions about educational policies and practices. We have argued that the tight time-space paths may contribute to the relatively poor school atmosphere in Finnish schools – a pattern sometimes suggested by comparative studies (such as PISA).

Comparative reflections

In our study we made comparisons not only between the countries and the schools, but also between boys and girls. Numerous studies suggest that the actions of girls and boys are interpreted differently by teachers. For one article Janet, Tuula, Elina and Tarja explored how we, the researchers, interpreted them. The initial analysis was made through calculations and comparisons based on our own field notes.

We realised that not only the teacher's, but also the researcher's gaze and ear were directed more often towards the boys than towards the girls. Recorded audible action consists mostly of informal interaction among the boys. During one lesson when some boys' audible action drew the main attention of all others in the classroom, some girls took care that the lesson continued along the lines that it should. The following extracts are from Tuula's observations that concentrated on girls, recording audible and visible action, as well as silence and stillness.

> Sonja answers a question that the teacher has asked. Girls are quiet all the time. Some of them look in front of them, some look around them.

> Sonja puts up her hand and teacher asks her to answer a question twice. Teacher asks her one more question. Milla puts up her hand and teacher asks her to answer a question.

> Milla goes to the teacher at the end of the lesson.

Often the girls' voices are addressed to learning, such as clarifying a given task, or answering the teacher's questions. In one of the lessons that Tarja followed, Taru and Jutta kept on chatting with each other, and so were Jaana and Leena, and no one interrupted them, as long as they did not bother others. Later on Jaana and Leena started to argue with the teacher:

> *Leena is massaging Tepa's neck. Teacher arrives.*

> Leena: I am counting how many neck vertebra Tepa has.

> Teacher: Just hurry a little. [Teacher is referring to tasks, which Leena ignores.]

> Leena: I will copy them anyway.

> Jaana: Will you massage my neck also?

> Teacher: Leena, now you stop that and start to work!

> Leena: Do you want some massage yourself?

According to Tarja's interpretation, Leena and Jaana tried to annoy the teacher after she had stopped a boy who was bringing them sweets. The girls used intimate methods to interrupt the teaching, massaging each other, and at the same time showing that their hands were not writing but busy doing something else. Boys may be critical and boisterous, and at the same time they can be seen to be fishing for the teacher's attention. But when girls are boisterous, they are interpreted as resisting the teacher. Their use of voice for challenging the teacher is in no way helping the teaching; here informal girls' culture is interrupting the official teaching. Boisterous girls are not seen as active and individualistic students like similarly acting boys often are.

The following extract is an example of a teacher noticing talkative girls. This is from Janet's notes from the Science lesson:

> The girls are a bit punchy today, lively, talkative, especially on the far table [from where I am sitting]. I later discovered that there was a change in friendship line-up going on. The teacher of this class also reported the whole class, but especially the girls, for being misbehaved.

In a conflict situation between Lasse (a boy) and Henna (a girl), observed by Elina in a Finnish school, the latter was reprimanded for her language more often than the former:

> *Lasse hoots in a shrill voice every time somebody answers incorrectly. Henna says "buuu" or "jeee" when somebody answers correctly.*

> Teacher: This is not a place for buuing.

> *Suddenly Henna turns backwards and asks Markku why he cannot take the cap from his head.*

> Lasse: He says that his hair is from ass [laughing, Markku does not laugh] he said it himself, I only repeat.

> Henna repeats laughing: From ass!

> Teacher [angry] to Henna: Do not use such language!

In conclusions of this analysis we suggested that when informal interaction catches the researcher's attention, it is very often loud boys who draw it. These actions may be part of the official agenda of the lesson, but allowed by the teacher even when they are not. Girls' audible action is interrupted more easily, and it is usually redirected to the official school. Girls' resistance as audible action is noted more easily since it is less common than that of boys.

Stillness and silence are not often quoted as action in our notes. We might have noted that "he just sits there" if we mention a quiet student at all. Some boys may have sensed this focus on action and they might test it by going to sharpen their pen in a quiet lesson, and then looking at the researcher to see if she is writing it down. However, when we noticed this, we also taught ourselves to focus on stillness and silence. We noted that the more silent girls and boys had developed a number of ways to communicate amongst themselves with less noise.

Analysis through discussion and found in translations – in various spaces of work

We have worked jointly in many different places and created spaces for reflection. Sometimes this co-operation took place at noisy schools, in restless classrooms or school yards. Often we worked, talked and edited our work at the quiet corners of hotel rooms or lobbies – sometimes making too much noise. We have discussed our data in places such as Janet and Robert's kitchen, in the archipelago of Finland, before sauna and swimming in the cold sea. The fundamental ideas of the article on girls' relations "Friends and Foes" were elaborated whilst we visited Edinburgh Castle. Ours has been a multi-sited ethnography in relation to the sites of research as well as to the sites to conduct analysis.

When we met – often using some extra days before or after conferences – we constantly talked about our data, doing comparisons about findings and preliminary interpretations. Analysis through discussion was a method that we adopted in order to share cross-cultural data, especially because the Finnish data needed to be translated in order to be shared with Janet. Having to talk and write in English has opened for us, THE FINNS – as we were regularly called here in London – new ways to conceptualise, and new ways to think. It has been tedious for us too, but also for Janet who has had a constant task to polish the "Fenglish" of Elina especially. It was tedious, but fruitful too, for Tarja to translate Janet's and colleagues' article into a Finnish Journal in 1991[2]. Therefore, rather than talking about the difficulties with working with two languages, we emphasise the possibilities that it has opened to us.

Our work in all these spaces has strongly affected us. Words, reflections, discourses, good food and wine have carved into our memories and our bodies – it is like the in-between space in a good dialog during the fieldwork, but this time it happened between us. We are happy and privileged to have had the possibility to work with Janet for all these years. Thank you Janet and congratulations. Thank you Rachel and colleagues for organising this wonderful conference.

References

Lahelma, Elina & Tuula Gordon (forthcoming 2010) 'Comparative and cross cultural research', in *Perspectives to Sociology of Education* edited by Jaakko Kauko, Risto Rinne and Heli Kynkäänniemi. Publications of the Finnish Educational Research Association.

Gordon, T., Holland, J. & Lahelma, E. (2000) *Making Spaces: Citizenship and Difference in Schools*, London: Macmillan & New York: St. Martin's Press.

Gordon, T., Holland, J., Lahelma, E. & Tolonen, T. (2005) 'Hidden from gaze: problematising action in the classroom, *Qualitative Research* 5(1): 113-131.

---

[2] Janet Holland, Caroline Ramazanogly, Sue Scott, Sue Sharpe and Rachel Thomson (1991) Painostus, vastarinta, vahvistuminen: Nuoret naiset ja turvaseksistä sopiminen [Pressure, Resistance, Empowerment: Young Women and the Negotiation of Safer Sex] Nuorisotutkimus [Journal of Youth Research] 9(2).

Collective Research Practices: Janet In The Middle

Rachel Thomson; Robert Bell; Sue Sharpe; Sheena McGrellis and Sheila Henderson

It is no coincidence that Janet Holland is at the forefront of the new research paradigm – qualitative longitudinal methods – as the twin motifs of collaboration and duration over time are the signatures of her research practice. It would be fair to say that Janet hates to end a project, and will go to great lengths to imagine the next time- horizon, be that a funding round, a publishing initiative, conference or meeting. Janet is the Queen of stretching budgets, bridging, vire-ing and keeping contract researchers on for a few more weeks, months, years - enabling them to build a serious intellectual project from the precarious landscape of contract research. Janet was part of a group who made trouble in the 1980's through the BSA Equality of the Sexes Committee, about the marginal position of contract researchers. And she was one of the first to show that it was possible to make a successful academic career from the margins, from contact researcher to research professor. The trouble that Janet and colleagues made in the 1980's resulted in an institutional response, such as the Concordat which demanded that institutions demonstrate responsibility and awareness around the employment conditions and career paths of researchers. Yet as Natasha Mauthner has pointed out, there have also been losses for contract researchers, excluded from the new 'institutional inside' that performs to the tune of the RAE and REF. It is then especially important to think about collective and enduring research collaboration at this moment in time, and to try and unpick, or simply describe some of the practice that it is made out of.

The craft

There is a growing trend towards talking about the 'craft' of social research, informed in part by an interest in what people do – embodied practices – as well as what people say. Richard Sennett writes about the 'craft of experience' in terms of the identification of techniques, that furnish 'an envelope of tacit knowledge for our actions' and which can be made 'transparent in order that others can understand and respond to it' (2008:289). And this is partly what we will try and do in this presentation – describing the techniques that form the basis of the research practice that Janet has modelled with her collaborators. Yet this is not simply a question of 'technique' but also involves a set of values, political commitments to the generation of troubling knowledge, for the researcher themselves and for the object of study. It is an approach that is in keeping with Dorothy Smith's most recent articulation of institutional ethnography where she argues for a research practice that 'takes up women's standpoint, not as a given and finalised form of knowledge but as a ground in experience from which discoveries are to be made' (2005). Discovery demands creativity, and collective creativity has to be nurtured (Thomson and McLeod 2009).

The cast

Janet has a long and illustrious research career, and has collaborated with many people on projects such as Girls and Occupational Choice, and the evaluations of CLASH and Angel project. Our focus here is on a series of overlapping research collaborations that took Janet from the Women. Risk ad Aids project in 1990, though it's various stages and elaborations, through the series of projects that we have come to know as the 'Inventing Adulthood' study 1996- date. Some of us like Sue Sharpe and Rachel Thomson have a continuous involvement over this 20

year period, others like Sheena McGrellis and Sheila Henderson joined later, while the involvement of those like Sue Scott, Robert Bell, Tina Grigoriou, Jorge Camancho and Debbie Holder was time limited. Janet's research collaboration with Caroline Ramazanoglu was particularly important, involving groundbreaking theoretical and methodological work. We have constructed today's presentation from contributions from some of those who have worked closely with Janet over the years as well as those, like Robert Bell who joined a well established group:

> I'd just met four women who were to be my colleagues for the next few years. One in particular looked at me suspiciously, over glasses. I think she was the leader. What planet had I come from? What sort of man was I to think he could join this group?

