The Disestablishmentarian.
Volume 1, issue 1.

Edited by Alexis D. Black,
Mark D. Doerksen
& Leanne Letourneau.

Design and layout by John Manicom.

Cover photography by Kris Murray.

SUSTAINABILITY
ACTION FUND

Concordia Council
on Student Life

[sagsa]

Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
Concordia University

Table of Contents

Letter from the Establishment of The Disestablishmentarian

It is our honour and great pleasure to present you, dear readers, (apprentice) scholars and fellow curious minds, with the first edition of The Disestablishmentarian. Our mission and goals have been laid out in appropriate statements and official documentation; however, we would like to take this space to bring you into the conversations that have shaped the journal up to this point, conversations to which we hope you will contribute. Many of the formative dialogues at this journal can be divided up into a series of questions. What's in a name? What's in a purpose? What's in a conversation?

What's in a name?

Naming is a fundamental action within the larger social and cognitive processes of categorization, of making sense of the world, appropriating the world, and building the worlds that we desire to see in place. Naming is a tool, a human technology; it is a power relegated to gods and monsters in many human traditions. To name is to assume a detached Apollonian view from above and the love, wonder, and intimacy to associate a symbol with a phenomena hitherto unknown. We name new species of bacteria, we name our children, we name our works of art, we name everything we encounter and create.

All this naming is not indicative that we are simply mad logophiles, each of us, but that we are deeply social creatures. Names permit us to share our worlds with one another, however they can also foster divisions between us. In many religious traditions the all-encompassing name cannot be known by human beings. Therefore, we have many partial names for many partial truths.

Our goal in naming The Disestablishmentarian is to highlight the partial truths we find crucial to a relevant scholarship for the 21st century. The term *disestablishmentarianism* can be linked to the separation of church and state in the 18th century United Kingdom. The roots of the term are found in arguments about not allowing special favors to particular social sects, though current definitions of the word concentrate more on opposition to established orders.

Opposition, disentangling, re-thinking, unwinding -- none of these terms necessitate a vision in which all established orders are inherently corrupt nor that authoritative bodies and laws are unnecessary and harmful (rough definitions of antiestablishmentarianism and anarchism, respectively). Rather, these terms imply how precious established order is and how important it is to revisit and reshape these orders to ensure that they are functioning in such a way as to appropriately serve the social purposes for which they were designed.

The Disestablishmentarian takes a disestablishment stance vis-à-vis current academic divisions and traditions and seeks to create and disseminate knowledge driven by data

and discovery, rather than disciplinary boundaries and politics.

The journal is not positioning itself as an arbiter of what "stays" and what "goes." We aspire for researchers to perform their work as they see fit and submit to our journal if they feel like their work fits with our mission. The Disestablishmentarian seeks to encourage and give priority to research that works outside disciplinary boundaries and traditional academic divisions. Our mission is to provide an arena in which experimental and novel approaches to social sciences can be explored.

The fact is that we are living in exciting times for academia, but that there do not seem to be many excited people in the academy. How, for example, are we to go beyond the traditional dualisms and divisions in the social sciences (e.g. the nature versus culture debate) if we do not construct new ways of knowing and of sharing our knowledge? How can we engage fully with questions of human embodiment, emotion, cognition, and biology while keeping one foot inside the door of Cartesian error? How can we gain perspective on our practices without going beyond them, without challenging them? The Disestablishmentarian likes to consider itself somewhat in the role of instigator, as giving a little push to current practices to see where they might be able to go. In many cases, as in the parable told by Apollonaire, we are certain that we cannot fly until the moment that we are shoved off the ledge.

What's in a purpose?

The Disestablishmentarian is not a graduate student journal with the purpose of churning out traditional, by-the-book social science research. We desire to create a different kind of space giving play to research that may otherwise be passed over because it does not clearly fit academic categories and practices as they currently are. In this space we prioritize discovery-driven and data-driven research. By this we mean that we encourage research that follows its subjects, listens to its participants, and allows the phenomena that motivate it to create the research and frame the questions. For this reason, the journal accepts artistic as well as academic submissions, visual art, poetry, essays and experiments are encouraged as well as more traditional papers.

To be honest, we, as many of our peers, are not only disillusioned, but disgusted at our potential future forms of employment and the practices we must embrace in order to be successful as academics. The 'points system' in academic publishing, the neoliberal educational model in which our students are 'clients,' and increasing pressures to produce and exchange knowledge as a commodity (especially for primarily military or industrial application) are horrifying to us. Our purpose in disestablishing these practices within the space we have created with this journal is not because we reject the academy, but because we hold it and its traditions very dear. The Disestablishmentarian is committed to original scientific research, the critical process of peer review, and the quest to reshape our traditional practices in the academy in order to fulfill relevant roles in the emerging human worlds of the 21st century.

We would not be producing an academic journal if we did not believe that scholarship serves humanity. The Disestablishmentarian seeks to encourage young scholars to continue the work that they do and to engage critically with the paradigms in which we

create knowledge and transmit it.

What's in a conversation?

Conversation is interplay, exchange, and a collision of difference both between interlocutors and the meanings of the words they use. Conversations cannot be controlled. They are ideally chiasma in which new ideas, forms, connections, and meanings can be forged. In the worst-case scenario, they are useless, occasions in which people talk past each other (as is so often said of scientists), or occasions in which people alienate themselves from one another.

In all cases, conversation is in motion, as is evident in the submissions of our first edition. A perfect leadoff to The Disestablishmentarian, Kathryn Travis disrupts the habits of knowledge production through a reflexive engagement with the very processes of comprehending that lead to rupture, re/inscription, or transformation. How one enters the ongoing conversation, she claims, has ramifications that spill into social, political, and cultural critique. Ongoing conversations, however, may not have stable temporal properties, according to Maija Duncan. Taking Travis' ideas and pivoting, Duncan demonstrates how visual art and prose suggest a glitch in the ongoing present of political student and social protests in Québec. Our final contribution from Daphne Laurel Heflin examines how multiple, disparate processes culminate in patterns of normative gender inequalities that have for too long gone without fracturing.

True to our name and purpose, we do not desire to allow the printed word to act as a special social order for which particular privileges are accorded. Rather, the materials we publish are to be kept in motion, the ideas they present are to presented to be refined, not to be taken as established. The Disestablishmentarian seeks to integrate the dynamism of conversation into the structure of its publication. For this reason, we encourage readers to read the following texts generously and to respond to these texts, whether in written, visual, auditory or mixed media forms. One of our goals is to create a space for ongoing dialogue between young scholars and, hopefully, their mentors. To do this we will publish responses to past articles in each forthcoming volume of the journal and will use our web presence as another platform through which to converse. Won't you join in? Send your replies and/or new submissions to journal.sagsa@gmail.com

Doing Comps: Thinking About *alterity* and *disciplinary knowing* Through the Ph.D. Comprehensive Exam Process

Kathryn Travis

Ph.D. Candidate, Graduate Program in Gender, Feminist and Women's Studies
York University, Toronto, Canada

ABSTRACT This piece draws from two written texts that were prepared for the comprehensive exam degree requirement in Gender, Feminist and Women's Studies (GFWS) at York University. Presented as a spoken piece, the first nine paragraphs were the introductory statement for the oral defence of my general exam. This opening situated my approach to, and choices made in, the exam question. This was: How might we rupture formations of alterity in disciplinary traditions of knowledge production? Do theories of decolonization rupture, reinscribe or transform these formations? I provide brief definitions for the concepts of 'alterity', 'disciplinary' and 'rupture' as starting points, and the response that follows further thinks about elements of the question. I strongly emphasize that the language and words used in framing this question reveals my entrance into, and engagement with, particular academic/scholarly conversations. At times, these conversations can use words that are confusing, unclear, and perhaps unknown. Ultimately, the ideas that I focused on, how I clustered the works into conversations, and brought them into my own thinking and writing reflect how I made connections between the ideas and approaches in the texts on my lists. By preserving each piece's original tone and style, I am materializing and recording the learning processes that created these words in the first place.

This piece draws from two written texts that were prepared for the comprehensive exam portion of the Ph.D degree requirements in Gender, Feminist and Women's Studies (GFWS) at York University. The first nine paragraphs were written as an introductory statement for the oral defence, which was the final part of the exam. Around the circle-like[1] table arrangement in the Founders College second-floor classroom, I sat with my supervisor and two committee members and delivered this introductory remark. Presented as a spoken piece, this remark situated my approach to, and choices made in, my response to the exam question. This question was: *How might we rupture formations of alterity in disciplinary traditions of knowledge production? Do theories of decolonization rupture, reinscribe or transform these formations?* As a starting point in this piece, I have provided brief definitions for the concepts of 'alterity', 'disciplinary' and 'rupture'. The response that follows further examines elements of the question. Throughout this response, I draw from the texts on my reading list for the general component of the exam. My choice to use particular texts reveals various layers of interaction: namely, the conversations

---

1. I write *circle-like* because the tables used to make the circle are rectangular. In an L shaped formation, the short end of one table is placed flush against the bottom, long side of the second. Repeated, mirrored and inverted, the L shape becomes closed off by another series of tables. As one of the main spaces in the department, a number of different events, conversations and gatherings happen in this room. In an accumulated seven years, I've experienced a multitude of tones and dynamics around the table in this room. As far as I can remember, the table arrangement has remained the same.

and recommendations made to me by committee members, the structural expectations of the department as to what constituted (and still constitutes) a field in the context of GFWS, and how I conceptualized each idea in relation to the process at that particular moment in time. Ultimately, the ideas that I focused on, how I clustered the works into conversations, and brought them into my own thinking and writing reveal how I made connections between the ideas and approaches in the texts. I use asterisks to draw your attention and bring emphasis to particular words and moments in the piece.

I emphasize strongly that the accessibility of ideas within academic/scholarly conversations and practices is a serious matter. Language, words and categories impact how we conceptualize, imagine and ultimately re/produce and interact with ideas, both on our own and with other people. The language and words that I used to respond to the exam question reveals how I entered into, and engaged with, particular academic/scholarly conversations. At times, these conversations use words that are confusing, unclear, and perhaps unknown. Reflecting on the process now, part of what I liked about doing comps was having the time and space to think about the words and ideas that made-up these conversations. I could figure out how I was going to orient myself to them. The cool thing about orientations is that they hold the potential to grow and change through every learning encounter. Orientations change through engaging ideas and words that are unfamiliar and not known, as much as with – if not more so than – those that are.

You may notice that the structure, style and tone shift at various points throughout the piece. By maintaining the original tone of the texts – tones that may be unconventional in article format – I firmly locate my thinking and writing in these initial contexts. By keeping these tones *intact*, I aim to preserve the affects of various process-specific experiences: the formation of and working with a committee; selecting reading lists that correspond to areas of study determined by the program; establishing the problematics[2] and overview statements for each list/area; the scheduling and setting of timeframes; administrative work, such as emailing between members, completing necessary paperwork, getting signatures, and the submission of documents; and innumerable hours reading, note-taking, compiling, piecing together, conversing, processing, writing and preparing. For me, the affective side of these activities included an array of psycho-physiological states experienced because I was going through the process. For example, the stress, fatigue, loss of appetite and a literal pain in the butt (caused by sitting in unwieldy positions for far too long) that I experienced leading up to the exam. And *the high*, a mixture of relief, excitement and coming-down, that came after passing the oral defence. The *doing* of comps itself reverberates the affective side of thinking about ideas. As thinking never happens in isolation, these affects were (and still are) relational. Moments of interacting with my supervisor and committee members, colleagues, staff, students, professors and friends (both two and four legged) were invaluable to how I thought about these ideas, the texts, fields of literature, areas of study and the doing of comps itself. By preserving

---

2. The GFWS website describes *problematics* in the following way: "The student develops two one-page overview statements (General and Specific) which identify several central questions or key issues of interest to the student (the problematics). The problematics are central questions or conceptual frameworks, which have informed feminist dialogue and debate (i.e., identity politics, difference, and sameness/difference). The overview statement should also speak to the logic for determining or selecting the most pertinent literature relevant to the central questions, key issues or problematics." (GFWS website, 'The Comprehensive Exam Process', http://gfws.gradstudies.yorku.ca/phd/#exam)

the original tone and style of each piece, I am materializing and recording the learning processes and relationships that created these words in the first place.

***

Sitting down to prepare this introduction, I automatically turned to a particular vocabulary to try to frame this piece. I had a *first* in mind, which I then changed to *start*, but finally settled on *begin*. Firstly. To start. To begin. For the most part, years of schooling and learning have taught me that I can feel comfortable turning to these kinds of words. These words are acceptable and, more often than not, will be accepted by those engaging the work. At their very foundation, these words not only signal toward, but also labour to build, a logic of linearity and progress. At some level, every time we *begin* or form our thinking, writing, and speaking in terms of a consecutive, progressive logic, we repeat a particular mode of articulation and conceptualization. Over time, these repetitions labour to produce habits that become naturalized through practice. And while I want to think more deeply through the implications of using *dominant* to frame this logic, I do believe that there is considerable force and weight supporting and reinforcing particular ways of conceptualizing; especially when particular ways become positioned as the singular way to do anything. I emphasize again that habit is familiarity acquired through repetition. Under the force of repetition, habits come to pass as natural. They labour to produce a normative path. Or, what Sara Ahmed would call, a straight line. Firstly, to start, or to begin is not as benign as we might automatically assume.

In *A Thousand Plateaus*, Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari write that the question is one of perceptual semiotics: "it's not easy to see things in the middle, rather than looking down on them from above or up at them from below, or from left to right or right to left: try it, you'll see that everything changes" (1987, p. 23). To see things *in the middle* requires orienting oneself to the process. I have brought my Earnest Ice Cream jar[3] with me today because it is middle. It houses innumerable shards and pieces which continue to bring me into proximity with this process, in all of its different moments. It materializes multiplicities of encounters and relations that I experienced throughout this process. For me, this comprehensive experience is about *process*. I clarify: it has been an experience that is whole-ly and entirely about processes, in all of its different variations and particularities. In *Metamorphoses*, Rosi Braidotti's emphasis on flows and interconnections, much like Deleuze and Guattari, orient towards middles. She writes,

> the challenge lies in thinking about processes, rather than concepts. This is neither a simple nor a particularly welcome task in the theoretical language and conventions which have become the norm in social and political theory as well as cultural critique. In spite of the sustained efforts of many radical critics, the mental habits of linearity and objectivity persist in their hegemonic hold over our thinking. Thus, it is by far simpler to think about the concept A or B, or of B as non-A, rather than the process of what goes on in between A and B. Thinking through flows and interconnections remains a difficult challenge. (2002, pp. 1-2)

I entered into the conversation thinking about how alterity and knowledge are

3. I was in Vancouver, B.C. when I officially began my comprehensive exam process. The first drafts of my problematics and lists were thought-out and written – alongside a very close friend – with Earnest Ice Cream's 'serious chocolate'. I kept the glass jar (complete with cardboard wrapper) and used it to hold the pencil shavings from each pencil that I used throughout my reading, note-taking and writing processes. At my oral defence, I brought out my jar filled with shavings and lead-bits, and placed it on the table in front of me. This jar was a physical reminder of the processes that had accompanied me to that point in timespace.

related. I then moved to think about: *how can we analyze alterity without reifying it as a category?* The tenor of this question motioned me towards the exam questions. I entered into this conversation along a particular path due to the kinds of questions that I was thinking about at certain moments. I can assuredly say that this has been a fluid process through which much change has happened.

Thinking through categorization in a way that refuses a particular kind of fixity is to be attuned to the force of movement. What keeps things the same is the repetition of how things are. A and B remain the same if we continue the complex processes and practices of demarcating them as such. Force emerges through movements of repetition. I would like to explain how I am understanding *becoming* with a quote from Braidotti; "becoming is about repetition[,] affinities and the capacity both to sustain and generate inter-connectedness" (2002, p. 8), it "is the actualization of the immanent encounter between subjects, entities and forces which are apt mutually to affect and exchange parts of each other in a creative and non-invidious manner" (p. 68). I am wary of the compartmentalization of concepts and ideas because of the habit to fix in a way that assumes a kind of unchanging stasis. If we are open to seeing stasis as its own kind of movement, then I stand to reimagine the potentiality of compartmentalizing. However, in the meantime, I again emphasize that *fixing* tells us more about *ourselves relating* than it does about the thing itself. In my response to the exam question, I emphasize politics of process and relationality. Relationality, in this sense, does not hinge on the components involved, but rather on the motion and movement between. It is not multiple singularities that stand alone, as bound distinct components and entities, but particularities that become through the potentiality of assemblages.

I like Deleuze because he *picks and chooses*, enacting what Braidotti calls "the art of 'bricolage' and of conceptual pickpocketing…What Deleuze retains, repeats and enhances is the most affirmative aspects of his favourite thinkers' philosophy. In so doing, he experiments with a philosophical style" (2002, p. 66). I took risks writing as I did in the comprehensive exam. It was, and still is, a question of reconfiguring the theoretical style. I echo Braidotti by choosing a style that,

> may strike the academic reader as allusive or associative. It is a deliberate choice on my part, involving the risk of sounding less than coherent at times. In choosing to defend the often poetic [and what some call inaccessible] 'ways' in which philosophers like [Trinh T. Minh-ha] and Deleuze present their theories, I am joining the call for a renewal of the language and the textual apparatus of academic writing but also of public political discussions (2002, p. 8).

