

(Re)Visioning the Ethnographic Site: Interpretive Ethnography as a Method of Pedagogical Reflexivity and Scholarly Production

Bryant Keith Alexander
California State University, Los Angeles

This article uses and advocates the use of interpretive ethnography as a method of pedagogical reflexivity and scholarly production. Specifically, it seeks to further the discussion of the classroom as a cultural site that places the teacher as both participant and observer in the intense cultural negotiation of lived experience, curriculum, and politics of education. Using the constructive metaphor of pedagogy as drag, the project also suggests that similar to drag (and the performance of gender), pedagogy is about what teachers reveal and what they conceal in the classroom and why. To that extent, the article uses a series of reflective poetic excursions on the nature and experience of viewing and discussing the performance of drag. These excursions take the author away from the formal construct of the classroom but always bring him back to the constructed nature of pedagogy as drag, blurring the boundaries between place and space.

Keywords: *interpretive ethnography; reflexive pedagogy; drag performance; performative writing*

"Perhaps this is the time to stress technique again? . . . A detour into strategy, tactics, and practice is called for, at least as long as it takes to gain vision, self-knowledge, self-possession, even in one's decentredness."

—Luce Irigaray (1985)

In my performative scholarship, I often begin with a personal moment, a narrative, or a confession. This reiterative moment in my work is a signal to

Author's Note: This article was presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002. Some of the ideas were originally constructed and presented under the title, "Performing Teacher/Performing Drag in the Classroom," at the National Communication Association convention in 2000.

Qualitative Inquiry, Volume 8 Number 4, 2002 1-26
DOI: 10.1177/1077800403251765
© 2002 Sage Publications

myself and to the audience (the reader) that I am personalizing the text. It signals that I am engaged in a reflexive project of seeing myself see myself in both the moment of the academic utterance (a scholarly conference, written text, or classroom lecture) and my aware presence of owning what I say. So, I also begin this essay with a confession because I think that interpretive ethnography is partially about self-disclosure. It is “autoethnographic, vulnerable, performative, and critical” (Denzin, 1999, p. 510). It is about articulating one’s views and perceptions. It is about detailing experience and offering “storied histories of sacred spaces” (Denzin, 1999, p. 510).

So I confess, recently I have been interested in drag performance and how that relates to identity and more specifically how it relates to the authentic character and identity of teachers in the classroom. My interest in drag is not exclusively relegated to the reductionary and reifying discussions of sex, sexuality, and gender; or the polemics linked with subterfuge and deception; or even the contested performative accomplishment of allusion versus impersonation—though these issues inform my thinking of drag performance. My interest in drag focuses on the sensuousness of experience, the challenge of display and representation, and the risky and risqué nature of performing and critiquing drag in the classroom.

I am interested in the notion of pedagogy as a performance of drag. Thus, I would like to offer three theoretical constructs that help ground my joint interest in pedagogy and drag and how I am relating this to and through interpretive ethnography. First, in *Passing and Pedagogy*, Pamela L. Caughie (1999) stated that

pedagogy often been defined as the “art” of teaching, functions more like interpretation; it provides students with the means to accomplish something. The purpose of pedagogy is to make things clear. . . . Even if, following John Dewey, we conceive pedagogy as teaching inquiry, not knowledge, as process-oriented rather than content-centered, and even if we resist its reduction to a set of rules or methodology, still pedagogy is largely conceived in humanist terms; it is supposed to be comforting by providing guidance, enabling students to become part of an academic community and to see themselves as members of a broader social community, responsive and responsible to it. (p. 64)

In that sense, and playing with Roger Simon’s (1992) notion of pedagogy, pedagogy is similar to teaching good manners—which signals the practical synthesis of the question “What should be taught and why? with considerations as to how that teaching should take place” (pp. 55-57). Similar to good manners, pedagogy is always something that is relational. The beauty of the performative accomplishment is only truly appreciated by those with an articulate understanding of intention and effect.

Second, in *Drag: A History of Female Impersonation in the Performing Arts*, Roger Baker (1994) offered a conceptualization of drag performance that

speaks not to the practice of donning the clothes of the other as much as the effect of the engagement. He said,

Drag is about many things. It is about clothes and sex. It subverts the dress codes that tell us what men and women should look like in our organised society. It creates tension and releases tension, confronts and appeases. It is about role-playing and questioning the meaning of both gender and sexual identity. It is about anarchy and defiance. (p. 18)

Baker suggested that drag is about disrupting notions of the normal or the expected. It is about performances of resistance and resistant performances of gender.