> A few weeks later I was rolling up to her house in north London, puzzled by what was in store. They were all waiting there, and some breakfast was being prepared. I leaned on the kitchen counter and – to my horror – a large chunk of Janet's worktop came off in my hand. I jammed it back in place, but she didn't really notice or care. I liked her laid back style.

Spaces and places

Anyone who has worked with Janet knows how central 47 Dalmeny Road is to how she works. Some of us, like Sue and Rachel, have actually *lived* in the house, later settling on having a work-space there that allows for the generative merging of books, plastic folders, propeller pencils, and a single wireless network. Many books have been written under its roof, it offers refuge to travelling academics and poverty stricken researchers and has one of the best collections of feminist theory of any London library. For Rachel:

> It was the epitome of a North London bohemian house. The corridor wallpapered by an ordinance survey map of London, with the Thames winding its way from the Medway near the door, through to Lechlade by the stairs. On the other side a series of framed print of steel point engravings of Thameside in the 16th century, rendered side on, the south bank the place of marshes and fun, the northside of palaces and St Pauls. Down stairs to an open plan kitchen opening onto French windows and garden.

Sue Sharpe elaborates:

> As well as working at our desks, in the summer sunshine our notes and papers (and Ambre Solaire) would often be taken and spread out either in the garden or on the bathroom roof. And after a long days work there was always a pleasant glass of wine to enjoy.

It is impossible to divorce Janet's research practice from the house. Maybe this is because as an itinerant researcher she moved between institutions, often with her desk contained in the boot of her car or her trolley on wheels. Before the introduction of the congestion charge, Janet's car was one of her 'spaces', a place for conversation and communication:

> One day when I needed to get to South East London in a hurry to interview someone, she tossed me her car keys. 'Don't smash it up'. I preferred her car when I was driving. She got very animated when she was telling stories, at roundabouts in particular, waving her hands about and drifting across lanes. It made me nervous, but I enjoyed the lift home.

And of course we sometimes met in institutional settings: at the Institute of Education, or at South Bank. But a proper meeting has to be outside of the university, and around a kitchen table, usually Janet's but sometimes the table of other team members or in rented houses in the various locations of our occasional research weekends. For our research weekends there was always a good balance of concentrated work time and play time, and the enjoyment of walks and meals

and general appreciation of whatever beach or country environment we were in, fed back into the productivity of these days. It is interesting to reflect on what was behind the need to escape the institution – perhaps a freedom, a sense of doing the work because we want to – a personal investment. Yet there was a discipline, in fact a steely discipline, which centred on an agenda, minute taking and agreed actions.

This is where they worked, all around the kitchen table, a computer purring and conversation turned into minutes, decisions recorded, but also creativity, ideas and fun. Janet wrote the minutes, in fact wrote everything always. The short hand secretary's habit of a life time, turned ethnographic prowess. This took the pressure off the others who enjoyed the privilege of the chat, the play, and bouncing off each other. Sometimes the dynamics were difficult, people were stressed and angry, feeling under pressure to volunteer for activity. They instigated a new practice at this point, going round in a circle first, and all listing their 'to do' list, to save them from panicking in the meeting.

Practices

At the heart of our team work there were three connected practices: minutes, memories and munchies. It is impossible to disentangle them. Munching (or eating and drinking) requires little explanation. Minute taking represents the purposefulness of our interactions, the use of the research meeting as the vehicle through which the collective does its work, makes decisions consensually, deciding what is important, planning the period before the next meeting. Sheena explains:

Rachel took orders for tea and coffee. Janet popped the croissants in the oven. The laptop was switched on and a file opened to record the minutes of the FF meeting. Present - SH, JH RT SFS SMG. We shuffled into our seats, organised our notes for the meeting, decided on chocolate or plain croissants, and caught up with each other – sharing the latest joys, the current worries, any news. Just taking a bit of time to check out how we all were behind those initials.

And so we turned our attention to the agenda. It was certainly a challenging and ambitious one and we settled in for an all day, intensive, meeting. Working our way through we debated, we considered, we argued, we laughed, we cried, we sighed, we listened, we decided. In the middle of it all was support and supervision, encouragement and challenge and friendship.

Memory work, for those who don't know, is a complementary research practice, developed by feminist researchers in the 1980s as a tool for researching the self as a necessary step in researching the social (see McLeod and Thomson 2009 for overview). It involves agreeing a trigger word, and writing a memory – usually from childhood – in the third person ('she was') and sharing it in written form with the research group. The memory texts form the starting point for an exploration of a theme, as well as providing a means of communication between the group. We got into the habit of memory work in the late 1980's and have continued it since, convinced of its power as a creative method and as a method for forging understanding within a group. As Sheena McGrellis explains, it usually comes at the end of the meeting.

At 5pm we wrapped the meeting up with champagne and memory work. Sue had brought fancy chocolates, Sheila had brought smoked salmon. A mixture of nibbles tempted us as we shared our thoughts and observations on the memories we brought to the table. What a powerful tool. And one that worked so well in this collective work environment - underpinned as it was by friendship, trust, honesty and diversity. Slightly lightheaded, with champagne and emotion I

dandered back to Tufnell Park Tube. A slightly unusual but wonderful way to spend a working day I mused

Sheila Henderson elaborates:

'Right', 'wrong', 'trust', 'leaving', 'believe', 'secret', 'decisions', 'me', 'critical moment', 'home', 'being different': these were some of the words they used to trigger memories of their childhood and, later, teen years. The process of writing a memory, reading those of other team members and reflecting on them all collectively at team meetings was an important part of their reflexive research methodology - but it was much more than that. There, around the table in Janet's kitchen, the bubbles of the fizzy white wine they always drank at this point fused with these bubbles from the past as they discussed them. Whatever anxieties, stresses, annoyances may have been felt or voiced during the long day of working together simply dissolved, leaving only the taste of the collective fun, creativity and intimacy of their collaboration. Repeated over the years, this activity became a valued part of their shared history – as friends and colleagues. And the cornerstone of this shared history was Janet's kitchen table, somehow the powerful and seemingly timeless symbol of Janet's commitment to collective working.

Writing

Of all the research practices, writing is perhaps the hardest to share or to pull off in a genuine collective model. It is in relation to writing and publishing that the politics of the academy have become most acute. Collective writing has never been so hard, discouraged by publishers, research managers, mentors and the REF. Yet there are many ways to explore the potentials of representing collective research, and as a team we have explored many of the options.

- The 'first draft' approach. Where one person writes a first draft and becomes in what is now archaic technical speak 'the disk mistress', collating and integrating everyone' comments – prefiguring the 'track changes' programme by the use of CAPS and brackets (which is in fact still a better option).
- We have also developed a style in which the multi-vocality of the team can be expressed through layers of researchers voice, with field notes and analytic commentaries quoted alongside 'data'. This means that the voice of the researchers are preserved, even where they are not writing the articles.
- We have perfected the well-timed multi-person presentation, as well as experimented with systems of authorship that give everyone a fair share.
- We continue to explore ways in which the individual may speak from the group, and the group from the individual, combining individual and different combinations within collective authorship. With both single and jointly authored books and articles arising from the collective work
- We have left a record of collective work in our methodological writings and in the archive of the Inventing Adulthoods study.

Janet in the middle

It is strangely hard to keep Janet at the centre of this account, and perhaps that is how she would like it. Always happier as part of an ensemble rather than at centre stage, yet quietly ensuring that the stage exists in the first place. Janet may be quiet but she has the character and the skills of the boss. Robert Bell was right when he identified her as 'the leader', but not in any straightforward, or recognisable form:

At first, Janet's absolute humility threw me. It isn't a quality associated with academia. But I began gradually to sense that I was working with someone really quite extraordinary. She is a leader by example. She's not a big mouth. In fact, she used to hate presenting – probably still does. I've not met anyone like her since, and I realise that from her I learned a lot about team work, leadership, and tenacity.

Janet has experienced her own share of frustrations with collective work, wondering if her contribution is recognised and valued – and we appreciate the opportunity provided by today to communicate the very high regard we have for her as a friend and a colleague. Sue Sharpe explains:

Although Janet and I shared anxieties about giving presentations, we supported each other in this, Janet going on to overcome hers enough to successfully give papers in places all over the world. Living and subsequently keeping on a workroom in Dalmeny road gave me space and creative atmosphere to write several books, in addition to working with Janet on several other projects at the Institute of Education and then at South Bank. Janet is very generous in lots of ways, including her readiness to help in talking through research work, and her constant interest in whatever people are working on. Her concern with not only her work, but the wellbeing of all the researchers involved with all of her projects, and the time and energy she has spent obtaining funding for people such as myself to continue doing the research they enjoy, let alone keeping the wolf from the door, makes her for me and many others much more than a project director or co-worker, but a special and much valued friend

Conclusion

Our time is already over, and we have only begun to pick at the surface. What we have omitted to say entirely is how extraordinarily powerful these research collaborations have been. The two groups of studies: WRAP and Inventing Adulthoods have both made a mark, influencing academic communities, policy and practice. They are studies known around the world, and admired for their innovations. Working in research collectives involves a pooling of resources, meaning that a wide range of skills are deployed in making the most of all elements of the research process: locating the study within existing literatures; designing elegant methods; generating data; analysis and writing and dissemination. Real impact takes a long time to reveal itself. For research to really make a mark on the world requires more than one individual, working together purposefully over time. For relationships such as this to endure over time requires flexibility, informality and friendship.

References

McLeod, J. and Thomson, R. (2009) *Researching Social Change: Qualitative Approaches*, London: Sage.

Sennett, R. (2008) *The Craftsman*, London: Penguin.

Smith, D. (2005) *Institutional Ethnography: A Sociology for People*, Rowman and Littlefield.