As part of his movement towards affirmative methods and creative genesis, Brian Massumi writes that "vague concepts, and concepts of vagueness, have a crucial, and often enjoyable, role to play" (2002, p. 13). *Imagining otherwise* claims an *openness towards* the potentiality for multiple interjections, interactions, participations, becomings and imaginings. Echoing Tuhiwai Smith (1999), demystifying is always part of decolonizing.

There are always a multiplicity[4] of paths to follow. The guidelines and conditions around the comprehensive exam process – those of time, deadlines, field requirements

---

4. By writing *a multiplicity* I am intentionally playing with and juxtaposing the singular and plural.

4

and structure – meant that I had to make choices about what I was able to take-on. How I chose to enter into the conversation – which was thinking about how alterity is related to knowledge – was a culmination of the learning experiences and environments that I encountered up to this point. Particular texts and clusters of texts emerged. Continuing the movement that this comprehensive conversation has animated, I am excited to see which new paths and networks of relation emerge. However, I take seriously a politics of *citing/site-ing*, which Emma LaRocque (2010), Katherine McKittrick (2006), and Tuhiwai Smith (1999), among others, speak to in their texts. In many ways, citing is about familiarity. Habits of citing bring some thinkers, writers and ideas into closer proximity than others in academic practice. To be cited repeatedly brings a certain academic celebrity, as citing physically situates and sites one into the academic literature and scholarly tradition. Citing/site-ing is serious business. Perhaps part of Bruno Latour's (1993) call for *a new assembly* is as much about looking beyond familiar citations and labouring to site those who might not be as *well-known* within academic places, praxis and practices.

I've been thinking a lot about the 'so what' question. What does this orientation *do* that is different from other approaches? And so on, because this mode of thinking snow-balls[5]. In 'Pleasures of philosophy', the foreword to *A Thousand Plateaus*, Brian Massumi writes,

> the question is not: is it true? But: does it work? What new thoughts does it make possible to think? What new emotions does it make possible to feel? What new sensations and perceptions does it open in the body? The answers for some readers, perhaps most, will be 'none.' If that happens, it's not your tune. No problem. But you would have been better off buying a record (Massumi in Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. xv).

It is easy to get caught-up in the force of, what I will call, *nodes of completion*. These nodes are moments when everything comes together and you get to pass through a particularly *knotty encounter*. I see these kinds of encounters as, for example, the completion of coursework, passing exams, the defence of a dissertation, granting of tenure, and so forth. The successful passage through moments of procedural knottiness holds the ability to soften the affects that were endured to get there. Recollecting these affective experiences, I hope to continue in the movement and tenor that this process has animated. Oriented towards middles, I repeat that there are no beginnings or endings.

> *New paths might be found by letting go of the sterile opposition between the*
> *abstract and the concrete and its fellow-traveler, the subjective and objective.*
> *(Massumi, 2002, p. 206)*

***

The Exam Question -- How might we rupture formations of alterity in disciplinary traditions of

---

5. For me, snow-balls is when something grows through momentum, becoming larger and larger. For example, when a ball of snow is pushed down a hill or incline, the principle is that it will become larger in size as it picks up additional snow by rolling downwards. I literally picture a ball of snow rolling down a hill, growing larger as it picks up speed and covers distance. My use of this visualization and analogy – of snow that is substantial enough in quantity to create a ball, and then is able to roll downwards – could reveal a lot about the potential physical geography and cultural location of which I am apart. Or, potentially, this *snow-ball* could signal towards the kinds of texts, citations and frames of reference that I used and want to recreate for you, the reader. In any case, these kinds of moments mark a *site-ing* which build particular landscapes and timespaces. Snow can be sticky matter. Snow-balls *become* through weather conditions that make snow form-able and able to stick together.

knowledge production? Do theories of decolonization rupture, reinscribe or transform these formations?

> Alterity (al'ter'i'ty) *n. pl.* al*ter*i*ties: The state of being different, especially with respect to one's perception of one's identity within a culture; otherness.
>
> Disciplinary (dis'ci'pli'nar'y) *adj*: 1. Of, relating to, or used for discipline; disciplinary training; disciplinary measures, 2. Of or relating to a specific field of academic study (education).
>
> Rupture (rup'ture) *n*: 1. An instance of breaking open or bursting (for example, a rupture in the fuel line), 2. A break in friendly relations, 3. Medicine – a) a hernia, especially of the groin of intestines, b) a tear in an organ or tissue (for example, a rupture of an appendix; ligament rupture).[6]

I attempted to break this question into two parts. I tried to respond to the first part and then aimed to move onto the next. I found myself stuck. Overwhelmed by fragmentary pieces that I could not make work together, I could not find the *filon* – the thread – that would hold this all together. I had cornered myself into a compartmentalized approach that I was increasingly being cemented into. With lots of pieces – literally hundreds of pages and sticky notes – I felt like I was circling in increasingly tight and fast circles. Trying to go everywhere, I felt like I was going nowhere. Like trying to move in a drying pad of cement, I found myself in a fix.

Concrete is solid material, it doesn't move. It is matter that is used when wanting to fix and secure something. Buildings are erected with concrete, and things set vertical with the assurance that they will not topple or fall. The understanding is that concrete is stable, secure, hard and fixed. Concrete is poured and molded because it doesn't 'let go'. A certain kind of trust is placed in this material, a trust which assumes that under *normal* everyday conditions concrete won't break or give. It doesn't move. Or does it?

Concrete does move. *In Parables for the Virtual*, Brian Massumi writes that "concrete is as concrete doesn't" (2002, p. 6). It is matter that is formed by innumerable particles that are in constant motion, within their range of movement. A range of movement that is very much determined by the composition of other particles in proximity. Within its own frame of reference, concrete is a substance that has its own tempo, range of motion, and character. The conscientious/inquisitive imagination learns about the conditions under which concrete thrives and the various environmental dimensions that can come to impact it. This learning seems even more urgent when we are made aware of our inter-dependence with this substance (leaky foundations come to mind). Those who want to maintain a relationship with concrete might be more attuned and open to learning about concrete's character and ways of relating.

Why am I writing about concrete in an exam on alterity and disciplinarity? In many ways, this *onto-story* about concrete sets the foundation for the rest of the conversation. Keeping in mind that concrete is on-the-move, this foundation is not 'set in stone'. Or it is (set in stone), as long as we are prepared to challenge the commonly held assumption that stones don't move, and imagine within the conditions of potentiality of the stone itself. I emphasize that this foundation is multiple, fluid, open to change and affected by that which is in proximity. This foundation challenges us to reconsider that which

---

6. All definitions have been found online through Thefreedictionary.com.

we assume to know, think, and perceive. It is "a listening otherwise that suspends the willfulness of the self and fore-knowledge" (Lipari, 2009, p. 44) and is attuned to the limitless potentiality of that which is in-relation. As a politics of process and relationality (Manning, 2006; Massumi, 2002), this foundation is movement. Like the *filon*/thread itself, it contains entire networks of motion and circuits of movements that can be imagined as an assemblage of intersecting components. It is "wholeness and detail at once" (Chow, 1991, p. 115). A whole composed of multiple particularities that together manifest an orientation towards (Ahmed, 2006; Chow, 1991; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Gilroy, 2005), rather than a desire to know that is predicated on a mastering. Lived experiences with concrete can show us that the life of concrete cannot be mastered. Ultimately, it will do things that are beyond our control, such as crumble, break, crack and fall.

My response to this question necessitates that I begin by writing through the processes and structures that animated this conversation. In many ways, it has been a process of reanimation. I initially approached this question with a force that was akin to taking a sledgehammer to a concrete block. I forced the question to move in such a way that I imposed a split and manufactured a fracture. By severing disciplinary traditions from theories of decolonization, it was as if I had put my finger on the vein itself: I stopped the flow of ideas. And I could have continued down this path of compartmentalization, forced the pieces together, or perhaps fallen back on familiar scripts or structures, to make things work. Luckily, this question is *complicated matter*. As a whole composed of multiple particularities, there are always a multiplicity of paths to follow (Ahmed, 2006; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Manning, 2006; Massumi, 2002). By simultaneous moving across and through, this process is *movement between*. Again, I emphasize *moving between* because it signals an approach that does not follow or abide by boundaries. My approach does not take a straight path or assume a particular structural or disciplinary convention. Rather, it is movement. A form of creative genesis that emerges relationally. This question has its own tempo and character. By moving back-and-forth, sometimes jumping across (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) and appearing to digress (Massumi, 2002), I open towards a thinking otherwise that takes seriously the force and weight of analysis. In orienting myself to the whole of the matter, my response will move through a series of particularities that emerge through the question itself. Much of what has already unfolded can and must be looped forward. Concrete tells us more about alterity and disciplinarity than we might automatically assume. It is hard to *fix* something that is constantly on the move. The *fixing* tells us more about ourselves-relating than it does about the thing itself.

The Force of Habit

> Consider that there is no 'raw' perception. That all perception is rehearsed. Even, especially, our most intense, most abject and inspiring, self-perceptions. Repetition precedes resemblance (even to oneself). Consider that although change is compatible with repetition, it is nonetheless ontologically prior to sameness. See stasis, see station, as a special case of movement (a special case of reiterative movement: that allowing recognition). Passage precedes position.
> (Massumi, 2002, p. 66)

A substantial part of this response is about becoming familiar with the processes and practices of knowledge-making that have become invisible through habit. As Sarah Ahmed writes in *Queer Phenomenology*, "orientations are about the direction we take that puts some things and not others in our reach. So the object…can be apprehended only insofar as it has come to be available to me" (2006, p. 56). In his discussion of 'race-thinking' in *Postcolonial Melancholia*, Paul Gilroy states that in order for categories to be intelligible, continued effort must be made to produce the demarcations that mark the outlines of such concepts in the first place (2005, pp. 29-33). Continued work is required to reinforce the constructed borders around what we know and how we know it. The danger is, however, that the "labour of repetition disappears through labour" (Ahmed, 2006, p. 56). Habit forms familiarity through which made-ness disappears. In such a way, "habit is an acquired automatic self-regulation. It resides in the flesh. Some say in matter. As acquired, it can pass for 'natural'" (Massumi, 2002, p. 11). Habit is familiarity that is acquired through repetition. Under the weight of repetition, habits pass for natural. Habit is tricky matter.

In his discussion of the 'massive psycho-existential complex' that juxtaposes black and white, Frantz Fanon states in *Black Skin, White Masks* that the "collective unconscious is quite simply the repository of prejudices, myths and collective attitudes of a particular group…this collective unconscious is…cultural, i.e., it is acquired" (1975, p. 165). Echoing the constructed nature of 'implicit knowledge' (Fanon, 1975, p. 91), "what bodies 'tend to do' are effects of histories rather than being originary" (Ahmed, 2006, p. 56). Massumi asks: "aren't the perceived unity and constancy of the object and of the subject – co-snowballing differentials both – just habitual, even institutionalized, exaggerations? Is recognition anything more than the habit of no longer seeing what's new?" (2002, p. 221). In such a way, alterity is not a pre-given or pre-determined object (Ahmed, 2006; Fabian, 2002; Fanon, 1975; Gilroy, 2005; Said, 1978). It is a category and concept in Western thought (Fabian, 2002, p. 18) that has been crafted, shaped and made by and through Western theories of knowledge and practices. These "patterns have history and can be understood as social and political rather than natural phenomena" (Gilroy, 2005, p. 11). Alterity is not natural or essential. Rather, it is the repeated, accumulated effects of thought that are very much connected to and invested in Western colonial/imperial practices. These ways of seeing and experiencing the world are "man-made" (Said, 1978, p. 5; Trinh, 1989). Knowledge of 'the other' is a "temporal, historical, political act" (Fabian, 2002, p. 1) that must be contextualized in relation to the complex imperial industries that had, and continue to have, enormous investments (including, but not limited to, political, economic, socio-cultural and militaristic) in seeking out, solidifying, and re/producing alterity as 'otherness'. What is central is working through how 'the other' emerges as an object within Western Traditions of knowing. Through knowledges that naturalize and authorize, Western practices and processes of knowledge production repeatedly produce 'the other' so to concretize it as an apprehend-able object (Ahmed, 2006, p. 57; Fabian, 2002; Said, 1978). It has become a dangerous habit, all too familiar.

To learn to be/do otherwise, we must know from where we have come. As Linda Tuhiwai Smith writes in *Decolonizing Methodologies*, "coming to know the past has been part of a critical pedagogy of decolonization. To hold alternative histories is to hold alternative

knowledges" (1999, p. 34). Coming to know the past means taking seriously where the weight of analysis is located and placed within knowledge production. The violence and trauma of academic modes of knowing, writing, and being must be reconnected to their imperialist roots (LaRocque, 2010; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). In many ways, these roots have nourished upon alterity. Quoting Disraeli, Edward Said states in Orientalism, that "the East [is] a career" (1978, p. 5). Such *ideas* build careers, grant tenure and secure scholarly *celebrity*. In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Fanon powerfully examines "the psychological burdens that colonial racism imposed upon its victims" (1975, p. x) by instituting dehumanizing hierarchies of being very much centred in processes of locating, identifying and re/producing 'others'. Quoting W.J.T. Mitchell in *The Right to Look*, Nicholas Mirzoeff writes that "an empire requires not just a lot of stuff but what Michael Foucault called an 'order of things,' an epistemic field that produces a sense of the kinds of objects, the logic of their speciation, their taxonomy" (2011, p. 49). In the 'complex of visuality' (Mirzoeff, 2011, p. 4) – which combines classifying, separating and aestheticizing – Mirzoeff posits that "visuality sutures authority to power and renders this association 'natural'" (p. 6). Through violent enforcement and visualized surveillance, "empire thus claims objectivity" (Mirzoeff, 2011, p. 49). This is achieved by visually re-inscribing the authority and power-over the objects of imperial conquest, for example through guidebooks, manuals, realist art, and painting. In Mirzoeff's interrogation of the plantation/slavery complex that sustained Western European imperialism through colonization, these *objects* are literally the bodies of slaves.

Formations of alterity reveal the academic practices, spaces and pedagogies which evoke and come to use them. In *Images at War*, Serge Gruzinski writes that "the West projected categories and grids onto Latin America in order to try to understand, dominate, and acculturate it…the Christian West reduced its prey to fit its own schematics and make it the object of its debates" (2001, p. 6). In such a way, *rupturing* formations of alterity becomes about reanimating the academic habits and structures through which learning, researching and knowing take place. By tracing the emergences and formations of alterity as an idea, the motion of tracing reanimates such nodes of thought. Motion and movement challenge the stasis and rigidity of categories. A category on-the-move defies solidification and stagnation, as stasis and stagnation are particular kinds of movement that lead down particular paths.

The texts connected through this exam are not focused on fixing or securing a definition of alterity. Rather, they work through the complex processes and practices through which ideas of otherness, the other, and other-ing materialize (Ahmed, 2006; Fabian, 2002; Fanon, 1975; Puar, 2007; Said, 1978; Taussig, 1993; Trinh, 1989). They take-up in ways that break with old patterns and orientations because they do not re-centre or re-objectify the *object*. Working-with and tracing emergences attempts to shift from analyzing to conversing – or analyzing-differently – which holds the potential to rupture normative patterns and dynamics of 'doing' or moving. Moving beyond that which is assumed and already known, these thinkers are oriented towards the limitlessness of potentiality (Massumi, 2002).

Imagining otherwise means attending to how alterity has been centred as an object in

disciplinary Traditions of knowledge production. And while repeating this does not undo or change the violence and brutality that has been – and continues to be – committed under the force of alterity and otherness, repetitions are tricky matter. Habits have a force of their own, they snow-ball. The potential to snow-ball, to gain momentum at an ever increasing rate, weighs upon perception until it is perceived concretely. That is, as a fixed, hard form. Habits can be broken (or melted). But it is a question of force and weight. Knowing that alterity is an idea is not enough. This knowing cannot contend with the force through which alterity continues to snow-ball. The act of knowing itself remains caught in the same back-looping pattern of habit. Concrete is as concrete doesn't. But it does.