The Women's Group

Lesley Caldwell, Pat Dyehouse, Maureen McNeil, Mica Nava, Sara Rance, Gella Varnava Skoura

For about 33 years Janet has been a member of a Women's Group, an informal grouping that began in an academic setting, but which has not been an academic, research, publishing, or campaigning collective. *The* **Women's Group** (as we refer to it) began its life in the Sociology Department in the Institute of Education of the University of London in l976, at the instigation of Diana Leonard, who was the first female lecturer to be appointed to that department. It drew together relatively atomised women who 'belonged' to that department. When we joined we were postgraduate students, researchers, and administrative staff. Although a number of us felt like satellites in relation to the male teaching staff, the diversity in our relations with the department was great, and so were our socio-cultural and our professional (or unprofessional) pasts.

In the beginning the group met in Janet's room at the Institute on a weekly basis. In the early days, students from different parts of the world joined the group and then returned to their country of origin. However, by 1978 a core of eleven had emerged and we made the decision then that it should be a closed group. In fact, the membership has now been fixed for over 31 years. The members who made the brief presentation at the celebration of Janet's working life in December 2009 are: Lesley Caldwell, Pat Dyehouse, Maureen McNeil, Mica Nava, Sara Rance, and Gella Varnava Skoura. The other members of the group include: Barbara Cook (who lived in the Southeast of England but who sadly died shortly after Janet's celebration), Catherine Kenrick (Chile), Jean Spence (Northeast England), and Judi Stevenson (Canada).

Janet was the last member of the group to leave the Institute of Education but, before she left, we had started to meet in the homes of those who lived in London. Once that happened, the meetings revolved around meals (usually dinners) and, although we occasionally get together in restaurants, this pattern has persisted. There is no rigid or fixed scheduling of our get-togethers, but over the last thirty-one years, there has almost always been at least one meeting per month. Members of the group have stayed in London, left London, returned to London, some have returned to their country of origin, some have moved around the UK, and all, in somewhat different ways, have remained committed members of this group and been mutually supportive. There has been only one meeting outside of London during the lifetime of the group.

The group began at a time when feminist consciousness-raising groups were springing up in the UK and elsewhere. Now such groups have become things of the past and we believe that we are probably the longest surviving (slowest?!) conscious-raising group in the UK. The founding of the group came out of our common need and wishes to understand and cope better with the multiple realities of our personal and professional worlds. The trust and support for each other which developed over the years has played a significant role in all our lives. However, maintaining this has not always been easy. In some respects we have constituted a sort of alternative family and our group dynamic sometimes mimics traditional family patterns, in both positive and negative ways.

Over the years the group has been exciting and serious, and yet there has always been lots of laughter. We have followed each other's lives, professions, relationships, families, both in detail and in broad sweeps and there has been a continuous experience of relationship within the group and between individual members that has been challenging, enriching, and supportive. Our

meetings are informal and usually, but not always, the host does the cooking. Although there is some variation in the form of the meeting, we try to make sure that everyone has an equal chance to speak about whatever they decide to bring to the meeting. We pick-up the threads of each-other's life narratives when we get together and sometimes these sound like the plots of interlocking soap-operas.

Janet has been at the heart of the group from its outset --sustaining the group and making it possible. She has been the prime facilitator of the group: chivvying, encouraging, providing space, food, drink, shelter (she and Robert often provide accommodation for those of us visiting from outside London), and a sense of welcome that has never faded, and which is always reliable. Robert, also, despite being excluded from his kitchen when the group meets, has accepted this, welcomed and offered his never-ending hospitality to all of us. Their generosity has been unstinting. Although there has never been a group leader, and despite the meetings having moved, in recent times, between the homes of the remaining four permanent residents of London, over the middle years of the group's life, it was Janet who held us close to the centre of it, however far away, individually, we had flown.

Indeed, Janet has played a crucial role in holding the group together, keeping links with out-of-London members and maintaining the momentum when it begins to falter. In the group, as in the rest of her life, she is ever generous with her convivial hospitality and her attention to others. Her ability to remember what is going on in our individual lives and those of our loved ones is also remarkable.

Despite her centrality within the group, Janet is characteristically self-effacing. In fact, her anxiety about public speaking (which some other members of the group share and to which she is sensitive and sympathetic), extends to the more private sphere of the women's group in that she is often reluctant to take her turn in speaking in our meetings. We have become used to Janet's opening gambit: that she has nothing to say. Without giving away any of her confidences within the group, it will not be a surprise to many that we have often heard stories of her working incredibly hard and we have devoted a good deal of time (largely unsuccessfully) trying to get Janet to take it easier, to work less, to acknowledge and celebrate her range of achievements, etc. Her modesty invariably wins out and any suggestion that she should rest on her laurels gets short shrift.

The Women's Group continues to be an important part of each of our lives and we value our sharing of over thirty years of rich encounters with each other and the vibrant collective life within and through the group. Despite our consensual assessment on this, this contribution to Janet's testimonial constitutes the first piece of public writing about the group. This is particularly remarkable because many of us are writers of some kind in our professional lives. Even the prospect of producing this little publication generated some unease: about 'going public'; about bringing our private practices and bonds into the public domain; about how we could and should represent the group and Janet's role in it. Indeed, somewhat ironically, the assemblage of this piece replicates the more general pattern of how Janet makes things happen within our group and in other collective contexts. Once again, it is Janet who has stirred us and, without making demands or without even speaking, she has got us to do something we would never have done otherwise. She has created a space for us to reflect on and celebrate our collectivity—in this case, to do this through a bit of writing that we have often talked about, but never quite managed. Once again, she has been at the centre, sustaining another form of our collective activity and life. So, we take this opportunity to thank her for her generosity, her collective spirit, and for her friendship which has sustained us both individually and collectively --within our very special Women's Group.

Publishing as activism

Robert Albury and Dave Hill

Robert Albury writes:

It was back in 1984 when I was forced — in a manner of speaking — to buy my first Macintosh computer. I say forced because not only did I realise that home computers were going to be something everyone would want and I wanted one, but also because I thought that it would enable Janet to spend less time on the electric typewriter.

It had only been a couple of years before that when Janet had prepared some kind of annotated bibliography on women's status around the world for Unesco[i].

This involved her manically translating the annotations from various brands of English, typing them out and then retyping them. The entries would then be cut into strips and laid out on the floor in an assortment of different patterns obeying some kind of sociological logic. Each new floor pattern required more typing until the electric typewriter developed a peculiar complaining whine of protest and third world forests began to be denuded of their wood pulp.

Needless to say she was locked away in the back bedroom only occasionally emerging to eat and sleep.

I thought a computer with word processing and a database programmes would solve that. How wrong I was.

Janet took to the computer like a duck to water. Of course computers were not new to her. She had already enjoyed the pleasure of punching cards and booking a few seconds of computer time on a mainframe.

I don't quite know who came up with the idea of writing the best selling novel but with discussion it was felt that a romantic novel would be the best route to fame and fortune.

It was a collaborative enterprise.

The Mills and Boone project began - a group of six of us would congregate to each write a chapter and then edit each others and aim to produce a book in a week. Written by three academics, one psychotherapist, a solicitor and myself.

It was a great success.

Of course the romantic novels had to espouse certain equal opportunity and feminist principles but that was not a problem. After all three of the group were members of an exclusive club innocently called the Women's Group.

The collective - which we called the text factory produced two, how best to describe them, pilot novels? These were sent off to Mills and Boon.

The novels were brilliant. What else could they be? — the romances could hardly fail. They contained all the right adjectives - powerful, rasping, rich, arrogant, handsome, young, beautiful, shy, vulnerable, plucky, blistering, red-hot, chic, glamorous, independent and succulent and sensual. The women in the romances had equality. The characters smouldered, despaired,

misunderstood, argued and fought and then kissed and the plots were suitably unrealistic and would confound any rational person.

We sent the manuscripts - possible the best romantic novels ever written - off to Mills and Boon.

They rejected them

Of course we then realised that they were too advanced for their time; Mills and Boon did not know what modern romance and what modern readers wanted. In other words we discovered that the publishers were crap.

All this coincided with the then Thatcher government — or as Janet like to refer to it as those bastards. She was incensed that they were ruining the education system. We even had to buy the Mail on Sunday just to be up to date with their perverse thinking and prejudices.

What became clear was that we had to generate a countervailing body of thought.

What to do?

Publishers were crap, and television was not much better — dependant on print for their ideas. The answer was obvious, we should start our own publishing venture.

After all academic publishers did not pay much in royalties and academics had to get published as part of the research career structure.

Why not publish pamphlets - quick and easy to produce able to react to current events, confront the Thatcher policies and give the authors half the profit. It all therefore had a strong socialist underpinning - taking control of the means of production and furthering the revolution.

We already had some of the means of production - the Apple Macintosh - all we needed was the latest — very expensive — new toy on the block - a laser printer.

I managed to persuade the people where I worked that a laser printer was indispensable for their future, something I could use when nobody was around, and we were ready to go.

The first publications were going to be the Women Risk and AIDs working papers; that is until Janet decided that the Hillcole writing group should do more than just write, they should publish as well.

So the Tufnell Press was born and both WRAP and Hillcole achieved remarkable levels of dissemination of their work.

And surely it was no accident that Thatcher and the Conservatives were overthrown and our collaborative romances no doubt unknowingly inspired others such as Nicci French; Margaret Weis; Jenny Crusie ; Bob Mayer and others too famous to list here!

David Hill writes:

How lovely to be invited to share in this celebration of Janet Holland's life, career and activism! I'm so pleased to be hear to pay tribute to, and to thank Janet for her teamwork, fun, warmth, organising ability, socialist commitment, humanity- and for `being right'! Janet and I first met when Mike Cole and I founded the Hillcole Group of Radical Left Educators in 1989. This was in the really dark days of Thatcherism. The Left was taken by surprise, and in retreat- especially after

the defeat of The Great Miners' Strike of 1984-5. In retreat organisationally, in terms of ideology and policy- and also in terms of left activists having a hard time- in academia as elsewhere.

I had recently gone more deaf/ hearing disabled, and was moving out of Labour Party activism and elections. As a politician you have to be able to hear the insults! In addition, Labour was also moving rightwards, from the eighties/ Kinnock onwards. So Mike and I, who knew each other from various picket lines and politics, decided to invite a number of left academics- people involved in feminist, anti-racist, anti-homophobic and class politics- socialists- to `fightback' to organise and publish, to write, to develop critiques of the Radical Right. Also, proactively, to develop socialist education ideas and policy. The initial members were mainly people who had written with Mike previously. Janet was one of them. Other early members included Caroline Benn, Anne-Marie Davies, Rehana Minhas, Tamara Sivanandan (then Jakubowska) and Jan Lee. Others soon joined, including Stephen Ball and Gaby Weiner (for the first few years), Meg Maguire, Rosalyn George, Glenn Rikowski, Imelda Gardiner, John Clay, Clyde Chitty, Ken Jones, Andy Green. (Richard Hatcher Shane Blackman, Julian Wooton and Martin Allen were later members).

What did the Hillcole Group try to do?

We tried to write collaboratively, to work as a writing group, not just a discussion group. We wanted to have impact. The collaborative aspect was important. Now I'm a pretty clever chap! I've got GCE O levels! But I have a healthy respect for the limitations of my own intelligence. I ain't brilliant! I've always believed that two minds- or ten- are likely to be much more productive than just mine, than just one mind. Our three aims were: 1. To improve the quality of schooling and teacher education; 2. to respond rapidly to the assaults by the radical right on the quality of education; and 3. to influence policy and decision making on educational matters.

But what did we do?

Well, we didn't do much of the first, other than perhaps tangentially in our own and our readers' practices as teachers and political agitators. We were able to respond quickly to attacks on radical (left) education by such radical right groups as the Hillgate Group. When Robert (Albury) set up Tufnell Press to publish our booklets, we were able indeed to `get in quick'. And as for influencing policy and decision making on educational matters, Tony Blair and New Labour soon stopped all that. (Until 1994 we were, some of us, involved in (Old) Labour Party discussions at national level. That shuddered to a halt when Blair became leader of `New' Labour).

We wanted to change the world! We still do! We were hugely unsuccessful! In that enterprise, anyhow. But we did change ourselves. We did change each other. And we did give each other emotional support when professionally and politically times were grim, and we gave each other intellectual support and stimulus and laughs and `belonging' and a particular focus, with our regular fortnightly or monthly work meetings, collaborative writing, collaborative critique meetings. As Mike Cole says, Hillcole's `strengths were its basic democracy and comradeliness at the meetings and its uncompromising commitment to democratic socialism'.

Arguing and Collaborating: Collective Work

Janet commented `I enjoyed the meetings, and organising them in various places over the years, and particularly enjoyed the discussions of the books, which I think were really democratically and collectively worked on'.

How we argued, over each line of some of our joint writing! How some of us hated each other! But this was suffused in and worked into scintillating and vibrant argumentation, dispute, analysis, lexis. We argued together, drank Tony Benn's tea together, sometimes drank together- we

worked together! Resulting in our improved collaborative understanding and into our booklets and books.

As Glenn Rikowski noted:

> For those involved in the *Rethinking* project (one of our two books, *Rethinking Educationand Democracy: A Socialist Alternative for the 21st Century* (1997)) it was an exciting, but exhausting time. The intensity of debate on educational theory, policy, history, principles and practice was experienced to a degree few of us had found elsewhere. This was 'education, education, education', raw and live! Caroline Benn kept this all together, and with Clyde Chitty she ensured that ideas were transformed into text. Caroline played a leading role in welding our debates and ideas into a coherent whole. She was absolutely determined that although individuals held views on education most deeply, a *collective* view emerged. That it did was mainly due to Caroline and the organisational work of Janet Holland.

Our books and booklets were unsuccessful, too. Unsuccessful in terms of mass readership at any rate. The most any of our 11 booklets and 2 books sold was around a thousand. *But* as Janet has commented, and Robert, too, some bought the booklets and books, but more read them. They were passed around- if not like the Russian oppositional *samizdats*, then at least our publications and ideas became known in little corners of probably every university in the country. And they got into many university libraries.

I go round the world, and up and down the country, making speeches on (our) socialist ideas, socialist education, socialism- sometimes to mass audiences- of five people. Sometimes more. And during that period of Hillcole, 1989 to 2001, especially during the Thatcher era, whenever I went to a different university, someone would, nervously glancing around, approach me and say things like- `thank goodness for the Hillcole stuff. At least someone, some people are fighting back, and keeping the flame of socialist education alive'.

How did the Hillcole Group function? Now I thought that I was a pretty key figure- I chaired all but one of the meetings over the 11 years. I thought I was pretty important. But most people, apparently thought the two key figures were Caroline Benn and Janet!

Pat Ainley's view is that the Hillcole Group

> gathered a range of talent and expertise across the range of educational research and informed opinion around the unifying figure of Caroline Benn, who was its emotional heart, while Janet Holland, another hard-working and dedicated individual, provided its organisational muscles by keeping meetings minuted and ordered with exemplary efficiency.

Organisation And that's what Janet did. Organised us. Kept is on track. Took clear, judicious and full minutes. She's still got them! Being here today at this celebration of Janet's work, listening to the various groups such as the Womens Group she was involved in over the same (indeed, a far longer) period has made me realise what she did with her evenings- she was trotting off to one meeting/ group one night, organising it, keeping it on track, and the next night, trotting off and doing the same for another group! And she's still doing it!

Culture Wars We did engage in `the culture wars', we did contest the then rapidly advancing ideological hegemony of the radical right. That first neoliberal/ neoconservative onslaught was a shock- it took us by surprise, challenging, and reversing the social democratic gains (health,

education, trade union and workers' rights, equalities legislation regarding sex and `race') of the thirty-year post war social democratic era.

It is different today. Today (regrettably) the neoliberal and neoconservative discourse of *The Daily Mail*, of commentators like Melanie Phillips are no longer widely seen as shocking, with their depiction of feminist analysis as `feminazism', and their labelling of class analysis as `class envy'.

The need for our Marxist, and feminist, and anti-racist academic analysis that Janet has devoted her career to, and to getting stuck in on the ideological battleground through publications (as Hillcole did and Janet does), and through political activism (as many of us do, whether in the micro- interpersonal (and/) or on the macro-public stage (and in street confrontations, too) remains an ever-present need.

Being Usually Right. So, through the nineties we did establish a presence (and, indeed, initially, some publicity, too). And that was important. And Janet is still doing it. Necessarily so.

I'll leave the last word on the Hillcole Group to Janet. Her summing up about it is that

> The Hillcole Group was always important to me, and I think it had some influence, as Mike says, despite the pamphlets not necessarily selling well. I think they were read a lot, (i.e. one person buys, more read) like newspapers, though not, obviously, in such large numbers.

Her concluding remark, the remark with which I conclude this brief tribute to her and her work in/ with the Hillcole Group, is this: she concludes,

> I also liked the way we were usually right, so to speak.

Details of Hillcole Group publications can be seen at the appropriate Tufnell press webpages at http://www.tpress.free-online.co.uk/hillpubs.html

Hillcole Booklets/ papers were:

Hillcole Paper 1 (1989) was Dave Hill's *Charge of the Right Brigade: The Radical Right's Attack on Teacher Education*

Hillcole Paper 2 (1990) was Ann Marie Davies, Janet Holland and Rehana Minhas' *Equal Opportunities in the new ERA*

Hillcole Paper 3 (1990) was Dave Hill's *Something Old, something new, something borrowed, something blue: Schooling, teacher education and the Radical Right in Britain and the USA*

Hillcole Paper 4 (1990) was Pat Ainley's *Training turns to Enterprise: Vocational education in the market place*

Hillcole Paper 5 (1990) was Stephen Ball's *Markets Morality and Education.*

Hillcole Paper 6 (1991) was Dave Hill's *What's Left in teacher education.*

Hillcole Paper 7 (1993) *Falling Apart: the coming crisis of Conservative education*, written by Pat Ainley, Caroline Benn, Shane Blackman, John Clay, Mike Cole, Imelda Gardiner, Andy Green, Dave Hill, Janet Holland and Ken Jones.

Hillcole Paper 9 (1993) was *Whose Teachers: a radical manifesto,* written by John Clay, Mike Cole, Dave Hill, Ros George, Meg Maguire, Imelda Gardiner (with comments by Caroline Benn, Shane Blackman, Andy Green, Janet Holland and Gaby Weiner).

The two Hillcole books are

(1997) *Rethinking Education and Democracy: a Socialist Alternative for the Twenty- First Century*, London: Tufnell Press, (102pp).

(1991) *Changing the Future: Redprint for Education*, London: Tufnell Press (199pp).

(1999) Dave Hill, Mike Cole, Peter McLaren and Glenn Rikowski edited *Postmodernism in Educational Theory: education and the politics of human resistance.* This was published by Tufnell press, although it was not discussed as a book at Hillcole meetings. Postmodernism- and Marxist critiques of it, were.

(2001) Glenn Rikowski wrote *The Battle in Seattle: its significance for education.* This was discussed exhaustively at Hillcole Group meetings, Caroline Benn, in the final weeks of her life, wrote full comments on it.

Glenn Rikowski has written an e-article on the Hillcole Group at http://www.flowideas.co.uk/?page=articles&sub=After%20the%20Hillcole%20Group

Dave Hill has written a fuller version than this speech on the Hillcole Group- from which the various quotes in this speech are taken, at http://www.ieps.org.uk/hillcole.php

[1] Bibliographic guide to studies on the status of women: development and population trends *1983, UNESCO*

Janet Holland as a University Manager

Jeffrey Weeks

Janet was in many ways a reluctant manager. I sometime think she is the least likely manager I could have appointed. Her famous diffidence made it painful for her to push herself forward, and even more difficult for me to push her. She hates addressing large groups of people, and prefers to sit out committee meetings taking copious notes rather than intervening in the cut and thrust. Worse still from the point of conventional images of management, she is always the voice of the grass roots. The badly paid researcher, the over-burdened teacher, the hassled administrator: her instinct is to defend and promote them, and to be sceptical of the wishes and whims of senior management. But for all that – perhaps because of all that - she is an effective manager, and I like to think one of my success stories as faculty dean. As director of the Social Sciences Research Centre, co-director of the Families and Social Capital Research Group, and above all as Director of Research in the Faculty of Arts and Human Sciences, Janet got things done, and done effectively. Because of her empathy she could carry people with her. Because of her quiet certainties, she could get her way. Because of her belief in collective work, she was a strong team-player. Because of her tireless work and efficiency, she always delivered. And because of her passionate beliefs, she had devoted colleagues. She came to embody the faculty's commitment to research, and because of that she had the confidence of all those who wanted to commit to research. She was trusted in a way other senior colleagues were not.