Singularity Never Stands Alone: On Multiplicities

Western knowledge production and the role of the Western European academy has been – and still is – intimately connected to imperialisms and processes of colonization. Colonization/s, imperialism/s and knowledge/s are intimately intertwined and connected through dominating processes that labour to mark those with the authority, power and force to know (Hill-Collins, 1991; LaRocque, 2010; Said, 1978; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Conceptualizing what *rupturing* formations of alterity entails necessitates working through how disciplinary traditions of knowledge production colonize through singularity. Through imposing singular ways of knowing, being and doing that categorically concretize, meaning is one terrain in the power to know. Alterity is when it is concretely fixed within the confines of concept. "A thing is when it isn't doing. A thing is concretely where and what it is – for example a successfully shot arrow sticking in a target – when it is in a state of arrest" (Massumi, 2002, p. 6). Defining amounts to fixing an idea. To rupture alterity means attending to this force and taking seriously the impulses of research and knowledge as practices that fix ideas through static definitions. More often than not, we are trapped in our ideas (Gruzinski, 2001, p. 56). As Gruzinski writes, "I have tried to resist, whenever possible, the usual avatars of a dualistic (signifier/signified, form/content) and compartmentalized (economic, social, religious, political, aesthetic) way of thinking whose overly utilitarian outlines manage to imprison more than they explain" (2001, p. 4). Generally speaking, however, "we follow the line that is followed by others" (Ahmed, 2006, p. 15). This is because there is much at stake in lines and paths, i.e. Traditions and disciplines.

Disciplines themselves rely on boundaries that maintain and preserve the edges of their character. Through a number of different strategies and tactics, dominant Traditions of knowledge and knowing labour to maintain disciplinary boundaries by repeatedly demarcating the limits of the field; thinking, writing, speaking, knowing and professing are such tactics. There is power in these tools. Time, grammar, vocabulary, and structure labour together to build a framework through which things become familiar and comfortable. Part of the discursive creation that labours to form alterity involves the very structure of language. Language is power (Fanon, 1975, p. 22; LaRocque, 2010; Trinh, 1989); "to speak... means above all assuming a culture and bearing the weight of a civilization" (Fanon, 1975, p. 2). The habitus of the linguistic apparatus weighs upon

knowing. As Tuhiwai Smith writes,

> reading and interpretation present problems when we do not see ourselves in the text. There are problems, too, when we do see ourselves but can barely recognize ourselves through the representation. One problem of being trained to read this way, or, more correctly, of learning to read this way over many years of academic study, is that we can adopt uncritically similar patterns of writing. We begin to write about ourselves as indigenous peoples as if we really were 'out there', the 'Other', with all the baggage that this entails. Another problem is that academic writing is a form of selecting, arranging and presenting knowledge. It privileges sets of texts, views about the history of an idea, what issues count as significant; and, by engaging in the same process uncritically, we too can render indigenous writers invisible or unimportant while reinforcing the validity of other writers (1999, p. 36).

I quote Tuhiwai Smith at length because she moves through a number of particularities that are central to this conversation; training, learning, adopting, patterns, selecting/ arranging/presenting, and reinforcing. Knowledge is about power (Fabian, 2002; Fanon, 1975; Hill-Collins, 1991). When knowledge is power, the notion of singularity is of utmost value. The universalization of dominant forms of Western scholarship, knowledge and experience (LaRocque, 2010, p. 27) works in such a way as to delegitimize other ways of knowing and other forms of knowledge (Hill-Collins, 1991; LaRocque, 2010; Trinh, 1989; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Scholarly imperialism (Chow, 1991, p. 35) maintains a "politics of suppression" (Hill-Collins, 1991, p. 5) whereby the very nature of Disciplinary thought demarcates the boundaries around the very acceptability of knowledge and coming to know (LaRocque, 2010; Trinh, 1989; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). In *Black Feminist Thought*, Patricia Hill-Collins writes that "black women's exclusion from positions of power within mainstream institutions has led to the elevation of elite White male ideas and interests and the corresponding suppression of Black women's ideas and interests in traditional scholarship" (1991, p. 7). If "knowledge is both domination and resistance" (Gordon, 1997, p. 80), this tension becomes more than apparent in "the struggle to assume intellectual agency" (LaRoque, 2010, p. 27; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). Hill-Collins continues her critique of the dominant institution, saying that "the shadow obscuring this complex Black women's intellectual tradition is neither accidental nor benign. Suppressing knowledge produced by any oppressed group makes it easier for dominant groups to rule because the seeming absence of dissent suggests that subordinate groups willingly collaborate in their own victimization" (Hill-Collins, 1991, p. 5).

Formations of alterity are built into the very foundations of how we communicate and comprehend. This begins with the *I*. The factiously contained self, the *I*, which never is one; "call it a 'self-.' The hyphen is retained as a reminder that 'self' is not a substantive but rather a relation" (Massumi, 2002, p. 14). However, the manufacturing of *self* (no hyphen) and *I* are of mythic proportion. Their edges labour to conceal their multiplicity and inter/dependency. Like the mythic figure of the solitary academic, they are anything but ever a-lone. The *I* consumes in order to appear lone. It eats the other (hooks, 2006). By strategically incorporating multiplicity into its folds, disciplinary thought motions forward. In a certain sense, disciplines snow-ball. They open their borders enough as to strategically incorporate *new* and to harness the potential of change. Disciplines are smart, call them tricky matter. To resist all movement and all change risks appearing

stagnated. A certain disciplinary death, if you will. Like disciplines themselves, the potentiality of the I/i always threatens to loop back into *I* (Trinh, 1989). It even slips from I/i to I/I with the help of Microsoft Word's auto-correct. A lifetime of habit-making is hard to rupture.

As Tuhiwai Smith writes in *Decolonizing Methodologies*, decolonization does not mean a total rejection of Western modes of knowledge production, researching or theorizing. Rather, it entails a centring of indigenous "concerns and world views and then coming to know and understand theory and research from our own perspectives and for our own purposes" (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 39). In this way, decolonization can be approached as openness toward knowledges, researching and academic practices. Such openness toward multiplicities of knowing resists domination through singularity. The centre does not hold the same power when there are networks of multiple connections and relations. In such a way, decolonization contains the potentiality to destabilize master narratives and visions of academic and disciplinary traditions that power-over, over-power and dominate. "Native resistance to dehumanization challenges the academy to re-examine its privileged position. The assumption is, of course, that decolonization is a dynamic process requiring introspection and critical change" (LaRocque, 2010, p. 14). The authors relating through this comprehensive exam process each approach writing, thinking and theorizing from a multiplicity of experiences, positions and places. They themselves affiliate with, and are affiliated-to, a number of different academic disciplines and institutions. Such presence demonstrates how disciplines are also sites of potentiality. A decolonizing orientation attends to the myriad of potentialities that emerge through disciplinarity and scholarly practices.

Knowledge itself is a becoming that arises relationally (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Massumi, 2002), and is always multiple, acquired, and changing (Braidotti, 2002; Manning, 2006). It has varied histories. As such, knowledge is traceable. What this means is that how we *know* is not something that is given (an essence) but something that is open to examination and conversation. This alone does not negate the force of singularity that potentially over-powers, over-rides or power-overs the multiple. The traces of Disciplinary Tradition do not just go away. But within an approach that is oriented towards assemblages of intersecting networks, knowledge-practices emerge as things that we have a right to look at (Mirzoeff, 2002), that we must look at (Gordon, 1997; Stoler, 2010; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999), and have an ethical obligation and commitment to unpack.

Affirmative Methods and Creative Genesis

> 'Interdisciplinary work, so much discussed these days, is not about confronting already constituted disciplines (none of which, in fact, is willing to let itself go). To do something interdisciplinary it's not enough to choose a 'subject' (a theme) and gather around it two or three sciences. Interdisciplinarity consists in creating a new object that belongs to no one' (quoted in Clifford and Marcus 1986). Not owned by anyone yet, this Interdisciplinarity is in the public domain, which does not guarantee anything except that there is still some room to claim rather than discipline its meaning into existence. (Gordon, 1997, p. 7)

To create a new object that belongs to no one: transdisciplinary quasi object. To *create* rather than to *discipline* meaning into existence is a vision of interdisciplinarity that reimagines the tenor of scholarly practice. But there is never a guarantee. In many ways, the authors that I have lived with throughout the comps process are part of a force which *dares to imagine otherwise*. They imagine alterity *otherwise* which forces the cemented singularity of Traditional paths to rupture. To challenge and unpack how Western academic Traditions of knowledge production have been oriented towards alterity demands a re-orientation. This reorientation emerges as decolonizing (Gordon, 1997; Sandoval, 2000; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999), counterhistories (LaRocque, 2010), countervisualities (Bennett, 2012; Marks, 2000; Mirzoeff, 2002), networks (Braidotti, 2002; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Latour, 1993; Manning, 2006) and political ecology (Massumi, 2002; Bennett, 2010). Together, these works labour to force knowledge production and the tenets of knowing to bear the weight of analysis. A speaking-back, writing-back, researching-back, looking-back and imagining otherwise that refuses to re/produce Traditions of colonial/colonizing knowledges. The potentiality of interdisciplinary/transdisciplinary knowledges are that they belong to no one.

Creative genesis is the substance of invention. The failure of critical vocabularies directs Avery Gordon to a vocabulary of hauntings, ghosts and spectres in order to reimagine the possibilities of what sociological knowledges can do:

> The available critical vocabularies were failing (me) to communicate the depth, density, and intricacies of the dialectic of subjection and subjectivity (or what in my business we call structure and agency), of domination and freedom, of critique and utopian longing. Of course, it is not simply the vocabularies themselves that are at fault, but the constellation of effects, historical and institutional, that make a vocabulary a social practice of producing knowledge (1997, p. 8).

How we speak, and the linguistic structures that we come to depend on, signals familiarity and habit. Zones of comfort never weigh upon bodies in the same way. To be aware of the relationality of our presence is to be attuned to the matter of habit-forcing; a becoming that is moving towards an ethics.

The point is not to get rid of, discard, erase or forget. This cannot be done, nor should it be. Rather, it is to work through the structural, ideological nodes and techniques that labour to form alterity. To this extent, we experience the notion of *simultaneity* in the work of Bruno Latour (1993) and his conception of nonmodernity, in Mirzoeff (2011) and the idea of *counterpoints* – visualities alongside countervisualities – and Jasbir Puar's (2007) use of *assemblages*, as collections of multiplicities, whose very force as a conceptual tool attuned to movement arises through the back-and-forth motion of relating to intersectionality. It is not a debunking, disavowal, discarding or overcoming. Rather it is a working-with, a becoming-with that is a complex network of paths. In what he calls *nonmodern*, Latour imagines a "retrospective attitude, which deploys instead of [unveils], adds instead of [subtracts], fraternizes instead of [denounces], sorts out instead of [debunks]…A nonmodern is anyone who takes simultaneously into account the moderns' Constitution and the populations of the hybrids that that Constitution rejects and allows to proliferate" (1993, p. 47). The balance has to shift from those techniques that are attuned to negative critique, to what Massumi calls *affirmative*

methods, "techniques which embrace their own inventiveness and are not afraid to own up to the fact that they add (if so meagrely) to reality" (2002, p. 12). Criticisms that do not think of themselves as "life-enhancing and constitutively opposed to every form of tyranny, domination and abuse" (Said in LaRocque, 2010, p. 32), do not deal with the weight of the past. To criticize or debunk alone refuses to account for the force through which alterity repeats:

> It is not that critique is wrong. As usual, it is not a question of right and wrong – nothing important ever is. Rather, it is a question of dosage. It is simply that when you are busy critiquing you are less busy augmenting. You are that much less fostering. There are times when debunking is necessary. But, if applied in a blanket manner, adopted as a general operating principle, it is counterproductive. Foster or debunk. It's a strategic question. Like all strategic questions, it is basically a question of timing and proportion (Massumi, 2002, p. 13).

By urging and encouraging his reader to "take joy in your digression" (2002, p. 18), Massumi signals an orientation towards invention and "creative contagion" (p. 19). Imagining otherwise requires the use of imaginations, "there are times when new words are needed to convene a new assembly…[and] it is up to us to change our ways of changing" (Latour, 1993, p. 145). Creative genesis as a node of strategic reimagining generates such things as the quasi object and political ecologies. Or, more fittingly, it generates a network through which these things emerge. In any case, it is multiplicity:

> just as the body lives between dimensions, designing for it requires operating between logics… to welcome the translogical. A translogic is different from metalogic. It doesn't stand back and describe the way multiple logics and the operative levels they mold hold together. It enters the relations and tweaks as many as it can to get a sense of what may come. It is pragmatic…it is effective. Rather than metalogical, it is supermodulatory" (Massumi, 2002, p. 207).

Conceptual tools harness potential creativity and fluidity when approached with the force of invention. However, I am also wary of the force that this perspective signals. It is risky to challenge the status-quo. The *I/i* or *self-* supported by the force of relation, of solidarity, experiences risk much differently than the lone *I*. There is never a guarantee when taking a path that challenges the-way-things-are. When things go awry, the *I/i* that might have been can become the *I* which it was never supposed to be (a-lone).

Solidarity and Collaborative Knowledges: On Ethics

> *A political knowledge-practice that takes an inclusive, nonjudgemental approach to tending belonging-together in an intense, affectively engaged way is an* ethics *– as opposed to a morality. Political ecology is an amoral collective ethics. Ethics is a tending of coming-together, a* caring for *belonging as such.*
> (Massumi, 2002, p. 255)

Disciplines are intimately connected to processes and practices of colonialisms/ imperialisms. To decolonize is to deconstruct and re-examine in light of colonial/imperial pasts, presents and futures; "decolonization is a process which engages with imperialism and colonization at multiple levels. For researchers, one of those levels is concerned with having a more critical understanding of the underlying assumptions, motivations and

values which inform research practices" (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 20). Making visible the often invisible processes and practices through which we – as collective individuations (Manning, 2006, p. xviii) – come to know (Trinh, 1989) is part of how I understanding decolonizing as demystifying knowledge. *Demystifying knowledge* means challenging the common sense, taken-for-granted assumptions that sustain knowledge as an idea. For example, that knowing is easy and effortless, or the inverse, that it can be achieved through enough pain, sweat and tears. Even the idea that *one can know* signals a particular "myth of origin" (Massumi, 2002, p. 68). As Tuhiwai Smith writes, "the challenge always is to demystify, to decolonize" (1999, p. 16). Engaging in continued knowledge-sharing processes means more than sharing surface information which can be thought of as pamphlet knowledge (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 16). It means sharing "the theories and analyses which inform the way knowledge and information are constructed and represented" (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 16).

The force of risk necessitates that we take seriously an ethics of becoming. "In a decolonizing framework, deconstruction is part of a much larger intent. Taking apart the story, revealing underlying texts, and giving voice to things that are often known intuitively does not help people to improve their current conditions. It provides words, perhaps, an insight that explains certain experiences – but it does not prevent someone from dying" (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999, p. 3). Solidarity and collaborative risk-taking are emergent elements of social justice orientations that do not abide by boundaries that attempt to demarcate *academic* from *real-life* spaces/places. To take seriously an orientation that is an ethics, we must be attuned to labour and the force of analysis. When all that exists is the *I* (Mirzoeff, 2011, p. 259), there are un-foretold dangers in risk taking. To have ethics and academic praxis emerge relationally requires a politics of respect and commitment to collaboration. Reimagining what this entails becomes a potential site of change. As Emma LaRocque writes, "it is imperative that we treat with respect other people's works upon which we build our dialogics and, for many of us, our academic degrees; it is also important to maintain our right to disagree. Writers owe much to each other" (2010, p. 32). To rupture Traditions, canons, and structures – let alone refusing to sustain, support and police them – entails risks. These risks need to be weighed in relation to the histories of the academy itself. Part of reimagining an ethics of caring in relation to academic practices and processes of knowledge production is attending to how the burden and strain of labour weighs-differently on bodies in these spaces. *Becoming otherwise* necessitates that the force of risk-taking in academic and scholarly situations happens in ways that do not reproduce historical oppressions and violence/s.

Theories of decolonization contain the potentiality to become all three; to rupture, re/inscribe, and transform. This is because theories of/and decolonization can be disciplined and made to fit within Traditional paths. The question becomes: *decolonization how? Becoming through what kind of assemblage? As a singularity or through multiplicities?* Decolonizing emerges as risk-taking to imagine otherwise when it is not bound by borders, confined or limited. Even by single-ing out one text or idea from the network of a life's work disrupts the force of becoming. But single texts rarely are, as there is always the potential for relationality. For example, take this process of comprehending. This process generated its

15

own network through which connections and paths emerged.

Through collaborative knowledges, creative genesis/contagion and affirmative methods, a multiplicity of orientations emerge. In relation to these forces, decolonizing approaches hold the potential to move the cemented habits of Tradition. They were on the move already, so says the *onto-story*. And those attuned to *thinking otherwise* have always been in the motion of rolling-on, as stones do. The potentiality of decolonization is that it also risks being disciplined. There is never a guarantee. I urge us not to idealize the potentiality of political ecology either, even if its object is *symbiosis*, "the coming-together or belonging-together of processually unique and divergent forms of life" (Massumi, 2002, p. 255). As limitless potential, these ways can become anything. They are limitlessness. This includes being disciplined into familiar, singular dominant lines of knowing. To not connect with what LaRocque (2010) calls 'Aboriginal ethos' and knowledges that approach life, matter, and humanness in ways outside of binaries and/ or dualisms, slides backwards into familiar paths that concretize singular Traditions of thought. The force of moving across borders means resisting the impulse to discipline and be disciplined, to break cycles of domination and emancipation (Latour, 1993, p. 10). Perhaps the *new* in materialisms should jump ship, creatively fraternize, and relate under the weight of different terms. As a continually unfolding process that is constantly in the making, decolonization is the potentiality of multiple lines of flight, paths, and orientations. This limitlessness, which might seem risky – if not outright scary – is also a source of potential change and of yet unimagined orientations.