I first met Janet in the early 1990s at the time of the WRAP project. I had written to Tufnell Press for some early WRAP pamphlets, but I didn't actually meet her until 1992, when we made a joint appeal to the British Sociological Association AGM for support for an annual conference to be devoted to sexuality and society - which eventually took place in 1994. Those two years turned out to be an intense period for both of. Not only was planning the conference much more time consuming than we ever managed – in those days conferences were planned in detail by the nominated organisers, with little help from the BSA administration – but it was also a difficult period for me personally and for Janet in career terms. The conference, however, was a great success, and soon after I moved to LSBU, taking up successively posts as head of school, dean, and executive dean. This reduced my own research time, but the corresponding gain was that I was able to use my position to build our research base. I was luckily able to bring in Janet, first as reader and then professor, and bit by bit she brought in many of her collaborators from the WRAP work. With Janet you never just get Janet; you get a team. It was one of the best moves I ever made, and Janet has been a vital part of the bedrock of social science research in the faculty ever since – still too valuable to lose. Staff at the university are expected to retire at 65. Janet still sails on indomitably.

What accounts for her success? We can trace the reasons, I think, by looking further at key elements of Janet's style.

First, there is her absolute commitment to research as a collective activity. This is ideologically rooted, no doubt, in her feminist commitment from the 1970s on, but what is remarkable is that it is more than a notional ideology, which many of us would verbally espouse, it is actually lived. It has become a mode of thinking, researching and writing that shapes each project in often original and always creative ways. For Janet it is the way good research is done. Although the established panjandrums of research nationally may advocate collaborative work, all the research structures, from personal promotion to research assessments, are geared against collective

research and publication. What universities and funding bodies want is proof of individual achievements. Janet has plenty of these, but pity the poor RAE coordinator trying to tease out the sole authored article or monograph for proud display. I have no doubt this for a long time held back Janet's career, both in getting a permanent post and in obtaining the promotion her contribution deserved.   For Janet such concerns are a bureaucratic nuisance. What matters is the quality of the work, and collective research activity is the best guarantee of that.

Second, there is Janet's role as the voice of the researcher. However senior and distinguished she has become, she never forgets that for many years she was a contract researcher, always looking for the next grant, never sure when she would fall off the branch or see it cut through by someone else. That gives you a toughness and resilience, a commitment to publish, publish, publish, because that might determine the next contract, but also in Janet's case an empathy for the young academic. A large part of her time has been taken up with capacity building, sustaining the up-coming generation.

Third, Janet leads by example. She never asks someone to do something she wouldn't do herself. More often than not she will go and do it anyway. At LSBU, despite always having major research commitments, she has always taken on teaching and supervision activities, gone to committee meetings, volunteered to taken on special tasks. And despite being a senior research manager, she has never feared getting her hands dirty in empirical research, detailed analysis, doing first drafts of chapters and papers.

Fourthly, I would underline Janet's exceptional professionalism. She never fails to comment on someone else's emerging publications; she always meticulously prepares a lecture or conference paper; she always turns up for meetings. If the day is too short, then the candle burns late into the night. She also of course has a great sense of fun, enjoys good food and drink, but it never stops her completing a task.

But Janet is more than the sum of these qualities and virtues. She is also a vivid example of a crucial shift in our social history that has transformed our intellectual and cultural life over the past generation. Intellectually, her preoccupations – gender, sexuality, young people, identity transitions, education, qualitative research – have like her, moved from the margins of academic life to the centre in recent years, propelled in part by the changing priorities of the baby boom generation, of which she is part, as it rose to leading positions throughout our social, political and cultural life. But there is also something else in Janet's history that we need to remember. She was born into a working class family at the Elephant and Castle. She has always remained close to her roots. There is something wonderfully symbolic about her returning to the Elephant, where LSBU is located, as a senior professor, a sort of homecoming in a world that has changed. So many things are different, but throughout a long and rich career, Janet has remained true to her history and to herself.

Sharing the Load and the Glory? Collaborative Leadership of the Families & Social Capital ESRC Research Group

Rosalind Edwards

This paper is drawn directly from the talk that I gave at the 'Collaboration and Duration' celebration event, and that accounts for its informal style and brief length. In the talk, I discussed collective leadership with Janet with respect to the Families & Social Capital ESRC Research Group, which Janet and I co-directed. The Families Group was officially launched at the beginning of 2002. At its core was a major grant that we and colleagues[3] gained from the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) for a five-year programme investigating the relationship between family change and the dynamics of social capital from a critical perspective. We were the first, and I think still the only, new university to receive ESRC funding for a research group programme, so we were very aware of wanting to make it a success in that respect. The main budget amounted to just under £3 million, we had up to 11 core projects running under the programme alongside other associated research projects, and at its height there were 18 research staff and two administrators working in the Group. So, it will be evident that directing the Group was no small task. Indeed, as part of overseeing the programme Janet and I were attempting to manage six other professors – a classic herding cats scenario.

I want to digress back to times before the Families Group for a moment because I think that is important to how Janet and I undertook collaborative leadership together. Janet and I first became work colleagues in the mid-1990s when she joined what was then called South Bank University as a Reader attached to the Social Sciences Research Centre (SSRC), which was headed by Professor Miriam David, and where I was then a senior research fellow. It was this research centre that was to transmogrify into the Families Group in later years.

In 1997 the SSRC held a conference to celebrate its first five years of existence, and as part of this event everyone involved in the Centre delivered a reflection on the opportunities and challenges that faced social science research in the new universities. Janet's paper focused on a comparison of her research career and conditions in old and new universities. I remember distinctly that her talk was the first time I had heard another academic give a serious and considered account of collaborative, collective research. Our presentations were published in a paper[4], so I am able to give a flavour of some what Janet said in her own words:

> The academic profession has always placed an emphasis on individual success … but it has always been my practice to collaborate … Largely this collaborative work has also been collective. At whatever level of skill and experience a person joins a research team that I am working on, we are all equal partners. We all take part in all aspects of the research, although time and commitment constraints might mean that some do more of one aspect than another – data collection being a typical example. One issue which

---

[3] Along with Janet and me, these colleagues were Irene Bruegel, Claire Callender, Harry Goulbourne, John Solomos and Jeffrey Weeks.

[4] *Social Science Research: Strategies and Challenges. Celebrating the first five years of the Social Sciences Research Centre,* edited by Philip Gatter, published in May 1998. Janet's paper (pp. 15-18) was entitled 'Social science research: 'old' and 'new' universities in contrast'.

arises with this style of working is dealing with the interface with the outside world and funders. Funders tend to like to have one person responsible for the project at whom they can point the finger if necessary … Where an individual is the interface with the funder or possibly gets publicly identified with the specific research project to a greater extent than any of the other team members, this calls for considerable openness and trust within the research team for it successfully to be able to work collectively. So this way of working is not easy since hidden, and sometimes not so hidden, hierarchies of power can develop, and some might find more traditional and obvious power relations easier to handle.

These words of feminist wisdom must have gone deep into my sub-conscious because in the last few years I have published three pieces – two of them as collaborations with Natasha Mauthner – on feminist research management addressing these very points.[5] Some of the points about collaborative leadership covered included:

- the erratic ricocheting between being a female patriarch, Great Mother and co-operative feminist;
- clashes between competing discourses of power and subject positionings around, on the one hand, hierarchy and audit, and on the other, collaboration and interdependency;
- tensions between equality as 'the same' and 'equal but different'; and
- the anger, envy, frustration and guilt that can be bound up in the value accorded to different aspects of the division of labour between research processes and management responsibility.

In my experience of collaborative leadership with Janet, co-directing the Families Group, however, I can honestly say that none of these sorts of tussles occurred between us, although they did occur within the Group including involving me. This may well be related to the division of labour in the 'sharing the load and the glory' that is the topic of this session. Janet certainly shares the load but she does not take her share of the glory.

In line with the point Janet made back in 1997 about funders, the ESRC would not agree that the Families Group could have two directors, as co-directors. In its contract with South Bank, the reference was to the Research Group Director and the Deputy Director. The responsibilities the contract listed for Director – that is, me – involved:

   i.   achieving the Research Group objectives;
   ii. performance and strategy of the research Group;
   iii. providing intellectual leadership; and
   iv. carrying out my own research.

The responsibilities for the Deputy Director – that is, Janet – included:

---

[5] Edwards, R. (2000) 'Numbers are not enough: on women in higher education and being a feminist academic', in M. Tight (ed.) *International Perspectives on Higher Education: Academic Work and Life*, London: JAI; Mauthner, N. and Edwards, R. (2007) 'Gender, power and research management in higher education', in V. Gillies and H. Lucey (eds) *Power, Knowledge and the Academy: Exploring the Institutional and Personal Dynamics of Research*, Oxford: Routledge; Mauthner, N. and Edwards, R. (2010) 'Feminist research management in higher education in Britain: possibilities and practices', Special Issue: Women and Men in Management: Issues for the 21st Century, *Gender, Work and Organisation*, 17:5.

i. managing day-to-day pursuit of work priorities to achieve maximum value for money;
ii. providing reports and performance indicators;
iii. attending meetings;
iv. implementing the publication and dissemination strategy;
v. implementing the user engagement strategy;
vi. supporting the ESRC's policies;
vii. recruiting and accepting visiting staff;
viii. liaising with the relevant departments and services within the university

oh, and

ix. carrying out her own research.

I cannot now recall how this division of glory – me, and the load – Janet, came about in its contractual form.