While I insist that there is no beginning or ending, how one enters into the conversation is of the utmost importance. This sets the tenor for how one will continue. The authors discussed in this response enter into alterity through the complexities, histories and processes of colonialisms/imperialisms. What these works collectively demonstrate is how ideas become constructed as unshakable *facts*, and that research, knowledge production, and academic praxis are themselves reproduced through learned practices of habit. Knowing, writing, speaking, and imagining are repeated acts of emergence (Fanon, 1975; Gruzinski, 2001; Hill-Collins, 1991; LaRocque, 2010; Lorde, 1984; Trinh, 1989; Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). To force the weight of analysis onto disciplinary Traditions of knowledge production aims to rupture formations of alterity. It breaks with the usual habits and tenor of Traditional practice. Rupture is movement. But so is cement. Concrete tells us more about alterity and disciplinarity than we might automatically assume. It is hard to *fix* something that is constantly on the move. I repeat. The *fixing* tells us more about ourselves-relating than it does about the thing itself. I cannot emphasize movement and motion enough.

References

Ahmed, S. (2006). *Queer phenomenology: Orientations, objects, others*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Bennet, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Bennet, J. (2012). *Practical aesthetics: Events, affect, and art after 9/11*. London and New York: I. B. Tauris and Co Ltd.

Braidotti, R. (2002). *Metamorphoses: Towards a materialist theory of becoming*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Chow, R. (1991). *Woman and Chinese modernity: The politics of reading between West and East*. Minnesota, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fabian, J. (2002). *Time and the Other: How anthropology makes its object (with a new foreword by Matti Bunzl)*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Fanon, F. (1975). *Black skin, white masks*. Trans. C. L. Markmann. London: Paladin.

Gilroy, P. (2005). *Postcolonial melancholia*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gordon, A. F. (1997). *Ghostly matters: Haunting and the sociological imagination*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Gruzinski, S. (2001). *Images at war: Mexico from Columbus to Blade Runner (1492-2019)*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Hill Collins, P. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment*. New York and London: Routledge.

hooks, b. (2006). Eating the other: Desire and resistance (1992), in M. Gigi Durham and D. M. Kellner (eds) *Media and cultural studies: Keyworks (revised edition)* (366-380), Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

LaRocque, E. (2010). *When the Other is me: Native resistance discourse 1850-1990*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern*. Translated by C. Porter. USA: Harvester Wheatsheaf and the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Lipari, L. (2009). Listening otherwise: The voice of ethics. *International Journal of Listening* 23(1): 44-59.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Berkeley: Crossing Press.

Manning, E. (2006). *Politics of touch: Sense, movement, sovereignty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Marks, L. (2000). *The skin of the film: Intercultural cinema, embodiment, and the senses*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.

Massumi, B. (2002). *Parables for the virtual: Movement, affect, sensation*. Durham: Duke University Press.

McKittrick, K. (2006). *Demonic grounds: Black women and the cartographies of struggle*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.

Mirzoeff, N. (2011). *The right to look: A counterhistory of visuality*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Puar, J. (2007). *Terrorist assemblages: Homonationalism in queer times*. United States: Duke University Press.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York: Random House.

Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed*. Minnesota: The University of Minnesota Press.

Stoler, A. L. (2010). *Along the archival grain: Epistemic anxieties and colonial common sense*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Taussig, M. (1993). *Mimesis and alterity: A particular history of the senses*. New York and London: Routledge.

Trinh T. Minh-Ha (1989). *Woman, Native, Other: Writing postcoloniality and feminism*. Bloomington, Illinois: Indiana University Press.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. London and New York: Zed Books Ltd.

Affect and the Ongoing Present in the Québec Spring of 2012

Maija Duncan

Social and Political Thought, PhD, York University

ABSTRACT Lauren Berlant (2011) characterizes the current neoliberal moment as a "crisis of the ongoing present". This is a useful notion to understand what may be unique about our current present, but it does not sufficiently engage with the problem of the individual versus the collective; that is to say, whether this notion is useful to think of the political. This paper explores how affective attachments shape what we call the present in a collective sense. The Québec Spring of 2012 was an event that is arguably located within the ongoing present while still breaking with its sense of impasse, thus making it an ideal object of study for understanding the role of affects and temporalities in shaping the ongoing present. How Québec conceives of the present is shaped by affective attachments to stories that are told about the past and identity, including stories that are racialized. Through an analysis of visual art and prose that originated in the Québec Spring, this paper argues that the Québec Spring consisted of a "glitch" in this ongoing present. Conceiving of collective movements as glitches presents both political potential and limitations due to the critique of sovereignty. Group affects can be very powerful, but run the risk of causing harm when fixated on unhealthy or self-defeating attachments.

KEYWORDS Québec, politics, student protests, affect theory, critique of sovereignty

Introduction

The present is a difficult temporality to locate with any kind of certainty; we can only live it. This difficulty is especially true of events or moments in time that remain vivid in the collective imaginary. My object of study, the student and social protests which occurred in 2012 in Québec[1], is one such event. I will engage with this event mainly through two interrelated concepts. First, Lauren Berlant (2011) characterizes the current neoliberal moment as "an impasse of the present"(255), by which she means that we live in a moment of austerity and precarity that feels like both a crisis and the ordinary, stretching out until an event rupturing this impasse is felt as a relief. The second concept is Berlant and Edelman's (2014) critique of individual sovereignty, a myth to which the self clings as a defence against the insult of its lack of agency. I will consider what this means for the lingering traces of the past in the present. I will then argue that the Québec Spring was what Berlant calls a glitch in the ongoing present. This event that ruptures the neoliberal present is made possible through what Georgis (2013) refers to as 'queer

---

1. What to call these protests presents a terminological difficulty. While commonly known, especially in English Canada, as the Québec Student Protests, I object to this name, as it reduces a larger social movement to post-secondary students. In French, the term "printemps érable" was commonly used, a play on words referring to the Arab Spring. While this has often been translated to Maple Spring, without the original wordplay, this term loses its implied meaning. Consequently, I will be using the term "Québec Spring", even though this also has limitations, specifically that the activism both preceded and exceeded the months of spring.

affects'. These queer affects result in the fashioning of a different affective relationship to self-defeating desires, also referred to as 'cruel attachments' by Berlant (2011). Within this framework, affective relationships inform this temporality that we call the present; they can hold us back in the stranglehold of a continuous present that cannot escape the past, or they can enable us to form new relationships with both the past and present. To explore the ways in which affect and temporality work to form and maintain a particular form of present during the Québec Spring, I will examine a variety of cultural texts: a work of visual art which was reprinted in the anthology *Le printemps québécois* (2013), a speech reprinted in that same anthology, and sections of Gabriel Nadeau-Dubois' account, *Tenir Tête* (2013)[2].

This paper is divided into three sections. I begin by examining Berlant's critique of individual sovereignty. This is followed by a critique of national sovereignty, which explores the role of the perceived past in shaping the present. The final section draws out what an interruption of the ongoing present potentially means for the relationship between affect and temporality and whether this relationship provides alternative political possibilities.

The Québec Spring was an historical moment of social turmoil, which lasted from February to September 2012, with the apex of activism during the spring. It was sparked in response to Jean Charest's Liberal provincial government's decision to increase tuition fees in all Québec universities. Students took umbrage to this plan out of fear for their financial survival, as well as a perceived violation of Québec's social contract. Many considered this social contract to be based on the Quiet Revolution[3], an era in which the objective of establishing free higher education was prevalent. Universities and CÉGEPs[4] joined the general unlimited strike and nightly protests. One hundred night protests were held in Montreal between April 11 and August 1, counting only those that occurred in the metropolis (Bonenfant, Glinoer, & Lapointe, 2013, p. 106). While Montreal protests were often the most impressive, it should not be forgotten that protests happened in Québec City, Gatineau, Chicoutimi, and Trois-Rivières, to name a few. One of the bloodiest protests took place at Victoriaville, a small city of 43,000 people (Bonenfant, Glinoer, & Lapointe, 2013, pp. 180-83). To complement the violent police repression[5], the government implemented a law (Bill 78) forcing a return to class and severely limiting the right to public protest. The reaction was public outrage: people from all walks of life joined nightly protests, clanging on pots and pans to indicate their loss of faith in the legitimacy of the government and collectively refusing to abide by the new law, which was thus rendered impossible to apply. The stand-off between society and government

2. Neither of these works are available in English. Their titles loosely translate to "The Québec Spring" and "Standing Strong", respectively. All passages from these works have been translated by this paper's author.

3. This is the name given to a period in Québec history which roughly started in the 1960s. During this period, Québec liberalized and secularized through a number of notable reforms. Of all these reforms, those that came out of the Parent Commission (1963-64) are the most relevant to this topic. This Commission investigated the state of education in Québec, concluding that education is a culturally essential right. Amongst other consequences, the CÉGEP system was established, and a tuition freeze was implemented. In Parent's report, freezing tuition fees was seen as a transitory measure towards completely free education.

4. The CÉGEP (*Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel*) is a public post-secondary establishment unique to Québec. Students typically attend these colleges for two years before university, or three years if enrolled in a trade program.

5. There were 3418 arrests across the province between February 16 and September 3 (Bonenfant, Glinoer, & Lapointe, 2013, p. 236), often amongst allegations that the police had kettled peaceful protestors and not given them the chance to walk away. Indeed, on May 4, the same day that two people were severely hurt in Victoriaville and the Sureté du Québec had felt it appropriate to arrest entire buses of protestors as they left the city, Amnesty International denounced the police violence taking place (Bonenfant, Glinoer, & Lapointe, 2013, p. 183).

came to an end on September 5th, when an election replaced the liberal government with the Parti Québécois, which immediately repealed Bill 78 and promised to work out an agreement in regards to tuition fees.

The Critique of Personal Sovereignty

In my research on the affective dimensions of the Québec Spring, I encountered an issue regarding the gap between affect theory and political theory. Affect theory is more suited to understanding the individual, while political theory is often concerned with understanding the collective. For this reason, it is difficult to apply an affect theory framework to social movements without grappling with how to bridge that space between the individual and the collective. In the case of Québec, this gap is illustrated by concepts which tellingly share a semantic structure: sovereignty and what is referred to in French as *souveraineté*. I use the French term throughout this paper when referring to the political wish for sovereignty; the English term is reserved for sovereignty as the individual desire for agency. The individual/collective divide is not unbridgeable; by understanding the limitations of personal sovereignty, it becomes apparent how *souveraineté* operates under similar attachments to continuity and control.

Let us first examine the critique of sovereignty, as it is set out by Berlant (2011) and Berlant and Edelman (2014). Berlant (2011) suggests that sovereignty is limited because of the role of the unconscious in shaping the self. As the self makes attachments that are not fully conscious or cognitive but rather unconscious and affective, it is false to assume that the individual has full control or knowledge of the self. Berlant and Edelman (2014) coined the term "non-sovereignty" to define their version of sovereignty. While they do not fully agree on what non-sovereignty would look like, Berlant and Edelman (2014) do agree that typical understandings of sovereignty, the individual's total control over the self, does not account for the reality of the unconscious, as well as creating a crisis for the self when that sovereignty is shown to be incomplete.

The limits of sovereignty can be difficult to bear; it is a challenge to the ego to acknowledge its limited control and knowledge of itself. The lack of control over others causes "the insult that the world is not organized around your sovereignty" (Berlant, 2011, p. 85). For numerous queer theorists, the example *par excellence* of this non-sovereignty of the self is found in sex, what Edelman calls "the encounter with what exceeds and undoes the subject's fantasmic sovereignty" (Berlant & Edelman, 2014, p. 2). It is the relationality of sex that presents a challenge to the self's understanding of its agency because of how it extends beyond the notion of a self-contained and self-controlled self. In sex, the self is striving for more than itself but cannot find it in the other; this is so, as temporary openness to the other cannot give one true access to another. It is in the impossibility of the non-sovereign self to fully relate to the other that the limits of agency are glaringly exposed.

Berlant and Edelman (2014) note this difficulty of relation occurring several times in their exchange, as *Sex, or the Unbearable*, is a conversation between the two authors. In their attempts at collaborative work, the intent of their words became distorted (pp. 68-69;

99; 109). There is no way to control others, so that any form of relationality, including conversation, is bound to be out of the control of the parties involved. Emotions ran high when it was perceived that their words were, willfully or not, misrepresented (p. 122). This illustrates how the ego is harmed by the notion that what is put into being, such as words and actions, could be out of its control in its realization. In her afterword in *Sex, or the Unbearable* (Berlant and Edelman 2014), Berlant reveals that she began writing a defensive response, which she later rejected because her disagreement with Edelman left her feeling attacked and misrepresented (pp. 122-24). A call for the potential of non-relation is contained in her thoughts regarding this defensive reaction, and the productive conversation she had with Edelman on the subject: "making a world for what doesn't work changes the consequences of those failures in a way that produces new potentials for relation within the structural space of the non-sovereign" (p. 125). Potential for a way to renegotiate non-relationality while coping with the shock of non-sovereignty resides in how we negotiate the space of misrecognition, whether it is in sex, in conversation, or in politics. I believe that politics is an under-appreciated and under-theorized site for non-sovereignty. It is important to note, however, that by politics I am not referring to the ritual of casting a ballot, but rather to the ever-expanding conflict between individual and groups, which is what Jacques Rancière characterizes as politics (2006). Politics in this sense requires that one be constantly faced with non-sovereignty; it forces the self into confrontation with the impossibility of control that is unavoidable whenever one comes into contact and works with others. In this sense, we cannot discount the role of affect in politics; the collective is composed of non-sovereign individuals coming into contact with each other and as such neither the individuals nor the collective they form can ever be considered as rational actors.

The Past in the Present: *Souveraineté*

Souveraineté, which I have defined above as the collective myth of sovereignty in Québec, is understood as the recognition of an independent culture and as the creation of a separate state. *Souveraineté* in its many forms is always a factor in Québec politics. It is important to note that the possibility of separation always holds affective strength, even when the discussion involves a different type of proposal, such as increased cultural independence. For numerous separatists, creating a separate state is the only manner which will permit Québec citizens to fully govern their culture and language. Whether separation is seen as a simple bargaining chip or the ideal outcome, it always has a place in discourses of *souveraineté* in Québec. While many feel the need to declare the death of separatism every time a referendum fails or the Parti Québécois suffers a resounding electoral defeat, the reality is far more complex. The idea of *souveraineté* is a ghost that haunts Québec politics and civil society. Any political or social strife tends to awaken it, if it could ever be considered to be slumbering. This was the case within several factions of the Québec Spring. *Souveraineté* shows the shape that the myth of individual sovereignty can take on the collective level. There are political reasons why *souveraineté* came up in the debates around the student movement; for example, the argument that Québec as an independent state would have more power to implement anti-neoliberal policies is theoretically sound.

Figure 1. "Jusqu'à la victoire", ArtAct 2012, http://artactqc.com/?p=167.
Also in Le printemps québécois *p. 149.*

The concern here is what these affective attachments to the idea of *souveraineté* mean in terms of how temporality plays a role in shaping the political.

While there are many manners in which *souveraineté* is affectively tied to the protester, one image is particularly striking. The months of turmoil produced significant amounts of art, poetry, and critical thought. One piece of visual art, reprinted in *Le printemps québécois*, by the anonymous artist ArtAct (*Figure 1*), is presented in the anthology without title or caption. On the artist's Facebook page, where the artwork was originally shared, it is titled "Jusqu'à la victoire" (Onwards to victory). The author has shared, in the space usually reserved for picture descriptions, a few paragraphs that muse about how people in positions of power fail to understand the people they rule. While it is clearly implied that these remarks are meant to apply to the leadership of the Québec provincial government in 2012, it is striking that there is not one word of the description which addresses the iconography of the artwork. However, to the Québécois public, this iconography needs little explanation, for it relies on shared cultural images. The implicit message is strong and somewhat troubling; against a dark background, a young man walks forward, waving a Québec flag and wearing the *carré rouge*[6]. The little felt square ties him to the student movement but also, the pot lying at his feet ties him to the larger social revolution. On either side, two other figures walk with him, both slightly recessed in the background and rendered in faded greys and blues. The iconography of the figure on the right is one that young people in Québec grow up with from their first history classes: with his *ceinture fléchée*[7] and holding a gun, he is a "Patriote," a name given to those who fought against the British in 1837-38. Despite ultimately being defeated, there were victories that have survived in Québec mythos as a sign of the Québécois people's refusal

---

6. While this red felt square which quickly became the symbol of the student movement has origins in a social justice campaign against welfare reform, where the colour red was used to denote opposition, it was taken up by the student movement shortly after, in reference to the phrase "carrément dans le rouge". Colloquially, this means to be very indebted, but literally, it would translate as "squarely in the red", hence the adoption of the red square.

7. This colourful hand-woven wool belt dates back to the fur trade and was adopted as an important cultural symbol in French North-America. This detail of the picture can be seen more clearly in the full-size version on Facebook.

23

to submit to the English oppressor. On the left side, the figure is a bit harder to visually determine but one thing stands out most of all; he is waving the *tricolore*, the French flag. As he is waving a flag and not holding a weapon, I am inclined to believe that he is not meant to represent the soldiers that defended *Nouvelle-France* from the British but rather it refers to the French Revolution and the people's fight for democracy against the French monarchy. The equation is obvious: the ghosts of Québec's past, the democratic impulses of the French Revolution and the Patriot's refusal to submit, are what drive the young man to protest against the Charest government's policies. The strength that drove the people to rebel against the British government and the French monarchy is the same as the one that filled the streets of the metropolis and the outlying regions with masses of people, and inspired them to take up clanging of pots and pans in protest.

The comparison makes sense in the affective strength of this iconography, which activates a feeling or belief that there is in fact continuity in the history of the people and that there is such a thing as a united people who refer to themselves as the Québécois, those who have been on a path to liberation from the very beginnings of an identifiable French people. As much as this relationship to the past has the potential to strengthen the collective struggle, it also works to reinforce the sense of impasse in an ongoing present that cannot distance itself from its dependence on the past. The struggles and deaths of the past, modern-day assaults with pepper spray and nightsticks, and even long periods of peace are not just facts of history but rather a progression or journey towards something better; the belief that collectively, we can choose the direction of history and we have been headed in that direction this entire time. This of course also implies that these coherent people are tied ethno-linguistically to France. That ArtAct was featured in the anthology is not at all surprising: while their artwork is beautiful and provocative, it is also prolific. On ArtAct's Facebook page, (used to disseminate the artwork as widely as possible) there are dozens of pieces of art, which could have been selected. The choice of this one, presented without commentary, says a great deal about the nationalistic affects circulating within the protests, giving them life.

The association between the movement and *souveraineté* is one that is also echoed in the conclusion of Nadeau-Dubois' account of his role in the movement, *Tenir Tête*. He considers the movement as a victory for *souveraineté*, if not one in terms of its stated goals with regards to tuition:

> La vive émotion que le printemps érable a fait naître découle en outre du fait que le Québec s'y est révélé comme une société mature. Dans ce débat sur notre avenir collectif, peut-être avons-nous découvert avec stupéfaction ce que signifiait être un peuple souverain?

> [The strong emotions which were born of the Maple Spring are the result of the fact that Québec showed itself to be a mature society. In this debate on our collective future, have we maybe discovered to our amazement what it means to be a sovereign people?] (Nadeau-Dubois, 2013, p. 206).

In this quote, Nadeau-Dubois ties "the strong emotions" themselves to the idea of *souveraineté*, showing a perceptive understanding of how the idea of individual sovereignty sustains itself. In the conclusion to his book, Nadeau-Dubois suggests that Québec represents an "us" that is defined by the institutions and beliefs that were the defining

features of the Quiet Revolution (Nadeau-Dubois, 2013, p. 208).

One way to understand this investment in *souveraineté*, and its narrative and affective contours, is with reference to what Dina Georgis (2013) calls the "better story." It should be stated that Georgis' theory has been developed around cases of queer affect and survival in the Middle East. I am in no way suggesting that the case of Québec is equivalent to the racialized and war-torn contexts of the Middle East and especially not the difficult realities of queer embodiment within those contexts. However, Georgis' framework describes nationalistic investments in a way that succumbs to neither condemnation nor approval. Georgis reads such stories of national identity and belonging for what they "psychically perform" (Georgis, 2013, p. 2). The stories we tell ourselves about who we are and what nations we comprise are narratives of survival vital to politics. These stories are a way to attempt to grapple with the effects of loss and trauma that exist in the present and in history, which is always a process of negotiation (Georgis, 2013, p. 8; 10). The term "better stories" is in reference to Yann Martel's *Life of Pi*; when investigators asked Pi which story of his survival is the real one, the young boy asks them which they think makes the better story. In this sense, these better stories are not better because they are more accurate, but because they represent a more palatable narrative of survival. These better stories not only help to manage suffering on a personal level but construct collectives that serve to insulate the self from the difficult process of mourning loss (Georgis, 2013, p. 2). Stories of the nation and its survival are a type of better story that affectively sustains nationalism and its reliance on the past. While these better stories are a way to negotiate difficult affects, and thus function as survival stories, there are always queer affects within a better story which resist it. Those affects formulate some other iteration of the better story.

Despite the shift in context, we can see how *souveraineté* as Québec's better story makes sense. Québec's nationalism is a difficult one to locate within anti-imperialist struggles. While it is true that the territory of what was then *Nouvelle-France* was acquired by war and that many policies of the British and then Canadian governments have been oppressive to the French Canadian population[8], although never to the extent of other British colonies (one of the many blessings of white privilege), *Nouvelle-France* was itself a settler colony established by a rather violent colonial power: France. In the story that Québec tells itself, a lot of this history is glossed over or blatantly rewritten. The claim to be a sovereign people while on stolen land holds very little water without significant negotiations. Children are taught in Québec schools that *Nouvelle-France* had a positive relationship with its Aboriginal allies, unlike the British, implying some form of moral superiority. Linteau, Robert and Durocher (1989), for example, only mention Aboriginal peoples in passing while covering the period from 1867 to 1929, but in those three pages they manage to condemn the federal government for the Indian Act (1876) and other oppressive policies, thus clearing the Québec government of any responsibility until the James Bay negotiations in 1970 (pp. 55-57). As problematic as this is, it should not be dismissed that to be a Francophone enclave surrounded by English pressure from all sides is cause in itself for myths of survival to take shape and foster the "strong emotions"

---

8. Most history textbooks originating in Québec are fond of highlighting the conflictual nature of the relationship between French Canada and English settlers, such as Lacoursière (1996) and Linteau, Robert and Durocher (1989) to name only two of many.

Nadeau-Dubois describes. After all, "affect is the past's legacy in the present" (Georgis, 2013, p. 12). These stories that Québec tells itself, about the Plains of Abraham, the Rebellions of 1837-38, the Durham Report, fights for French language rights, the Quiet Revolution, or about the Trudeau government's perceived betrayal with the War Measures Act[9] all come together to create the better story about surviving as a united people in the face of both its illegitimate claim to the land and the threats to its cultural and linguistic integrity. If anything, the tenuous position of the survivor/victim who is also an abusive colonial power requires a story that is clung to all the more ferociously for the possibility that it could unravel if one looks at it too closely.

While in numerous ways the myth of the collective was a necessary force behind the sustained nature of the Québec Spring protests, the idea that the collective is something that we can orient and choose, like a collection of sovereign individuals, presents problems in the light of the critique of individual sovereignty. If the individual cannot be fully sovereign, how can the collective? In fact, in constituting this myth of the sovereign people of Québec, racial and linguistic exclusions arise. This presents an obstacle to forming a united front in the face of neoliberalism. The largest problem with stories of belonging is their racial underpinnings, as Georgis points out: "resistance is emotionally invested in racial survival because it is the glue that makes political communities" (Georgis, 2013, p. 19). The constitution of the collective, as with the individual, is achieved through exclusion; in the individual through the exclusion of the unconscious and in the collective through the exclusion of the "Other," which does not fit with the racial and cultural story of belonging. This serves to determine the acceptable face of resistance and in this case, the assumed face of the protester.

Perhaps unwittingly, Nadeau-Dubois (2013) gives us in his account a perfect example of the problems exclusive nationalism can produce. He discusses an incident that occurred at a general assembly in mid-February at the *Collège Maisonneuve*. The CÉGEP in question was asking their membership whether they supported strike actions. At this point, several CÉGEPs had already gone on strike, thus creating some momentum, but the movement was still at the stage where every strike vote counted. As debates were wrapping up, Nadeau-Dubois noticed that one of the last people in line for the microphone was "a tall young black man," whose appearance he finds it necessary to describe in detail, noting "the purest hip-hop style" (Nadeau-Dubois, 2013, p. 42). He fears what this young man will have to say, "instinctively," as he does not resemble the image of a "traditional militant" (p. 42). Indeed, going back to the ArtAct's work of art, it should be noted that the militant depicted there is a young white man, who could very well be the son of the ghostly figures on either side. This survival story of the continuity of struggle, the continuity of the people, meets a blatant obstacle in the skin colour and dress style of this young man.

---

9. The battle of the Plains of Abraham, located in Québec City, was a deciding battle in the Seven Years War in which France lost New France to England on 13 September 1759. Following the 1837-38 Rebellions, the British government dispatched Lord Durham to report on the state of things in Lower Canada: his report resulted in the unification of Upper and Lower Canada in an obvious attempt at assimilation, as his report stated that the French were "a people without history or literature" (Lacoursière, 2013, p. 424). Consistent with this attempt at cultural assimilation, several attempts were made to quash the use of French as an official language, like when a 1845 ruling rejected a motion because it was drafted in French (Lacoursière, 1996, p. 27). Stories of cultural clashes are not limited to pre-Confederation Québec either: the use of the War Measures Act to suspend civil freedoms in Québec during the October Crisis in 1970 is still seen as a great betrayal. It is not incidental that these measures were put into effect in an effort to capture members of the terrorist nationalists Front du libération du Québec, who kidnapped and murdered a federal minister.

The young man's intervention, as told by Nadeau-Dubois, merits citation at length for its frank expression of the collective good. He begins by stating that he cannot afford an increase in tuition fees and then challenges those who are against the strike to volunteer to pay for his tuition. He then continues:

> Si vous voulez pas payer nos études, alors je pense qu'il va falloir faire la grève. Eh oui! Parce que moi, ça me fait chier que des gens puissent pas étudier juste parce qu'ils ont pas assez d'argent, ouais, ça me fait chier. Alors s'il y'a une seule personne au Québec à qui il manque cinq piastres pour étudier, eh bien pour cette personne et pour seulement cinq piastres, moi, aujourd'hui, je vais voter pour la grève.

> [If you don't want to pay for our studies, then I think we're going to have to go on strike. Oh yes! Because me, it pisses me off that there are people who can't study just because they don't have enough money, yeah, it pisses me off. So if there's a single person in Québec who's missing five bucks to study, then for that one person, and for five bucks, me, today, I'm voting in favour of the strike.] (Nadeau-Dubois, 2013, p. 43)

This young man's intervention speaks frankly to the idea that the collective needs to care for all those who comprise it. That Nadeau-Dubois expresses surprise at the man's powerful intervention says a lot about the potential damage of Québec's investment in its better story of past and present nationalism and *souveraineté*. This young man expressed a reality that impacts people of colour and other systematically disadvantaged groups much more than those represented by the typical image of the militant Nadeau-Dubois and ArtAct reproduce through their art and their words. Despite the government's baffling assertions that the tuition fee hike would not reduce access to higher education, the first casualties of this policy are those who are excluded from the image of the movement in the collective imagination and what Sara Ahmed (2010) would call the "affective community," meaning the shared feeling of a group that has made the same affective investments.

The affective investments involved in creating the exclusionary group also generate the Other. The student movement was not immune to the racism inherent to the construction of the Québécois as an ethno-linguistic group. Racist affects are the result of a "history of contact" (Ahmed, 2004, p. 7) of previous racial affects that have circulated in society, which make Nadeau-Dubois' immediate impressions feel instinctive. Creating a powerful political collective requires taking the risk of non-relation, due to the fact that it is in this unknowable exchange with the other that potential exists, in politics as much as in dialogue or sex. This fear of relation to one that is considered to be more different, more impossible to relate to, i.e. the Black man, stands in the way of this collective. As long as the story of Québec *souveraineté* revolves around past affects that tie the current people to French ethno-linguistic roots, the collective will remain limited. Nadeau-Dubois (2013) said that the movement was "ungovernable" (p. 119) but it, at times, remained governed by Québec's exclusionary better story. The myth of *souveraineté* in Québec is built around the myth of French-Catholic-Caucasian continuity based on a particular narrative of the past. This myth serves to defend Québec's understanding of itself as a minority under siege, which has the consequence of excluding those who do not fit this myth's image of the collective. This is counter-productive in a fight against neoliberalism, as it excludes

able activists and citizens from the collective.

If we understand *souveraineté* to be the better story by which Québec negotiates its identity and history, and staying true to the tone of Georgis' cases, it follows that it should not be condemned outright. There is value in the ways that people negotiate that which is difficult or even unbearable, including difference and unmourned loss. This exposes a parallel with how Berlant (2011) conceives of the ongoing present: it is a moment of prolonged crisis, but one that we affectively manage to live with. That however, does not mean that these negotiations are not often toxic, as xenophobia demonstrates. As Berlant suggests in her book Cruel Optimism (2011), our strongest attachments are often the ones that tie us to impossible or harmful ways of being. When survival stories become ill-suited to living well, what ways are there to tell a better 'better story' (Georgis, 2013, pp. 24-26)?

The Ongoing Present and the Hope for a Glitch

Based on the two previous sections, I argue that both the individual and the collective myths of sovereignty serve to sustain what Berlant (2011) calls the "ongoing present". She describes her understanding of the present as "thinking about the ordinary as an impasse shaped by crisis in which people find themselves developing skills for adjusting to newly proliferating pressures to scramble for modes of living on" (Berlant, 2011, p. 8). Berlant identifies three forms of impasse in the ongoing present: that which occurs after a traumatic event, the feeling of being stuck and drifting without an event causing it, and the management of anxieties and events in pleasurable ways (pp. 199-200). The second form, that of being stuck, unable to break free from the demands of the neoliberal present, is the one that best represents the situation in Québec prior to 2012. Since Québec's better story, its script of survival, depends on extending the past into the present, a clean break from affective ties to this imagined past is never possible. The third form of impasse, however, that of finding ways to "drift" (p. 212), still within the logic of the present but detached from a total attachment to it, is an interesting lead in terms of how sovereignty can be interrupted in a way that also disrupts typical understandings of temporality.

The essence of Berlant's response to the problem of living without sovereignty is the idea of lateral agency. Lateral agency follows from the critique of sovereignty; if the self is not sovereign, if sovereignty is but a fantasy, what kinds of agency are possible? Therein lies her disagreement with Edelman, I believe; their definitions of agency seem to differ. Berlant makes a point of thinking "about agency and personhood not only in inflated terms but also as an activity exercised within spaces of ordinariness that does not always or even usually follow the literalizing logic of visible effectuality, bourgeois dramatics, and lifelong accumulation or self-fashioning" (Berlant, 2011, p. 99). To Berlant, agency is not necessarily self-directed choice or action; it is often rather the patterns and routines of the everyday, half-thought or unthought-of. This is a type of agency that is distinct from the logic of sovereignty, as it does not presume total control. Instead, it is the myriad of small ways in which we negotiate what she calls the impasse of the ongoing present. It is lateral agency that is engaged with the process of surviving and managing this sense of being stuck in the present, allowing for what she calls "glitches" in the ongoing present

(p. 198), small moments of interruption of the logic of sovereignty that are part of daily life. These glitches are tied to lateral agency, due to the fact that the latter allows the occurrence of the former by existing outside the restrictive logic of sovereignty.

Can a political event come to play such a role of relief, of being a glitch in the ongoing present? Berlant (2011) speaks of these glitches as rather individual interruptions of personal affects. However, just like the critique of personal sovereignty can be extended to the collective, can a large portion of society not also experience a glitch in the ongoing present? Just as Georgis notes that every better story is plagued by queer affects that revolt against it, so is Québec's better story prone to affects that subvert its dominant message. The moment of protest, something about the relationality of shared struggle, is a moment that privileges the type of queer affect that revolts against toxic or cruel stories. Nadeau-Dubois, in a speech reprinted in *Le printemps québécois*, makes a case for a different kind of story:

> S'il y a une tradition québécoise à conserver, ce n'est pas la poutine ou la xénophobie. S'il y a une tradition québécoise à conserver, c'est celle que les étudiants et étudiantes du Québec sont en train de transmettre. Une tradition de lutte. De lutte syndicale, de lutte étudiante, de lutte populaire, de lutte féministe.
>
> [If there's a Québec tradition to preserve, it's not poutine or xenophobia. If there's a Québec tradition to preserve, it's the one the students in Québec are now transmitting. A tradition of struggle. Union struggle, student struggle, popular struggle, feminist struggle.] (Bonenfant, Glinoer, & Lapointe, 2013, p. 100)

In the conclusion of his book, he also notes:

> La crainte que la Charte des droits de Trudeau nous vole Noël ou que le multiculturalisme nous oblige à jouer au soccer avec des coéquipiers enturbannés, toutes ces bêtises me paraissent en comparaison de bien médiocres fondements pour notre identité commune.
>
> [The fear that Trudeau's Charter of Rights would steal Christmas from us, or that multiculturalism would force us to play soccer with a turbaned teammate, all that nonsense seems to me to be, comparatively, rather mediocre foundations for our collective identity.]" (Nadeau-Dubois, 2013, p. 207)

These words echo a belief that a superior better story exists in struggling together, instead of struggling amongst ourselves about who is *pure laine*[10] enough. It should be noted that Georgis is wary of stories of resistance when they become the only story that can be told (Georgis, 2013, p. 21). However, in a context where the better story has been one of resistance *against* an Other that does not meet specific ethno-linguistic features, telling a story of resistance *with* that Other disrupts the agreed upon terms of community and offers a more suitable better story with different affective registers.