We did however evolve our own way of working together as a collaborative leadership. Firstly, within and equal and the same mode, we instituted the practice of referring to ourselves as Director and Co-Director in contact with the ESRC and more widely. This was meant to signal our equal status while adhering to the ESRC's stricture that there could not be two directors. Secondly, within an equal but different mode, we played to our existing strengths. So, for example, Janet took the lead with keeping on top of the budget in the face of my dyscalculia, while our different approaches to deadlines meant that I did the draft of reports to the ESRC well before the due date and Janet did the careful editing. Janet's more self-effacing nature meant that I did more of the standing up in public talking about the Group's work, while my tendency to 'go off on one' meant that she would read through emails dripping with sarcasm before I pushed 'send' and advise more circumspect phrasing.

Such collaborative leadership with Janet has always been helped by us sharing an office. As research leaders, we have always had quite a large room between us. We have book cases down the centre acting as a room divider. Those who have visited us will know that Janet's side of the book cases, and indeed all of her side of our office, is completely full up with books and papers, while mine is pretty minimalist. There was lots of consultation about leading the Families Group and 'just letting you know' conversations over the top and around those book cases. We talked on the phone a lot when we were not in the office together. This meant that there was little going on about the Group that was known by one of us and not by the other. Knowledge is power, and we shared knowledge. We vocalized our guiding approach as, to all intents and purposes, 'we are as one'.

All of this collaborative leadership stemmed from Janet. It was having Janet as a colleague that meant that I knew not just from taking a feminist perspective that collectivity was possible, but importantly that I had seen what practicing collaboration actually looked like. And when I strayed from the path, which was quite often really, Janet was the little conscience perched on my shoulder – or more often on top of the book case. So, my thanks to Janet.

Janet Holland

Publications 1969 -2010

BOOKS

Henderson, S., Holland, J., McGrellis, S., Sharpe, S., Thomson, R. (2007) *Inventing Adulthoods: A biographical approach to youth transitions*, London: Sage

Edwards, R., Franklin, J. and Holland, J. (eds) (2006) *Assessing Social Capital: Concepts, policy and practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R., (2004*) The male in the head: Young people, heterosexuality and power*, London: the Tufnell Press. Second edition.

Weeks, J., Holland, J. and Waites, M. (eds) (2003) *Sexualities and Society*, Cambridge: Polity

Ramazanoglu, C. with Holland, J. (2002) *Feminist Methodology: Challenges and Choices*, London: Sage

Gordon, T., Holland, J. and Lahelma, E. (2000) *Making spaces: Citizenship and difference in schools*, Macmillan

Lloyd, B and Lucas, K. and Holland, J., McGrellis, S and Arnold, S. (1998) *Smoking in Adolescence: Images and Identities*, London: Routledge.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Thomson, R. and Sharpe, S. (1998) *The male in the head: Young people, heterosexuality and power.* London: the Tufnell Press.

Weeks, J. and Holland, J. (eds) (1996) *Sexual cultures: Communities, values and intimacy,* London: Macmillan.

Holland, J. and Adkins, L. (eds.) (1996) *Sex, sensibility and the gendered body*, London: Macmillan.

Holland, J. and Blair, M. (eds.) (1995) *Debates and Issues in Feminist Research and Pedagogy*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters in association with The Open University.

Dawtrey, L., Holland, J. and Hammer, M. (with S. Sheldon) (eds.) (1995) *Equality and Inequality in Education Policy: Historical and Cultural Perspectives,* Clevedon, Multilingual Matters in association with The Open University.

Blair, M. and Holland, J. (with S. Sheldon) (eds.) (1995) *Identity and Diversity: Gender and the experience of education*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters in association with The Open University.

Rhodes, T., Holland, J. and Hartnoll, R. (1991) *Hard to reach or out of reach? An evaluation of an innovative model of HIV outreach health education,* London: the Tufnell Press.

Blackman, S.J., Chisholm, L.A., Gordon, T. and Holland J.(1987) *Hidden messages: An equal opportunities teachers' pack*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Dahlberg, G, Holland, J. and Varnava-Skouras G. (1987) *Children, work and ideology: A cross cultural comparison of children's understanding of work and the social division of labour,* Studies in Education and Psychology 24, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International/Stockholm Institute of Education.

Holland, J. (1983) *Bibliographic guide to studies on the status of women: Development and population trends*, Paris: Bowker/Unipub/Unesco.

Holland J. and Steuer, M. (1969) *Mathematical Sociology: An annotated bibliography*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

MONOGRAPHS

Holland, J. (2010) 'Emotions and research: Some general and personal thoughts', in Weller, S. and Caballero, C. (eds) *Up close and personal: Relationships and emotions within and through research*, Working Paper No. 25, London: Families and Social Capital Research Group

Holland, J. (2008) Young people and social capital: What can it do for us? Working Paper No. 24, London: Families and Social Capital Research Group

Holland, J., Thomson, R. and Henderson, S. (2006) *Qualitative Longitudinal Research: A discussion paper*, Working Paper No. 21, London: Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group

Thomson, R. and Holland J. (2004) *Youth Values and Transitions to Adulthood: An empirical investigation*, Working Paper No. 4, London: Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group

Edwards, R., Franklin, J. and Holland, J. (2003) *Families and Social Capital: Exploring the Issues*, Working Paper No. 1, London: Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group.

Gillies, V. Ribbens McCarthy, J., and Holland, J. (2001*) Pulling together, pulling apart: The family lives of young people*, London: Family Policy Studies Unit/Joseph Rowntree Foundation

McGrellis, S., Henderson, S., Holland, J., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R., (2000*) Through the moral maze: a quantitative study of young people's values*, London: the Tufnell Press.

Gillies, V. with Ribbens McCarthy, J. and Holland, J. (1999) *Young People and Family Life: analysing and comparing disciplinary discourses*, Occasional Paper 3, Centre for Family and Household Research, Oxford Brookes University.

Holland, J., Mauthner, M. and Sharpe, S. (1996) *Family Matters: Communicating Health Messages in the Family*, London: Health Education Authority.

For the BSA Standing Committee on the Equality of the Sexes (with L. McKie and P. Watson) (1994) *Promoting women and research*, Durham: BSA.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C. and Sharpe, S. (1993) *Wimp or gladiator: Contradictions in acquiring masculine sexuality*, WRAP/MRAP Paper 9, London: the Tufnell Press.

Holland, J. (1993) *Sexuality and ethnicity: Variations in young women's sexual knowledge and practice*, WRAP Paper 8, London: the Tufnell Press.

Davies, A.M., Holland, J. and Minhas, R. (1992) [rev. ed.] *Equal opportunities in the new ERA,* Hillcole Group, London: Tufnell Press.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1992) *Pressured pleasure: Young women and the negotiation of sexual boundaries*, WRAP Paper 7, London: the Tufnell Press.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1991) *Pressure, resistance, empowerment: Young women and the negotiation of safer sex,* WRAP Paper 6, London: the Tufnell Press.

Hartnoll, R., Rhodes, T., and Johnson, A. (with Holland, J. and Jones, S.) (1991) *Out of the agency and onto the street: A review of HIV outreach intervention in the UK, US and Netherlands*, London: ISDD.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S.,Sharpe S. and Thomson, R. (1990) *'Don't die of ignorance' I nearly died of embarrassment: Condoms in context,* WRAP Paper 2, London: the Tufnell Press

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C. and Scott, S. (1990) *Sex, risk and danger: AIDS education policy and young women's sexuality,* WRAP Paper 1, London: the Tufnell Press.

Davies, A.M., Holland, J. and Minhas, R. (1990) *Equal opportunities in the new ERA,* Hillcole Group, London: Tufnell Press.

Holland, J. (1981) *Work and Women*, London: Institute of Education, Bedford Way Paper No. 6. Made into 'Talking Book' RNIB (1986).

Holland, J., (1980) *Female Occupational Choice: The impact of sexual divisions in society*, Reports on Education and Psychology Nr. 3, Stockholm Institute of Education, Department of Educational Research.

CHAPTERS IN BOOKS

Holland, J. (2009) 'Change and continuity in young people's lives: Biography in context', in Jay A. Mancini and Karen A. Roberto (eds) *Human Development Across the lifespan: Antecedents, Processes, and Consequences of Change,* Lexington Books, DC

Elliott, J., Holland, J. and Thomson, R. (2008) 'Qualitative and Quantitative Longitudinal Research' in Bickman, L., Brannen, J. and Alasuutari, P. *Handbook of Social Research Methods*, London/Thousand Oaks: Sage

Holland, J. (2008) 'Understanding the sexual lives of young people', in Furlong, A. (ed.) *Handbook of Youth and Young Adults*, London: Routledge

Holland, J. (2007) Inventing adulthoods: Making the most of what you have, in Helve, H. and Bynner, J. (eds) *Youth and Social Capitals: Constellations, cultures and identities,* London: the Tufnell Press.

Franklin, J., Holland, J and Edwards, R. (2006) 'W(h)ither social capital?, in Edwards, R., Franklin, J. and Holland, J. *Assessing social capital: Concepts, policy and practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Press

Gordon, T., Lahelma, E. & Holland, J, (2004) Ystäviä vai vihollisia? Tulkintoja tyttöjen vuorovaikutussuhteista koulussa. (Friends or Foes? Interpreting Girls' Interaction at School) Teoksessa Liljeström, Marianne (toim.) *Feministinen tietäminen: Keskustelua metodologiasta*. (Feminist Knowing: Discussions about Methodology) Tampere: Vastapaino. 169-190.

Holland, J. (2004) 'Young people and education: Processes of inclusion and exclusion' in Benn, M. and Chitty, C. (eds) *A tribute to Caroline Benn: Essays in Education and Democracy*, London: continuum

Gillies, V., Holland, J. and Ribbens-McCarthy, J. (2003) 'Past/present/future: Time and the meaning of change in the family, in Allan, G. and Jones, G. (eds*) Social relations and the life course*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Thomson, R., Holland, J., Henderson, S., McGrellis, S. and Sharpe, S. (2003) Researching childhood: Time, memory and method' in Allan, G. and Jones, G. (eds*) Social relations and the life course*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Gordon, T. and Holland, J. (2003) 'Nation Space' in Beach, D., Gordon, T. and Lahelma, E. (eds) *Democratic education: Ethnographic challenges*, London: the Tufnell Press

Gordon, T., Holland, J. and Lahelma, E. (2002) 'Making spaces: Researching citizenship and difference in schools', in Walford, G. (ed.) *Debates and developments in ethnographic methodology*, London: JAI.