While Nadeau-Dubois' words represent those of one single person and surely many individuals in Québec remained very xenophobic for the duration of the protests, to have such words pronounced by a predominant social figure without being criticized (though he was criticized plenty for every other perceived offense[11]) indicates something about the zeitgeist of the protests. In contrast, a virulent xenophobia emerged in the months

---

10. Literally, "pure wool" – the designation of a person with only Québécois ancestors, as if such a person is very likely to exist.

11. These criticisms culminated in Nadeau-Dubois being found guilty of contempt of court on November 2, 2012, for stating in a radio interview that he supported the legitimacy of the picket lines despite court injunctions mandating their removal (Radio-Canada, 2012).

immediately following the protests, when the newly elected Parti Québécois government's mission was to pass a Charter of Québec Values. This so-called secularism charter contained several xenophobic elements. Outside of the affects that circulated and were produced by the Québec Spring, it appears that individuals retrenched themselves into the original story of what it means to be Québécois: French-speaking, white, culturally Catholic. This is part of why I consider the Québec Spring as a glitch: the moment that enabled people to step out of the affect of impasse of the ongoing present by breaking with the narrative of *souveraineté* ended, and they reverted to the same old script of racial and linguistic belonging typical of the ongoing present's affective dependence to the past.

Indeed, this rather sudden shift illustrates a problem with simply saying that we should aspire to attain a better story or voluntary glitchiness. The notion of non-sovereignty undermines a belief in our own agency to decide to be better. These affective stories are weaved collectively, circulating amongst non-sovereign individuals. The power to intentionally modify these is not quite within reach for the individual or the collective. This is in fact the challenge that Lee Edelman addresses to Lauren Berlant since he is dubious about the importance she places on the possibility of repair: "just what agency" could make it possible to "'mov[e]' differently with affect" (Berlant & Edelman, 2014, p. 95). While Berlant suggests that it is possible or even desirable to be at peace with non-sovereignty and negativity more generally, Edelman is not convinced. This is so, as non-sovereignty precludes the notion that one could choose to interrupt the scripts of sovereignty in favour of stories that are preferable or more reparative, meaning they make loss easier to bear. His question is one that mirrors mine: in a context in which full sovereignty is acknowledged to be absent, what leads do we have to fashion better politics?

Conclusion

It is no accident that the previous section ends on a question, even though there is no answer provided for it. The aim of this paper is to discuss but a small portion of a larger project of thought that is still ongoing and which continues to produce questions in complete disregard to my desire for answers. Nonetheless, by extending Berlant and Edelman's critique of personal sovereignty to the question of national sovereignty, we can begin to see in what ways our individual and collective affective investments to the present are imbued with remnants of the past, both acknowledged and unacknowledged. Québec's particular relationship with its past, and the racial and cultural affects that result from it, make it fertile grounds for the examination of these affective relationships. The Québec Spring in particular, as a moment in time which brought people together, highlights what stories are told in order to cohere the collective. This observation, combined with Berlant's notion that we are living in an ongoing present that is nonetheless interruptible, leads me to suppose that Berlant's notion of lateral agency is a productive lead in attempts to understand how we can potentially break away from the holding pattern of a neoliberal ongoing present.

References

Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. New York: Routledge.

Ahmed, S. (2010). *The promise of happiness*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Berlant, L.(2011). *Cruel optimism*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Berlant, L., & Edelman, L. (2014). *Sex, or the Unbearable*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Bonenfant, M., Glinoer, A., & Lapointe, M-E. (2013). *Le printemps québécois: une anthologie*. Montréal: Écosociété.

Georgis, D. (2013). *The better story: Queer affects from the Middle East*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Lacoursière, J. (1996). *Histoire populaire du Québec, 1841 à 1896*. Sillery, Québec: Septentrion.

Lacoursière, J. (2013). *Histoire populaire du Québec: de 1791 à 1841*. Sillery, Québec: Septentrion.

Linteau, P-A, Robert, J-C., & Durocher, R. (1989). *Histoire du Québec contemporain: De la Confédération à la crise (1867-1929)*. Montréal: Boréal.

Nadeau-Dubois, G. (2013). *Tenir Tête*. Montréal: Lux Éditeur.

Radio-Canada. (2012, November 2). Gabriel Nadeau-Dubois reconnu coupable d'outrage au tribunal. Retrieved from http://ici.radio-canada.ca/regions/quebec/2012/11/01/006-nadeau-dubois-coupable.shtml

Rancière, J. *Hatred of Democracy*. (2006). (S. Corcoran, Trans.). London; New York: Verso.

They Care What You Wear: Gendered Practices in University Internship Manuals

Daphne Laurel Heflin

Master's in Women's and Gender Studies
University of Louisville

ABSTRACT Gendered organizations play a significant role in the perpetuation of inequalities in our culture. Current literature on gendered organizations acknowledges that the multiple processes of gendered organizations extend to social institutions outside of the workplace; however, few scholars have critically analyzed these institutions. University internships are the arenas in which many college students are socialized in preparation for their future professional careers or jobs. Internships, as part of a gendered social organization, therefore may reproduce internalized gendered norms and replicate gendered interactions through the expectations and stereotypes about gender based on the specific internship and the assumed gender and race of those chosen to participate. Drawing from the theory of gendered organizations, I analyze gendered expectations of university internships by examining internship manuals from different fields of study and exploring how they reproduce gendered assumptions about women and men. Using content analysis, business, education and general internship manuals were examined to show that gendered assumptions are reflected in the dress etiquette, interactional etiquette, and lack of representation for women and marginalized groups in these internship etiquette manuals. These explicit and implicit rules for behaviour and dress at internships depicted in these manuals illustrate the perpetuation of the multiple processes of gender inequality that are built into the structure and culture of organizations, specifically in workplaces as students move from internships to workplace employment.

KEYWORDS Gendered organizations, internships, tight-rope bias

As one of the main activities people engage in, work is an integral part of our human existence, and has a large influence over multiple facets of our lives (Acker, 1990; Padavic and Reskin, 2002). While many organizational studies of workplaces today at least mention gender, into the 1960s organizational theorists conceptualized organizations as "gender neutral" and largely ignored the ways organizational structures and practices are gendered (Acker, 1990, p. 218). By the 1970s feminist scholars began to "criticize conventional organizational research as inadequate" because this literature had, for so long, largely ignored the importance of gender and how it is a factor in shaping working life and organizations (Acker, 1990, p. 214). Joan Acker (1990) coined the termed gendered organizations to describe how processes of gender inequality are built into the organizational culture, job design, distribution of decision-making power and both the explicit and implicit rules for behaviour at work. Christine Williams (1995) similarly suggests that organizations are gendered in their organizational hierarchies, divisions of labour, and informal practices. In the 21st century, gendered organizations have been a

growing topic of interest among feminist scholars.

The current literature on gendered organizations acknowledges that the multiple processes of gendered organizations extend to social institutions outside of the workplace; however, few scholars have critically analyzed these social institutions. Gendered organizations play a significant role in the perpetuation of inequalities in our Western culture and a critical discussion of how other social institutions are gendered is needed. The majority of the current feminist research on gendered organizations has focused on work settings, even though most of this research is also relevant to universities. Universities are also workplaces and, like most organizations, hierarchies and divisions of labour based on gender and race exist (Bird, 2011; Wingfield 2013).

Bird (2011) shows how universities tend to divide and value faculty employees differently based upon the department they are employed in and the tasks they perform. Although not all encompassing, many universities value female dominated scholarly fields and departments less than the male dominated fields and classes (Bird, 2011). For example, within female dominated scholarly fields, female professors are often paid less, expected to do more work, such as menial tasks, advising multiple students, planning collegiate events, and attending more events outside of normal working hours that does not always lead to more pay or advancement of status (Bird, 2011).

However, even with the advent of new research and literature on universities as gendered entities, gaps in our scholarly knowledge remain. For example, organizational research has not yet explored how university internships are gendered and may perpetuate gender inequalities. Internships are the arenas in which many college students are socialized in preparation for their future professional careers or jobs. Internships, therefore, may reproduce internalized gendered norms and replicate gendered interactions through the expectations and stereotypes about gender based on the specific internship and the assumed gender and race of those chosen to participate. These internships and internship etiquette guidelines and manuals socialize students in gendered ways and may mirror the gendered organizations of the workforce.

As Joan Acker (2012) discusses, there are a multitude of ways that organizations are gendered. Due to laws banning overt gender discrimination we have moved away from the more overt gendered practices that lead to gender inequality, such as refusing to hire or promote women based on their gender or race; however, analyzing the informal practices (such as having different standards for employees based on race, gender or sexuality or only mentoring people that are similar to you in race, gender or sexuality) that continue to be embedded in organizational structures is important. As Acker (2012) points out, these informal practices are often less visible processes in which "gendered assumptions about women and men, femininity and masculinity, are embedded" and reproduced within organizations (Acker, 2012, p. 215).

Drawing from Joan Acker's theory of gendered organizations, as well as other authors, I analyze gendered expectations of university internships by examining internship manuals from different fields of study and exploring how they reproduce gendered assumptions about women and men. Certain college majors or fields, such as business, education, social work and STEM fields as well as others, have been typically dominated by one

gender, which is theoretically why expectations within internship manuals are gendered based on the field of study. Internships are therefore potential areas in which scholars and universities can critique and challenge gender stereotypes and the processes that reproduce gender inequality. By exposing how the current internship etiquette guidelines and expectations are gendered, universities can create systematic change within their institutions to change the expectations in the manuals and how they are communicated to students. Critically analyzing the expectations placed on students who participate in these internships can establish a missing and crucial piece in how to disrupt these gendered processes. Therefore, using the theories and research on gendered organizations as a framework, my main research questions are: 1) How do gendered expectations of dress etiquette in these manuals (business, education and general internship manuals) vary by area of study (i.e. typically male or female job placements)? 2) Is the information provided in internship etiquette guidelines and internships gendered based upon their specific field of study?

Literature Review

Along with an increase in scholarly research on gender and work, women themselves moved into the workforce in large numbers in the latter decades of the 20th century. In 2013, 53.1% of all women were in the labour force in the United States, and 75% of these women ages 25-44 years were in the labour force. This is in stark contrast to the 35.5% of women in the labour force in 1960 (Latest Annual Data, 2013; Women in the Labour Force: A Databook, 2014). However, many contend that while women have moved into the labour force in large numbers, gendered assumptions about work and family life have hardly changed. For example, organizations and employers structure most jobs around expectations for an ideal worker assumed to be male (Acker, 1990; Kelly, 1991; Padavic & Reskin, 2002 and Williams, 1995); most jobs today still assume an unencumbered worker with no caregiving demands (Williams, 1995). For example, the United States is one of the only affluent nations that does not offer paid parental leave, and it also has one of the least generous childcare policies. When thinking of a typical professional worker we also inherently think of a male because society reinforces the association of men with the idea of a successful professional (Williams, Dempsey, & Slaughter, 2014). A few notable exceptions are careers or fields in which women dominate, such as education, social work, and caregiving jobs; but as Christine Williams (1995) shows, men in these fields ride a 'glass escalator' in which they have higher rates of promotion and pay than women, in part because of the assumption that men are the ideal workers. Drawing from the theory of gendered organizations, Williams (2010) asserts that our current workplaces are "perfectly designed for the workforce of 1960s" and have not evolved to keep pace with the rapidly changing society (Williams, 2010, p. 1).

Williams (2010) and Acker (1990) discuss the mechanisms that create gendered organizations such as, for numerous years the societal assumption was that the man of the household would be the main provider while the woman would be responsible for taking care of the family and household. As such, employers often expect workers who will be productive at all times and "will spend the time it takes to finish the job,

even if that is almost 24/7" (Acker, 1990, p. 221). This gendered expectation implicitly disadvantages women, because women are less likely to be able to work long hours due to family obligations, parental obligations, and household obligations. Even in dual-earner households, women still do more child care and housework than men (Pew Research Centre, 2013). Women are then viewed as less devoted and competent at their jobs when family and parental obligations make them unable to live up to the required devotion of the imagined ideal worker. In contrast, this stigma is not usually associated with men who become parents because of the social belief that fathers will not be hindered by housework or childcare (Williams, 2010). Therefore, the imagined worker, depending on the job or field, perpetuates traditional notions of femininity or masculinity reinforced by the expected behaviours and outcomes within the job (Williams, 1995; Williams, 2006; Williams, Muller, & Kilanski 2012).

This imagined worker concept also plays out in multiple other facets of the organization and often dictates the gender and race of the employee. The imagined worker, especially within professional settings, is assumed to be not only male but also white (Williams, 2006; Williams, et. al, 2014; Wingfield, 2013). These expectations, in turn, affect who is pushed to make contacts and build relationships through networking for their jobs and careers. As Wingfield (2013) discusses, "social networks play a critical role in helping establish connections and create forward movement in one's chosen professions," but many of the black males interviewed for her book lamented that in comparison to their white male counterparts they were not provided with as many networking opportunities and were also limited in the amount of established connections they already had coming into these organizations. This is generalizable to other marginalized groups, such as women, who do not match the imagined worker ideal in many professions and are therefore limited in their opportunities to develop a strong network of peers and clientele.

Finally, employers' standards, expectations, and language used to dictate professional dress etiquette and behaviour reflect gender, race, and class dynamics. Scholars' lack of analysis of these dynamics and "their impact on workplace conditions, access, and opportunity for advancement" contributes to their negative cumulative effect (Williams, 2006, p. 119; Williamson, 2006). Employers typically require some form of professional dress and these specific standards and rules dictated within professional business organizations seek to signify "whiteness, middle-class respectability, and a professional demeanor" (Williams, 2006, p. 119). Employers also, in many cases, direct employees to cover tattoos, remove piercings, and have conservative hairstyles and appearance, especially when the clientele they serve is imagined to be middle-to-upper classes.

Employers' deference to culturally constructed norms when creating these dress expectations is in itself potentially subjective and discriminatory, but these dress etiquette standards may also impose gendered expectations when cultural views of female professional dress are dictated and policed more harshly by organizations (Bartlett, 1994; Williamson, 2006). Organizations establish this subtle form of gendered discrimination under the guise of professionalism or "maintenance of corporate image" and in hopes of reassuring customers that the employees of their organizations are professionals worth doing business with (Bandsuch, 2009; Williams, 2006, p. 120). Overwhelmingly the

dress etiquette guidelines created by organizations impose more stringent and detailed standards on women than their male counterparts, which McNarama (1994) asserts is due to the patriarchal assumption that "women do not possess the intelligence and discretion necessary to choose proper business attire" and therefore these guidelines must be dictated by the organizations (Barlett, 1994; McNarama, 1994, p. 11). This assertion is not all encompassing however, as managers may simply be following the status quo of dress etiquette for men and women and have not moved away from the idea that women should dress in a completely non-sexual manner so that they are not 'distracting' to other employees or clients, as this expectation has seemingly been accepted for so long. However, scholars assert that these expectations create a situation in which women are confronted constantly with a double bind of being instructed to be feminine and professional but not too feminine or sexual, while men in comparison do not face this same contradiction (Acker 2012; Maier, 1999; McNarama, 1994; Sandberg, 2013; Williams, Muller & Kilanski, 2012). This subtle form of discrimination creates more standards for women to meet and more barriers to overcome in order to be seen as on par with their male counterparts.

Using these studies as a framework, my research explores how 21 internship manuals reflect many of the gendered and racialized expectations above. After discussing my research methods and findings, I conclude with the implications of how gendered expectations in internships can contribute to gendered inequalities in organizations.

Methods

Sample

Twenty-one university internship etiquette manuals from the United States were chosen for this analysis (See Appendix 2). The sample was collected over a period of two months (November 2014 and January 2015) with 62 universities (See Appendix 1) contacted and researched over this time period. In hopes of garnering a somewhat representative sample of universities across the United States, four-year universities were contacted from multiple parts of the United States including the Northeast, South, Midwest, and Northwest. The universities contacted were co-ed institutions as well as women's and men's colleges in the U.S. The only criteria for these universities, besides being a four-year institution, was that the universities contacted had majors in education, business, or both. I focused specifically on universities that had school/colleges of education and business as these two fields of study tend to be dominated by one gender. The field of education continues to be female dominated while business has historically been male dominated. Even with more women entering into college and business fields, the majority of majors within the general business field continue to be male, although the margins are closing quickly (Goudreau, 2010). The assumption therefore was that analyzing internship manuals within two fields of study heavily dominated by one gender would potentially yield a wide range of expectations, tips, and guidelines on interactional and dress etiquette.

Along with this, if the universities' respective websites did not readily provide internship

etiquette manuals on their school/college of business or school/college of education site, I contacted the Dean or Administrative Assistant of these respective universities within the specific school/college through email (Appendix 3). If the respective university did not provide a response, I sent a follow up email or phone call. Out of the 62 universities contacted, 21 universities either provided their internship etiquette manuals or had them readily available to the public on their websites. Therefore, this sample of universities is a convenience sample rather than a nationally representative sample; however, I did get a fair amount of geographical diversity in my sample of 21 universities (see Table 1). Still, I cannot generalize my findings on internship manuals to any other universities outside this sample.

Content analysis

This study relied on content analysis to collect and analyze qualitative data through coding (Berg, 2001). Content analysis examines different artifacts of social communication and can include both written and visual communication. For this study, 21 internship etiquette manuals were collected and analyzed. I applied content analysis to determine if the internship manual presented to students was gendered in both manifest and latent content. Manifest content refers to elements within the text that can be counted accurately, while latent content is an interpretative analysis of the deeper meaning of the data or text (Berg, 2001). In the present study, I conducted content analysis on both written and visual texts by analyzing the written language within the manuals, as well as any visual texts, such as photographs, featured in the manuals. In many cases, especially for this study, both the text and photographs are worthy of critique.

In the present study, I first used content analysis to determine if the internship manuals discussed dress etiquette, interactional etiquette, and if they included photographs within their manuals (Table 1). The manuals were not coded as discussing dress or interactional etiquette if they only included a brief sentence relating to these topics. Interactional etiquette, for the purposes of this study, is defined as any substantial (more than two sentences) discussion of interactions or communications with the intern's respective employers, coworkers or customers in the manuals. Photographs were coded based upon having only a man/men in them, having only a woman/women in them, having both men and women in them or not having a photograph in the manual. The photographs were coded based upon this reasoning as many of the internships manuals across the three categories did not include pictures in their manuals, so the coding of photographs was based upon the availability of photographs and therefore not in depth.

I engaged in more in-depth coding by analyzing the interactional etiquette within each of the manuals for specific phrases and words. The manuals were coded for 13 different phrases (Appendix 4). Inter-coder discussion was used to improve the reliability of the words and phrases selected for coding purposes. After inter-coder reliability testing was completed and 100% consensus on words and phrase selection was reached, I coded the manuals. I chose the words and phrases through an inductive and deductive approach. As discussed earlier, networking, experience, and professionalism can influence one's success in the job market and therefore these phrases were chosen for coding deductively based on previous research. Other words or phrases were chosen inductively due to their

prevalence in multiple manuals.

Finally, all internship manuals were analyzed for gendered dress etiquette phrases. I recorded and compared specific phrases within the manuals to analyze which ones garnered more gendered phrases; school/college of business manuals, school/college of education manuals, or manuals that are provided to all students through the respective university career centres. I also analyzed the manuals to determine how much focus was given to dress etiquette and how much of this focus was directed towards women compared to men. This analysis proved fruitful for further discussion of the research questions.

Findings and Discussion

Manifest Content

As seen in Table 1 *(opposite)*, I list the universities according to the type of manual analyzed: manuals provided to all students, to business students only, and to education students only. According to Table 1, internship etiquette manuals provided to all students through university career centres discussed dress etiquette 50% of the time. The school/colleges of business manuals analyzed were more likely to provide dress etiquette instructions or tips; two-thirds of universities included dress etiquette instructions in their internship manuals. In contrast, only one out of seven schools/colleges of education discussed dress etiquette within their internship etiquette manual. The others either included no mention of dress etiquette or only included a brief sentence that was not enough to warrant a mark in the table. Therefore, business internships were most likely to include specific instructions on dress. Careers and jobs that historically and continue to be predominately male dominated are often sites where the effects of gendered organizations are most persistent. Organizations that have been fundamentally gendered for many years may be working to create policies and processes that support gender equality, but are still often sites that reinforce and reproduce gender inequality, which potentially explains the continued inclusion of dress etiquette in these business internship manuals (Acker, 2012; Dye and Mills, 2012).

In addition, out of the 21 university manuals analyzed, only two manuals did not include a discussion of interactional etiquette. All of the school/college of business and schools/colleges of education internship manuals included at least some discussion of interactional etiquette or provided tips on improving one's interactional etiquette. Interactional etiquette is perhaps included across a broader range of these universities' internship etiquette manuals because these internships are locations where students learn what skills are needed to garner employment and be successful in the job market. Businesses and universities therefore would be more likely to include interactional etiquette as many jobs profess that good social skills and professionalism are essential for many jobs and careers and usually stipulated on job applications.

As Table 1 also shows, most of the manuals (14 of 21) did not include any photographs while the rest varied in either only depicting men, only depicting women, or depicting a combination of both men and women in the photographs. Only three included women

Table 1: Count of dress etiquette, interactional etiquette and photographs in university internship etiquette manuals

INTERNSHIP ETIQUETTE MANUAL TOPICS	DRESS ETIQUETTE	INTERACTIONAL ETIQUETTE	PHOTOGRAPHS
UNIVERSITY MANUALS	YES (Y) NO (N)	YES (Y) NO (N)	MAN (M) WOMAN (F) MIXED (B) NONE (N)
PROVIDED TO ALL STUDENTS			
Oregon State University [OR}	N	Y	N
Florida State University [FL]	N	Y	M
San Jose State University [CA]	N	Y	B
Kutztown University [PA]	Y	Y	N
Florida International University [FL]	Y	N	N
University of North Carolina- Kenan-Flagler [NC]	Y	N	M
University of Memphis [TN]	N	Y	N
Boston University [MA]	Y	Y	B
PROVIDED TO SCHOOL/ COLLEGE OF BUSINESS STUDENTS			
University of Buffalo [NY]	Y	Y	N
Utah State University [UT]	N	Y	N
Ohio State University [OH]	Y	Y	N
Penn State [PA]	Y	Y	B
Frostburg University [MD]	Y	Y	N
University of Washington [WA]	N	Y	N
PROVIDED TO SCHOOL/ COLLEGE OF EDUCATION STUDENTS			
Ohio University [OH]	N	Y	N
Columbia University [NY]	N	Y	N
University of Utah [UT]	N	Y	N
University of South Alabama [AL]	N	Y	N
University of Texas [TX]	Y	Y	F
Western Washington University [WA]	N	Y	B
University of South Florida [FL]	N	Y	N

in their photographs, either in a mixed setting or alone. Only San Jose State University features a photograph that includes both a woman and a man of colour, while a few of the other universities rely on photographs of young white men or a mixed group of white men and women. As the ideal worker image that is perpetuated within our society stems from the construct of the male identity, visual representations of the ideal worker and in this case, the ideal intern, are mainly of men (Acker, 1990; Kelly, 1991; Williams,

1995). This lack of visual representation of women in internship manuals, besides the few that include women (albeit typically white women) in mixed settings is only found in one manual, which is given to school/college of education students. This potentially reinforces teaching as a female occupation, but as only one of the manuals analyzed does this, definitive conclusions cannot be drawn.

In contrast, the lack of visual representation of women in internship manuals that are provided to school/college of business students and the manuals provided to all students through career centres perpetuate the idea that the ideal workers businesses want and hire are men. This reinforces the visual hierarchy of gender by illustrating that men are more likely to gain internships in these fields of study. It must be noted that, as mentioned above, many of the manuals do not include any photographs, which could be a positive move as it keeps the manuals gender neutral and does not depict a specific ideal intern to students. On the other hand, this conceivably positive aspect is convoluted when the universities only use male pronouns when describing interns. This textual representation of the idealized student intern as male is discussed in further depth in the discussion section. Finally, the almost complete lack of photographic representations of men and women of colour within these internship manuals speaks to the problematic gendered and racial representations within these manuals.

According to Table 2 *(opposite)*, almost all of the internship etiquette manuals (18 of 21) included some mention or discussion of professionalism or acting professionally, which is where the similarities end. University internship etiquette manuals provided by the career centres or the schools/colleges of business had more discussion of the need to network, build contacts and relationships, gain experience for future jobs or careers, have a positive attitude, and show enthusiasm and interest during one's internship experience. School/college of education internship manuals discussed respect, sensitivity or consideration for other's feelings and being genuine more often than the general manuals and the ones provided to school/college of business students. Smiling, friendliness or kindness, confidence, and showing initiative or assertiveness varied the most, with few discernable patterns between the 21 internship etiquette manuals. While not a strong trend, it is interesting that school/college of education manuals were more likely than schools/colleges of business manuals to stress initiative and being assertive, as these are typically masculine characteristics. However, all of the other patterns in the tables reflected gendered expectations for male and female behaviours.

The variance of the content of the internship etiquette manuals analyzed is widespread. Some provide in depth discussions and tips on dress and interactional etiquette while others provide very little of either. Many of the school/college of education manuals are handbooks that are dense, extremely long and limited in information about expected etiquette outside of professionalism while many of the other manuals provide direct guidelines on dress, communication, and interactional etiquette. Therefore, in order to discuss the research questions of this study, both the latent and manifest content of these tables and the etiquette manuals must be analyzed and critiqued, as the tables alone provide limited information on the gendered meanings of these internship etiquette manuals.

Table 2: Count of 13 words/phrases present in university internship etiquette manuals

INTERNSHIP ETIQUETTE MANUALS: UNIVERSITY MANUALS	"Smile/ Smiling"	"Enthusiasm/ Interest"	"Positive attitude"	"Appreciation/ Gratitude"	"Professionalism/ Act Professionally"	"Friendly/ Kindness"	"Respectful/ Respect"	"Networking/Building contacts or relationships"	"Confidence"	"Sensitivity/Consideration for other's feelings"	"Being Genuine/ Genuine"	"Show initiative/ Assertive"	"Gain experience for jobs/career"
PROVIDED TO ALL STUDENTS													
Oregon State University [OR]					X			X				X	X
Florida State University [FL]		X			X			X	X			X	X
San Jose State University [CA]	X				X			X	X				
Kutztown University [PA]		X	X		X		X	X	X	X		X	X
Florida International University [FL]		X	X					X				X	X
University of Memphis [TN]		X	X		X			X					
University of North Carolina–Kenan-Flagler [NC]	X	X		X	X	X	X						X
Boston University [MA]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X
PROVIDED TO SCHOOL/ COLLEGE OF BUSINESS STUDENTS													
University of Buffalo [NY]		X		X	X		X	X	X			X	X
Utah State University [UT]		X		X				X					
Ohio State University [OH]		X	X	X	X			X					X
Penn State [PA]							X						
Frostburg University [MD]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X
University of Washington [WA]		X	X	X	X			X				X	X
PROVIDED TO SCHOOL/ COLLEGE OF EDUCATION STUDENTS													
Ohio University [OH]					X							X	X
Columbia University [NY]	X			X	X	X	X	X					
University of Utah [UT]					X					X	X		
University of South Alabama [AL]		X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
University of Texas [TX]	X				X	X	X	X	X				
Western Washington University [WA]	X				X		X					X	
University of South Florida [FL]	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X	X

41

Latent Content

As stated above, the school/college of education internship manuals and handbooks do not typically focus on dress etiquette and instead focus more on how to complete the internship, with a few focusing on interactional etiquette. Education is still a field that is typically female dominated and the imagined ideal worker for many of the jobs that students pursue in the educational field is a woman. In turn the school/college of education internship manuals do not focus on dress etiquette as much. The focus of these manuals is instead often related to creating a safe and nurturing environment for students and perfecting one's ability to interact with students and other staff in a professional manner. Education is also an accepted field of study for women to enter into and therefore does not challenge the existing gender hierarchy of jobs and careers within society.

In contrast, internship manuals provided by the school/college of business or the university career centres focus on both dress etiquette and interactional etiquette. In both business manuals and the manuals for all students, dress etiquette that is directed towards women is more explicit, lengthy, and gendered in comparison to what is directed towards men. These internship manuals direct women to have a greater focus on their appearance and instruct women on the multitude of ways that they can fall outside of the prescribed conservative dress that is expected of them. For example, University of Buffalo's business school internship manual tells women that they should avoid "dressing seductively or inappropriately" which includes not wearing "short skirts, see-through blouses, stiletto heels, sparkles or flip-flops". The manuals inform women to constrain any excess in dress and to be hyper aware of sending the wrong message with their attire. Other guidelines or tips found in internship etiquette manuals include:

> "Keep in mind that office attire is conservative, and so avoid shirts that are low cut, sheer, or revealing" (Florida International University)

> "If you dress like a competent professional, you will have a much better chance at getting the position" (Florida International University)

> "Don't wear clothing that is wrinkled, too tight, or revealing" (Boston University)

> "Skirted Suit, knee length…no extreme slits. Nothing that dangles or is distracting" (Kutztown University)

> "Women should avoid wearing exposing dresses and opt for little but natural make-ups" (Frostburg University)

> "Women should remember the difference between dressing for a night out and dressing for work. Although 4-inch stiletto platforms may be in style, an internship is not the place to make a fashion statement. You want to be remembered for your outstanding work, not for your attire" (University of Buffalo)

> "Avoid a tight fit…. keep with a conservative neckline" (Penn State)

> "Keep your hair, make-up and jewelry conservative, too"; "Dress to fit in and avoid any unusual or unconventional styles and clothing choices" (University of North Carolina)

The statements above and others similar to them can be found in almost all of the internship etiquette manuals that discuss dress etiquette. They are examples

demonstrating the gendered nature of dress etiquette in internship manuals and are a mechanism to reproduce gendered expectations and culturally constructed norms. These more stringent dress etiquette guidelines create a double bind of expectations, which Williams, Dempsey and Slaughter (2014) refer to as the 'Tightrope' that women have to navigate in these professional settings. This 'Tightrope' is the precarious balance that women are "expected to strike between masculinity and femininity" in their behaviours and dress (Williams, et. al, 2014, p. 61). Women are often judged harshly when they fall outside of this prescribed and unrealistic balance. Dressing in ways that are 'too masculine' is often associated with a lack of femininity, while dressing 'too feminine' is associated with a lack of competency in their work or professionalism (Williams, et.al, 2014, p. 61). This creates a very narrow range of acceptable female dress and is an often-inescapable expectation. In contrast, men are much less likely to be instructed or expected to strike this balance as the imagined worker.

The justification for regulation of women's appearance is built on the patriarchal assumption that women moving into the workforce are unable to dress in an appropriate manner and "thus, proper attire must be determined for women by their male superiors" (McNamara, 1994, p. 8). This assumption is faulty in many ways as it assumes not only that women are incapable of acting and dressing in a manner that is conducive to being a successful employee but also that the superiors within these organizations will be male. This restriction of dress etiquette and perpetuated assumption that women do not know how to dress professionally instructs women that they need to be more attentive to their appearance than their male counterparts do. Women are inherently instructed to dress and behave in ways that avoid sending the "wrong messages" and do not upset the gender hierarchy, all while "creating the sense that you fit in the organization" (William, et al, 2014, p. 65). These dress etiquette guidelines and expectations are directed overwhelmingly in very specific ways towards women within these internship manuals.

However, dress etiquette expectations of men are either hardly mentioned, discussed in simple terms, or mentioned in an almost humorous way. In all of these cases, the expectations for male dress are not implicitly gendered; they do not speak to expectations of male behaviour outside of dressing in a suit, having short hair, or shaving. Dress etiquette guidelines or tips that are directed towards men are much more direct and rarely discuss the need to constrain one's appearance, or to be aware of how their dress is 'seductive' or 'inappropriate'. For example, Penn State's business internship etiquette manual directs men to dress so that their clothes "fit properly" and to make sure their "hair is kept neat and that [they] have a clean shave". Other tips directed towards men's dress etiquette include:

> "conservative business suit"; "well groomed, showered, and shaved"; "haircut conservative" (Florida International University)

> "Men need to keep their hair neatly trimmed and set" (Frostburg University)

> "Men often fall into the trap of wearing too much cologne, hair products, jewelry or other accessories. Remember, your identity is shaped by your actions and quality of your work, not by your oversized watch" (Penn State)

In a few cases the internship manuals describe men's dress etiquette in a humorous way (such as avoiding an "oversized watch") that directly contrasts with the language used to discuss women's dress etiquette guidelines. Ohio State University directs women to "not sport wedge sandals if other women are wearing closed-toe heels every day" and to always "dress appropriately", while in contrast the manuals direct men to "wait for a formal go-ahead before [they] break out the muscle shirts". These manuals continually direct women to dress in a manner that does not draw attention to themselves, is conservative, and that is deemed to be appropriate. Instructing men to not "break out the muscle shirts" is perhaps an absurd add-on to make sure the manual does not read as being overtly focused only on women. Many of the other manuals make no mention of men's dress etiquette and instead only focus on the potential ways that women can wear the wrong attire and how this could potentially affect whether or not they are deemed to be "a competent professional" (Florida International University manual). This dress etiquette repeatedly instructs women to conform their appearance to a standard of what is appropriate for their gender, and to make sure their appearance does not draw too much attention or is not excessive. Moreover, directing women on how to not wear distracting, flashy or 'nighttime' wear is marginalizing and sexist. This double bind on women's dress etiquette and appearance reinforces the assumption that women need to be directed on how to dress and act within the workforce and that they are incapable of doing so without direction. These dress etiquette caveats and rules also reinforce social hierarchies that value maleness as the norm and create the expectation that others must assimilate to these norms. Finally, framing dress etiquette in these ways continues to demean women's importance in the workforce and create more subtle barriers for them to meet in order to be taken seriously or on par with their male counterparts.