Gordon, T., Holland, J. Lahelma, E. and Tolonen, T. (2002) ' Katseelta piilossa:Hiljaisuus ja liikkumattomuus kouluetnografin havainnoissa' [Hidden from gaze: Silence and immobility in school ethnographer's observations], in Aaltonen, S. and Honkatukia, P. (eds) *Tulkintoja tytoista*, [Interpretations about girls], Helsinki: SKS (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura).

Holland, J., Bell, R., Henderson, S., McGrellis, S., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (2001) Youth values and transitions: Young people's participation in the research process', in Clark, J. *et al.* (eds) *Young people as researchers*, Youth Work Press

Thomson, R., Holland, J., McGrellis,S., Sharpe, S. and Henderson, S. (2001) 'From Peter Andre's six pack' to 'I do knees': The body in young people's moral discourse, In Milburn-Backett, K. And Mckie, L. (Eds) *Powerful bodies: Gender, sexualities and embodiment*, London: Macmillan.

Ramazanoglu, C. and Holland, J. (2000) 'Still telling it like it is?: Problems of feminist truth claims' in Ahmed, S. Kilby, J. Lury, C. McNeil, M. and Skeggs, B. (eds*) Transformations: Thinking through feminism*, London: Routledge.

Gordon,T., Holland, J. and Lahelma, E. (2000) 'Moving bodies/still bodies: Embodiment and agency in schools' in McKie, L. and Watson, N. (eds*) Organising Bodies: Institutions, policy and work*, London: Macmillan

Gordon, T., Holland, J. and Lahelma, E. (2000) 'From pupil to citizen: a gendered route', Arnot, M. and Dillabough, J-A (eds) *Challenging Democracy: International Perspectives on Gender, Education and Citizenship*, London: Routledge/Falmer.

Gordon,T., Holland, J. and Lahelma, E. (2000) 'Friends or Foes? Interpreting relations between girls in schools', in Walford, G. (ed.) *Genders and Sexualities. Studies in Ethnography in Education*, Vol. 3, London: JAI Books

Gordon,T., Holland, J. and Lahelma, E. (2000) 'Ethnographic research in educational settings', in Atkinson, P., Coffey, A., Delamont, S., Lofland, L, and Lofland, J. *A Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage.

Gillies, V., Ribbens McCarthy, J., and Holland, J. (2000) 'Being There'? Young people's accounts of parental support in Ryan, H. and Bull, J. (eds) *Changing families changing communities: Researching health and well-being amongst children and young people,* London: HEA.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S., and Thomson, R. (1998) 'Feminist methodology and young people's sexuality,' in Parker, R. and Aggleton, P. (eds) *Culture, Society and Sexuality: A Reader*, London: UCL Press.

Thomson, R. and Holland, J. (1998) "Sexual relationships, negotiation and decision making", in Coleman, J.and Roker, D. *Teenage sexuality: Health, risk and education*, Reading: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Taylor, L. and Holland, J. (1997) "Equal Opportunities in Education" in Kramarae, C. and Spender, D. (eds.) *The Women's Studies Encyclopedia*, Harvester Wheatsheaf/Simon & Schuster Academic Reference.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1997) "Feminist methodology and young people's sexuality" in in Parker, R. and Aggleton, P. (eds) *Culture, Society and Sexuality: A reader,* London: Taylor and Francis

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., and Thomson, R. (1996) "In the same boat? The gendered (in)experience of first heterosex" in Richardson, D. (Ed.) *Telling it straight: Theorising Heterosexuality*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1996) "Pressured pleasure: Young women and the negotiation of sexual boundaries" reprinted in Jackson, S. and Scott, S. (eds) *Feminism and sexuality: A reader*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1996) "'Don't die of ignorance' I nearly died of embarrassment: Condoms in context" reprinted in Jackson, S. and Scott, S. (eds) *Feminism and sexuality: A reader,* Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1996) "Reputations: Journeying into gendered power relations" in Weeks, J. and Holland, J. (eds) *Sexual Cultures: Communities, values and intimacy*, London, Macmillan.

Holland, J. and Fullerton, D. (1995) "Establishing the effectiveness of behavioural interventions to prevent HIV: Some trials and tribulations" in Friedrich, D. and Heckmann, W. (eds) *Aids in Europe - The Behavioural Aspect, Vol. 4: Determinants of behaviour change,* Berlin: Edition Sigma, Rainer Bohn Verlag.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S., Thomson, R. (1995) "The male in the head: Heterosexuality, risk and power" in Friedrich, D. and Heckmann, W. (eds) *Aids in Europe - The Behavioural Aspect, Vol. 1: General Aspects*, Berlin: Edition Sigma, Rainer Bohn Verlag

Fullerton, D., Holland, J. and Oakley, A. (1995) "Establishing the effectiveness of behavioural interventions to prevent HIV: Some trials and tribulations", in Aggleton, P., Davies, P and Hart, G. (eds.) *AIDS: Safety, sexuality and Risk,* London: Taylor and Francis.

Holland, J. (1995) "'There's small choice in rotten apples': Women and work". [In Greek.] Introduction to Delyani, V. and Ziogou, S. *Gender and occupational choices: A study of Greek adolescent girls' transition to the job market* Thessaloniki: Vanias.

Ramazanoglu, C. and Holland, J. (1995) "Kvinnors sexualitet och mäns appropriering av begäret" ("Women's sexuality and men's appropriation of desire") in Hultqvist, K. and Petersson, K. (eds) *Foucault: Namnet på en modern vetenskaplig och filosofisk problematik*, Stockholm, HLS Förlag.

Holland, J. and Ramazanoglu, C. (1995) "Accounting for Sexuality, living sexual politics: Can feminist research be valid?" in Holland, J. and Blair, M. (eds.) *Debates and Issues in Feminist Research and Pedagogy*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters in association with The Open University

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1995) "Pleasure, pressure and power: Some contradictions of gendered sexuality" (abridged) in Blair, M. and Holland, J. (with S. Sheldon) (eds.) *Identity and Diversity: Gender and the experience of education*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters in association with The Open University.

Holland, J. Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S. Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1994) "Sex, gender and power: young women's sexuality in the shadow of AIDS", (abridged) in Rauh, Bethel, E. (ed.) *AIDS: Readings on a Global Crisis*, Allyn and Bacon

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S.,Sharpe S. and Thomson, R. (1994) "Methodological issues in researching young women's sexuality" in Boulton, M. *Challenge and Innovation: Methodological issues in social research on HIV/AIDS,* London: Falmer.

Thomson, R. and Holland, J. (1994) "Young women and safer sex: Context, constraints and strategies" in Kitzinger, C. and Wilkinson, S. (eds.) *Women and Health: Feminist Perspectives,* London: Falmer.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C. Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1994) "Becoming a 'real' man: The social construction of masculine sexuality", in Doyal, L., Naidoo, J., and Wilton, T. (eds.) *AIDS: Setting a feminist agenda,* London: Falmer.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S. and Thomson, R. (1994) "Desire, risk and control: The body as a site of contestation" in Doyal, L., Naidoo, J., and Wilton, T. (eds.) *AIDS: Setting a feminist agenda,* London: Falmer.

Holland, J. and Ramazanoglu, C. (1994) "Coming to conclusions: Power and interpretation in researching young women's sexuality", in Purvis, J. and Maynard, M. (eds) *Researching Women's lives from a Feminist perspective*, London: Falmer.

Holland, J. (1993) "Studied Youth: Gender and youth research in the UK" [In Greek] in Delyani, V. and Ziogou, S. (eds.) *Gender and Education: Historical perspectives and contemporary issues*, Thessaloniki: Vanias.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S.,Sharpe S. and Thomson, R. (1993) "'Don't die of ignorance' I nearly died of embarrassment: Condoms in context"*,* (abridged) in Berer, M. and Ray, S. (eds.) *Women and HIV/AIDS: An International Resource Book*, London: Pandora Press.

Ramazanoglu, C. and Holland, J. (1993) "Women's sexuality and men's appropriation of desire", in Ramazanoglu, C. (ed.) *Up against Foucault: Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and Feminism*, London: Routledge.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1992) "Pressure, resistance, empowerment: Young women and the negotiation of safer sex" in Aggleton, P., Davies, P and Hart, G. (eds.) *AIDS: Rights, risk and reason,* Lewes: Falmer.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1991) "Between embarrassment and trust: Young women and the diversity of condom use", in Aggleton, P. Davies, P and Hart, G. (eds.) *AIDS: Responses, interventions and care,* Lewes: Falmer. p127-148.

Holland, J. (1990) "Gendering Work" in Harris, M. (ed.) *School, mathematics and work,* Lewes: Falmer. p.230-252.

Holland, J. (1989) "Gender in Britain today" (1989) in Cole, M. (ed.) *The social contexts of schooling,* Lewes: Falmer

Holland, J. (1988) "Girls and occupational choice: in search of meanings" in Pollard, A., Purvis, J. & Walford, G. (eds.) *Education, training and the new vocationalism: Experience and policy*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Chisholm, L.A. and Holland, J. (1987) "Madchen und Berufswal: Anti-Sexismus in der Praxis am Beispiel eines Curriculum-Entwicklungsprojektes"(Girls and Occupational Choice: Anti-sexism in practice in a curriculum development project) in Wiebe, H-H, (Hrsg.) *Jugend in Europa: Situation und Forschungsstand*, Leske + Budrich.

Chisholm, L.A. and Holland, J. (1987) Anti-sexist action research in school: The Girls and Occupational Choice project", in Arnot, M. & Weiner, G. *Gender under scrutiny*, London: Hutchinson for Open University.

Holland, J. (1983) "Using a network developed by another", in Bliss, J., Monk, M. & Ogborn, J. (eds.) *Qualititative data analysis for educational research: A guide to uses of systemic networks*, London: Croom Helm

Holland, J. (1983)

(ii) "Social struktur och ideologi: Ungdomars syn pa olika aspekter av den sociala arbetsdelningen" (Social structure and ideology: Adolescents' views of aspects of the social division of labour).