In conjunction with dress etiquette, the interactional etiquette guidelines and tips illustrate specific gendered assumptions about who is the imagined ideal intern and subsequently the imagined ideal worker. The manuals and handbooks provided to school/college of education students lack advice about networking and building relationships. The handbooks also fail, in many cases, to direct students to seek potential jobs after graduation either within the school they are interning at or within the larger school system. This lack of direction provided from manuals for student interns within the educational field perpetuates assumptions that women within the educational field will only become teachers and not pursue upper level jobs such as principal or dean. The assumption may be that networking, gaining connections and experience for future careers does not need to be discussed. The school/college of education manuals also rarely mention being confident and assertive within their internships. This lack of discussion of networking, assertiveness, and gaining experience potentially adds to the effect of the glass escalator for men who enter into female dominated fields, as society instructs men from very early on to move into leadership positions and strive to network and connect for better jobs. However, women are often not socialized to build networks and connections. Thus, these education internship manuals may penalize women early on, before they have started careers. Not pushing women to network and gain experience to be used in their careers can affect their path to promotions, raises, better jobs, and ways to navigate the job market to gain employment or move forward in their career.

In contrast, school/college of business manuals and even most of the manuals provided to all students through the university career centres direct their interns to make connections, find mentors, and network in hopes of securing sustainable employment from the internship. As Florida International University asserts, "Internships give students the opportunity to gain valuable applied experience and make connections in professional fields they are considering for career paths; and give employers the opportunity to guide and evaluate talent", which is a good example why networking and gaining experience is so important for interns within their field of study, and why it should be directed to all students no matter the field they are in. This also illustrates a need for gender-neutral language or the use of both gender pronouns when discussing the supervisors, CEOs or managers within these internship etiquette manuals. Using only male pronouns when discussing the people that interns will be working under, reporting to, and trying to impress creates assumptions about who holds the power within the company and whether women have representation in these higher positions. A few universities do include both gender pronouns in their manuals, such as University of Buffalo, which directs interns to "confirm with your superior a regular meeting schedule if *he/she* does not suggest it first" (emphasis added). This is, however, convoluted by a later quote in their dress etiquette section where they state, "there is a reason the CEO wears a power tie". Although women's expression of gender can include wearing a tie, this statement is more likely suggesting that the CEO of the company is a man and that wearing a power tie is something male interns should make note of for their dress etiquette. Other universities solely rely on the use of the male pronoun when discussing supervisors or CEOs, such as Boston University, which includes the statement, "your employer doesn't want to feel as though *he's* interrupting your personal agenda when *he* approaches you with assignments" (emphasis added). North Carolina University even goes so far as to imply that that interns are only male with their statement that, "when a college student begins an internship, *he'll* get perhaps *his* first glimpse of the realities of the business world" (emphasis added).

Although it may seem trivial to discuss the use of gendered pronouns in these internship manuals, lack of representation for women in jobs and positions is an ongoing and systemic problem in our society. As Marion Wright Edelman says, "you can't be what you can't see," and a lack of role models, whether imagined through the lexicon of internship manuals or in person, can send implicit messages to women about what potential positions they can attain (Newsom, 2011). People rely on examples, leaders and images to inform us about who we are and our potential for advancement within society and without proper representation, we are left less aware of our options. If a female intern is not provided with the image that her supervisor may be a woman she may assume that her professional path may not lead to positions of leadership or power. This is especially important for women and other marginalized groups, as white males continue to dominate many businesses and fields, and a lack of representation for these groups can reinforce the idea that marginalized groups are not meant to strive for these jobs, careers, or fields of study.

Conclusion

Gender is one of the basic identity markers through which individuals perceive and interpret society and their place within it. Gender shapes social institutions, our interactions with others, and how we perceive and police ourselves. Some societal discussions of gender claim that gender inequality is a thing of the past, and while it is true that there have been significant social, educational, political, and occupational gains made by women, gender equality has not been reached. Within gendered organizations there is less overt discrimination and bias towards women than in the past, but subtle discrimination continues to permeate institutional structures and affects women and men in gendered ways. As overt discrimination has become illegal, some groups of male elites have transitioned to enacting barriers and more subtle discriminations including the division of labour, assumptions about male and female workers, and informal practices, that work to maintain the power dynamics and hierarchies of gender and other marginalized groups (Acker, 1990; Williams, 1995; Williams, 2010; Williams, et.al, 2014; Wingfield, 2013). These subtle and relatively small disadvantages that women continue to face in the workplace still have surprisingly large cumulative effects over time and are reinforced at the university level.

My analysis shows that gendered assumptions are reflected in the dress etiquette, interactional etiquette, and lack of representation for women and marginalized groups in these internship etiquette manuals. These explicit and implicit rules for behaviour and dress at internships depicted in these manuals illustrate the perpetuation of the multiple processes of gender inequality that are built into the structure and culture of organizations. This analysis extends the theory of gendered organizations as it demonstrates how these informal practices and gendered assumptions of workers are reflected in these internship manuals, which has not been previously studied.

However, it is important to note the limitations of this study. This sample of internship etiquette manuals was not representative of the entire United States, and therefore we cannot assume that all universities produce and provide manuals like these. Even still, given the theory of gendered organizations and the data retrieved from this sample, many other universities may be following similar gendered patterns in their manuals but these findings cannot be generalized to all universities.

Those who create these internship etiquette manuals that produce these gendered biases and implicit messages "may not perceive their behaviour as problematic or discriminatory" because they are following cultural ideals and norms (McNamara, 1994, p. 20). In addition, participants within these internships and subsequently jobs may experience some of these issues quite differently "depending on their position, their gender, their mobility, their support networks and the degree of their cross-gender interaction", but this does not detract from the problematic nature of these manuals (Williamson, 2006, p. 690). Cultural and societal norms are in many cases inherently gendered, racist, and classist within a patriarchal system. These norms and the reinforcement of these gendered messages and biases have to be continually critiqued and challenged.

As my research illustrates, in order for change to occur, universities and administrators

have to re-examine these internship etiquette manuals, as these manuals are one of the ways that students come to learn about internship expectations of dress and behaviour. Universities need to reconstruct the lexicon of these internship etiquette manuals to reflect the changing workforce and the changing culture by including gender neutral language when describing who the imagined intern is; they also need to depict equal representation of all races, genders, and ethnicities within their photographs and include both gender pronouns when discussing supervisors, managers, CEOs or positions of power. In terms of dress etiquette, language that reflects gendered and hierarchical dynamics, such as focusing solely on women's dress criteria, and words such as "inappropriate", "dressing seductively", "not in excess" or "conservative" should be removed. This would reduce the assumption that women are incapable of making their own intelligent decisions on how to dress in order to be a successful intern or employee and would minimize the idea that women need to constrain their dress and appearance so that it does not send the wrong messages or interfere with office dynamics. In addition, these gendered assumptions play into the patriarchal ideal that women are to blame for things such as harassment and workplace issues. Other ways to create internship etiquette manuals that are more gender-egalitarian would be to create a set of standards that are more general, realistic and gender neutral so that there is no distinction between men's dress etiquette and women's dress etiquette. These more universal dress etiquette tips would help to negate the reinforcement of gender hierarchy and the assumptions that women need more instructions on behaviour, dress, and appearance than men. Finally, a potentially more progressive way to approach these dress and interactional etiquette manuals is to have students, current interns, and young professionals more involved in creating these internships manuals and handbooks. This would ideally provide new points of view and would create manuals that are more representative of our rapidly changing society.

My analysis of how universities are gendered institutions through their internship manuals is only one piece of a larger picture of how students are socialized for future jobs and careers within the workforce. Future research of internship etiquette manuals could explore how these interactional and dress etiquette expectations are complicated by a queer lens, as the continued differentiation between suitable and expected dress etiquette of men and women is potentially an erasure and suppression of queer identities and their expressions of gender. These internships' etiquette manuals also implicitly create specific expectations for students from different cultures, ethnicities, and non-Western backgrounds. Therefore, future research could examine how these dress etiquette standards further penalize these marginalized groups and how assimilating to these normative standards is also an erasure of multiple facets of their identities. Finally, taking this current research on internship etiquette manuals as a starting point, it would also be useful for future research to examine the other avenues through which students learn about internship and job expectations of behaviours and dress within university settings. Analyzing internship practices within universities career centres and within other fields of study would provide a more holistic view of how students are socialized in gendered ways and illustrate more ways to challenge and change these messages.

References

Acker, J. (2012). Gendered organizations and intersectionality: Problems and possibilities. *Equality, Diversity & Inclusion*, *31*(3), 214-224.

Acker, J. (1992) Gendering organizational theory. In Mills, Albert J. and Tancred, Peta (eds) *Gendering organizational analysis*, pp. 248-60. Newbury Park, London and New Delhi: Sage.

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society*, *4*(2), 139-158.

Alvesson, M. & Due Billing, Y. (1997). *Understanding gender and organizations.* London: Sage.

Babbie, E. R. (2008). *The basics of social research*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Bandsuch, M. (2009). Dressing up title VII's analysis of workplace appearance policies. *Columbia Human Rights Law Review, 40*(287), 287-291.

Bartlett, K. (1994). Only girls wear barrettes: Dress and appearance standards, community norms and workplace equality. *Symposium: Visions of Equality: The Future of Title VII, 92*(8), 2541-2582.

Berg, B.L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bird, S. R. (2011). Unsettling universities' incongruous, gendered bureaucratic structures: A case-study approach. *Gender, Work & Organization, 18,* 202–230.

Dye, K., & Mills, A. J. (2012). Pleading the fifth. Re-focusing Acker's gendered substructure through the lens of organizational logic. *Equality, Diversity & Inclusion*, *31*(3), 278-297.

Goudreau, J. (2010). In pictures: 10 most popular college majors for men. Retrieved March 9, 2015, from http://www.forbes.com/2010/08/10/most-popular-college-degrees-for-men-forbes-woman-leadership-education_slide_2.html

Jong, A. (2012). You can't be what you can't see: How to get more women in tech. Retrieved February 16, 2015, from https://www.themuse.com/advice/you-cant-be-what-you-cant-see-how-to-get-more-women-in-tech#!

Kanter, R. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation* (Vol. 1, pp. 127-300). New York City, New York: Perseus Books Group.

Kelly, R. M. (1991). *The gendered economy: Work, careers, and success*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Latest Annual Data. (2013, January 1). Retrieved February 11, 2015, from http://www.dol.gov/wb/stats/recentfacts.htm#rates

Maier, M. (1999). On the gendered substructure of organization: Dimensions and dilemmas of corporate masculinity. In G. N. Powell (Ed.) *Handbook of gender and work* (pp. 69-93). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

McNamara, B. (1994). All dressed up with no place to go: Gender bias in Oklahoma federal court dress codes. *Tulsa Law Review, 30*(2), 1-31.

Newsom, J. (Director). (2011). *Miss representation* [Motion picture on DVD]. United States: The Representation Project.

Padavic, I., & Reskin, B. (2002). *Sociology for a new century*: *Women and men at work.* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Pew Research Center. (2013). *Modern parenthood*. Retrieved http://www.pewsocialtrends. org/2013/03/14/modern-parenthood-roles-of-moms-and-dads-converge-as-they-balance-work-and-family/

Sandberg, S. (2013). *Lean in: Women, work, and the will to lead* (1st ed.). New York City, New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.

Williams, C. (1995). Gendered jobs and gendered workers. *Still a man's world: Men who do women's work*, 6-17. Los Angeles, California: University of California Press.

Williams, C. (2006). *Inside toyland?* Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Williams, C. L., Muller, C., & Kilanski, K. (2012). Gendered organizations in the new economy. *Gender & Society*, *26*(4), 549-573.

Williams, J. (2010). *Reshaping the work-family debate: Why men and class matter*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Williams, J., Dempsey, R., & Slaughter, A.M. (2014). *What works for women at work: Four patterns working women need to know*. New York City, New York: New York University Press.

Williamson, E. (2006). Moving past hippies and harassment: A historical approach to sex, appearance, and the workplace. *Duke Law Journal, 56*(681), 681-720.

Wingfield, A. (2013). *Race and gender in men's work*. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University Press.

Women in the labor force: A databook. (2014, May 1). Retrieved February 11, 2015, from http://www.bls.gov/cps/wlf-databook-2013.pdf

Appendix I

Universities contacted:

1. Frostburg University (MD) Both departments
2. University of Oregon- Eugene (OR)
3. University of Oregon-Portland (OR) Both departments
4. Western Washington University (WA)
5. Washington State University (WA) Both departments
6. Xavier University of Louisiana (LA)
7. Louisiana State University (LA)
8. University of Louisiana (LA) Both departments
9. University of Maryland (MD)
10. University of North Carolina-Greensboro (NC)
11. North Carolina State University (NC) Both departments
12. University of North Carolina-Charlotte (NC)
13. Seattle University (WA)
14. University of Washington (WA)
15. Portland State University (OR)
16. Arizona State University (AZ) Both departments
17. St. John's University (NY) Both departments
18. Meredith University (NC)
19. Morehouse College (GA)
20. University of California- Berkley (CA) Both departments
21. The Citadel (SC) Both departments
22. Wesleyan University (CT) Both departments
23. Cedar Crest College (PA)
24. Barnard College (NY)
25. Simmons College (MA) Both departments
26. Ohio State University (OH)
27. University of Houston (TX)
28. Aquinas College (MI)
29. Columbia University (NY)
30. University of South Alabama (AL)
31. Salisbury University (MD) Both departments
32. Florida State University
33. University of Kentucky (KY)
34. Colorado State University (CO)
35. University of Louisville (KY)
36. Georgia Tech (GA)
37. Michigan State University (MI)
38. Ohio University (OH)
39. San Francisco State University (CA)
40. Oklahoma State University (OK)
41. University of South Florida (FL)
42. Arkansas State University (AK)
43. Northern Arizona University (AZ)
44. Texas State University (TX)
45. Boston College/ University (MA)
46. James Madison University (VA)
47. DePaul University (IL)
48. University of Florida (FL)
49. Fort Hayes State University (KS)
50. Rochester Institute of Technology (NY)
51. University of Cincinnati (OH)
52. University of Utah (UT)
53. University of Texas (TX)
54. University of Buffalo (NY)
55. University of Memphis (TN)
56. Penn State (PA)
57. University of North Carolina Kenan-Flagler (NC)
58. Oregon State University
59. San-Jose State University (CA)
60. Kutztown University (PA)
61. University of Akron (OH)
62. Florida International University (FL)

Appendix II

University Internship Etiquette Manuals selected:

1. Oregon State University (OR)

2. Florida State University (FL)

3. San Jose State University (CA)

4. Kutztown University (PA)

5. Florida International University (FL)

6. University of North Carolina- Kenan Flagler (NC)

7. University of Memphis (TN)

8. Boston University (MA)

9. University of Buffalo (NY)

10. Utah State University (UT)

11. Ohio State University (OH)

12. Penn State (PA)

13. Frostburg University (MD)

14. University of Washington (WA)

15. Ohio University (OH)

16. Columbia University (NY)

17. University of Utah (UT)

18. University of South Alabama (AL)

19. University of Texas (TX)

20. Western Washington University (WA)

21. University of South Florida (FL)

Appendix III

Email format used for contacting universities:

1.

Dear, (University, Dean, Assistant, or other contact person)

I am working on a Master's project at University of Louisville and wished to know if the college of business had any specific internship etiquette guidelines/ manuals that are provided to your students. I would greatly appreciate a copy of this if available for my research.

Sincerely, Daphne Heflin

2.

Dear, (University, Dean, Assistant, or other contact person)

I am working on a Master's project at University of Louisville and wished to know if the college of education had any specific internship etiquette guidelines/ manuals that are provided to your students. I would greatly appreciate a copy of this if available for my research.

Sincerely, Daphne Heflin

Appendix IV

Coding Frame:

1. "Smile/Smiling"
2. "Enthusiasm /Interest"
3. "Positive attitude"
4. "Appreciation/Gratitude"
5. "Professionalism/Act Professionally"
6. "Friendly/Kindness"
7. "Respectful/Respect"
8. "Networking/ Building contacts/ relationships"
9. "Confidence"
10. "Sensitivity/ Consideration for other's feelings"
11. "Being Genuine/ Genuine"
12. "Show initiative/ Assertive"
13. "Gain experience for jobs/career"