(i) "Sociala skillnader och forstaelse av innebord" (Social class and changes in orientation to meaning);

IN Bernstein, B. & Lundgren, U.P. (eds.) *Makt, kontroll och pedagogik*, (Power, control and pedagogy) Lund: LiberForlag,

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Refereed:

Holland, J. and Thomson, R. (2010) 'Revisiting youthful sexuality – continuities and changes over two decades' *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 25th Jubilee Issue. Accompanies reprint of: Holland, J., Ramazanoglu,C., Sharpe, S., and Thomson, R. (2000) 'Deconstructing virginity - young people's accounts of first se*x*', *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 15 (3): 221-232, one of the most influential articles published in SRT.

Holland , J. and Thomson, R. (2009) 'Gaining perspective on choice and fate: Revisiting critical moments', *European Societies,* 11 (3): 451-469 Special Issue: At a crossroads: Contemporary lives between fate and choice, edited by Anna Bagnoli and Kaisa Ketokivi.

Holland, J. (2009) 'Young people and social capital: Uses and abuses' *Young*: *Nordic Journal of Youth Research*, 17 (4):

Gordon, T., Holland, J., Lahelma, E. and Thomson, R. (2008) 'Young female citizens in education: emotions, resources and agency', *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 16 (3):

Holland, J., Reynolds, T. and Weller, S. (2007) 'Transitions, networks and communities: The significance of social capital in the lives of children and young people,' *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10 (1): 101-120

Holland, J. (2007) 'Emotions and Research', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, Theory and Practice*, 10

Holland, J., Gordon, T, and Lahelma, E. (2007) 'Temporal, Spatial and Embodied Relations in the Teachers' Day at School,' *Ethnography and Education*, 2 (2): 221-237

Henderson, S., Holland, J. and Thomson, R. (2006) Making the long view: Perspectives on context from a qualitative longitudinal (QL) study, *Methodological Innovations Online*, 1 (2), (www.methodologicalinnovations.org)

Gordon, T. Holland, J., Lahelma, E. and Tolonen, T. (2005) 'Gazing with intent: Ethnographic practice in classrooms' *Qualitative Research*, 5 (1): 113-131

Thomson, R. and Holland, J. (2005) 'Thanks for the memory': Memory books as a methodological resource in biographical research, *Qualitative Research,* 5 (2): 201-219

Gordon, T., Holland, J., Lahelma, E. and Thomson, R. (2005) 'Imagining gendered adulthood: Anxiety, ambivalence, avoidance and anticipation' *European Journal of Women's Studies,* 12 (1): 83-103

Thomson, R., Holland, J. McGrellis, S., Bell, R., Henderson, S. and Sharpe, S. (2004) 'Inventing Adulthoods: a Biographical approach to understanding youth citizenship,*' The Sociological Review,* 52 (2): 218-239

Holland, J., Weeks, J. and Gillies, V. (2003) 'Families, intimacy and social capital' *Social Policy and Society* 2 (4): 339-348

Thomson, R. and Holland, J. (2003) Hindsight, foresight and insight: The challenges of longitudinal qualitative research, *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, Theory and Practice, 6 (3): 233-244

Thomson, R. Plumridge, L. and Holland, J. (2003) edited Longitudinal Qualitative Research, Special Issue of *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 6 (3)

Thomson, R., Henderson, S. Holland, J. (2003) 'Making the most of what you've got? Resources, values and inequalities in young people's transitions to adulthood' *Educational Review,* 55 (1): 33-46.

Ribbens McCarthy, J., Holland, J. and Gillies, V. (2003) 'Multiple perspectives on the 'family' lives of young people: Methodological and theoretical issues in case study research,' *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, Theory and Practice,* 6 (1): 1-23.

Thomson, R. and Holland, J. (2002) 'Young people, social change and the negotiation of moral authority', *Children & Society,* 16: 1-13.

Thomson, R., Bell, R., Henderson, S., Holland, S., McGrellis, S. and Sharpe, S. (2002) 'Critical moments: Choice, chance and opportunity in young people's narratives of transition to adulthood, *Sociology* 6 (2), pp 335-354

Thomson, R. and Holland, J. (2002) 'Imagining adulthood: Resources, plans and contradictions', *Gender and Education,* 14 (4): 337-350.

Ribbens McCarthy, J., Holland, J. and Gillies, V. (2003) 'Multiple perspectives on the 'family' lives of young people: Methodological and theoretical issues in case study research' *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, Theory and Practice,* 6 (1): 1-23

Holland, J., Thomson, R., Henderson, S., McGrellis, S and Sharpe, S. (2000) 'Catching on, wising up and learning from your mistakes: Young people's accounts of moral development' *The International Journal of Children's Rights*, 8: 271-294.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu,C., Sharpe, S., and Thomson, R. (2000) 'Deconstructing virginity - young people's accounts of first sex', *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 15 (3): 221-232.

Ramazanoglu, C. and Holland, J. (1999) 'Tripping over Experience: some problems in feminist epistemology' *Discourse*, 20 (3): 381-392

Oakley, A., Fullerton, D. and Holland, J. (1995) "Behavioural interventions for HIV/AIDS prevention: a methodological review", *AIDS*
.

Oakley, A., Fullerton, D., Holland, J., Arnold, S. France-Dawson, M, Kelley, P. and McGrellis, S. (1995) Sexual health education interventions for young people: A methodological review, *BMJ* January.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S., and Thomson, R. (1994) "Power and desire: The embodiment of female sexuality" *Feminist Review*, 46, 21-38.

Rhodes, T. and Holland, J. (1992) "Outreach as a strategy for HIV prevention: Aims and practice", *Health Education Research*, 7 (4) 533-546.

Rhodes, T. and Holland, J. (1992) "Innovation and constraint: Evaluation findings on the management of an HIV outreach intervention" *International Journal on Drug Policy*, 3 (4) 141-152.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C., Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1992) "Pleasure, pressure and power: Some contradictions of gendered sexuality" *Sociological Review,* 40 (4) 645-674

Holland, J. Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S. Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1992) "Risk, power and the possibility of pleasure: Young women and safer sex" *AIDSCare*, 4 (3) 273-283.

Holland, J. Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S. Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1991) "Painostus, vastarinta, vahvistuminen: Nuoret naiset ja turvaseksistä sopiminen" (Pressure, resistance, empowerment: Young women and the negotiation of safer sex) *Nuorisotutkimus* (Youth Research) 9 (2) 15-26

Holland, J. Ramazanoglu, C., Scott, S. Sharpe, S. and Thomson, R. (1990) "Sex, gender and power: young women's sexuality in the shadow of AIDS", *Sociology of Health & Illness,* 12 (3) 336-350.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C. and Scott, S. (1990) "Aids: From panic stations to power relations - sociological perspectives and problems" *Sociology*, 24 (3) 499-518.

Holland, J., Ramazanoglu, C. and Scott, S. (1990) "Managing risk and experiencing danger: Tensions between government AIDS education policy and young women's sexuality" *Gender and Education,* 2 (2) 125-146.

Blackman, S.J. and Holland, J. (1989) "Equal opportunities in education and training" *Comprehensive Education*, No. 51, Spring.

Chisholm) L.A. and Holland, J. (1986) "Girls and Occupational Choice: Anti-sexism in action in a curriculum development project", *British Journal of the Sociology of Education*, 7 (4) 353-366.

Holland, J. (1986) "Gender and class: Adolescent conceptions of the division of labour", *Core*, 10 (1) 495 pp.

Holland, J. (1981) "Social Class and changes in orientation to meaning", *Sociology*, 15 (1) 1-18

Holland, J. (1979) "Diferencias de clase social en la orientacion al significado", *Infancia y Aprendizage*, 7 July, pp.43-59

Other

Holland, J., Thomson, R., Henderson, S., McGrellis, S. and Sharpe, S. (2002) Catching on, wising up and learning from your mistakes: Young people's accounts of moral development' Bridges, 7, December. (Published in Greek).

Holland, J., Gordon, T., and Lahelma, E. (2001) Mapeando el genero y la ciudadania en las escuelas, *Nomades*, (Departmento de Investigaciones Universidad Central, Santafe de Bogota) 14:24-34.

Thomson, R., Bell, R., Henderson, S., McGrellis, S. and Sharpe, S (2000) 'En ese momento todos estaban contra mi': Momentos criticos en las narrativas de transicion de los jovenes, *Nomades*, (Departmento de Investigaciones Universidad Central, Santafe de Bogota) 13:30-39.

Thomson, R. and Holland, J. (1993) "Young women and safer sex: Constraints and strategies", *Health Psychology Update,* Spring

Rhodes, T., Holland, J., Hartnoll, R., Johnson, A. and Jones, (1991) "HIV outreach in the UK" *Druglink*, 6 (3) 12-14.

Rhodes, T., Holland, J., Hartnoll, R., Johnson, A. and Jones, S.(1990) "How to reach the hard to reach: Drug injectors and HIV", *Druglink*, 5 (6) 12-15.

Economic and Social Research Council Reports (recent)

Thomson, R., Holland, J., Henderson, S., McGrellis, S. Sharpe, S., (1999*) Youth Values: A study of identity, diversity and social change*, Final Report to the ESRC, www.sbu.ac.uk/fhss/ssrc/youth.shtml. Judged 'outstanding' in ESRC Evaluation Process.

Thomson, R. and Holland, J. (2002) *Inventing Adulthoods: Young people's strategies for transition*. Final Report to the ESRC.

Holland, J. (2002) *Social Stability and Exclusion: Review of 37 ESRC Project Final Reports submitted 2000/2001*, Report to ESRC

Holland, J. Thomson, R. and Henderson, S. (2004) Feasibility study for a possible qualitative longitudinal study, Report (Specification and Discussion Paper for ESRC)

Henderson, S., Holland, J. and Thomson, R. (2006) *Negotiating the Long View: Archiving, Representing and Sharing a Qualitative Longitudinal Resource.* Final Report to the ESRC.

Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group (2007) *Final Report on Activities.* Report to the ESRC.

Website

www.lsbu.ac.uk/inventingadulthoods

---

[i] Bibliographic guide to studies on the status of women: development and population trends *1983, UNESCO*