Third, in this sense I want to use Judith Butler's (1993) clarification of performativity by switching metaphors from gender as drag to gender as an assignment. She wrote: "To the extent that gender is an assignment, it is an assignment which is never quite carried out according to expectation, whose address never quite inhabits the ideal s/he is compelled to approximate" (p. 231). The combination of these two utterances could suggest that the teaching persona is rife with expectations and that teachers who assume the expected assignments of character in a denial of their ideal selves are performing in drag. Linked with Butler's construction, Del LaGrace Volcano and Judith Halberstam's (1999) interviews with drag king performers suggest the difference between male and female impersonation. "The male impersonator [a woman performing a man] has to take things off . . . while the female impersonator [a man performing a woman] has to add things on" (p. 35).

In constructing the metaphor of pedagogy as drag, I want to suggest that similar to drag, pedagogy is about what we as teachers reveal and what we conceal in the classroom and why. It is about the construction of our personal identities and how we filter knowledge through experience. I want to suggest that teachers engaged in interpretive ethnography are filtering knowledge through experience, revealing aspects of themselves often left hidden.

So although the context of this article is focused on the links between drag (performance) and pedagogy, I must also reveal my own experiences with and positionality in these performances. To that extent, throughout this article, I will offer three descriptive excursions that take me away from the formal construct of the classroom but always bring me back to the constructed nature of pedagogy as drag performance, blurring the boundaries between place and space. In this way I seek to complicate what Suzanne de Castell and Mary Bryson (1997) called "the often contradictory implications of theoretical debates concerning identity politics/essentialism juxtaposed with the embodied actualities of producing, negotiating, performing, and troubling difference/s in educational contexts" (p. 1).

INTERPRETIVE ETHNOGRAPHY AS REFLEXIVE PEDAGOGY

Using Norman Denzin's (1997) construction of interpretive ethnography as a technique, this article also seeks to further the discussion of the classroom as a situated cultural site. It is a site that places the teacher as both participant and observer in an intense social negotiation of attitudes, beliefs, values, and practices. The nature of this kind of research

shifts the focus of research from the perspective of the ethnographer as an outsider to a discovery of the insider's point of view. Ethnography is not merely and objective description of people and their behavior from the observer's viewpoint. It is a systematic attempt to discover the knowledge a group of people have learned and are using to organize their behavior. (Spradley & McCurdy, 1972, p. 9)

Hence, teachers can be seen as ethnographers surveying the terrain of their classroom culture.

This research furthers the significance of storytelling by teachers by grounding it in the thick description and critical reflection of experience that is ethnography. "Story has become more than a rhetorical device for expressing sentiments about teachers or candidates for teaching profession. It is now, rather, a central focus for conducting research in the field" (Carter, 1993, p. 5). This article argues that because teachers are always and already positioned as participants and observers in the process of education, we are uniquely situated to engage in writing interpretive ethnographies as a means of both documenting our experience and providing insights to others.

"The typologies, and provisional unities that I use [in this article] are part of an explanatory strategy for demonstrating a general break or discontinuity" between what I am advocating as a critical interpretive ethnography at the service of pedagogy and what some might read as merely a venture into creative writing (Crary, 1999, p. 7). And yet, creative writing has benefit in the social world. Although grounded in aesthetics, it, similar to interpretive ethnography, is committed to the critical social processes of meaning making and illuminating experience through descriptive language. Interpretive ethnography is considered a theory of writing. It is also linked to a theory of intent. In the introduction to *Interpretive Ethnography: Ethnographic Practices in the 21st Century*, Norman K. Denzin (1997) stated:

A theory of writing is also a theory of interpretive (ethnographic) work. Theory, writing, and ethnography are inseparable material practices. Together they create the conditions that locate the social inside the text. Hence, those who write culture also write theory. Also those who write theory write culture. . . . There is a need for a reflexive form of writing that turns ethnographic and theoretical texts back "onto each other." (p. xii)

Within this sense, I must admit a fixation on the reflexive that is both a germinal element of interpretative ethnography and helps to “theorize the interpersonal conditions and politics of [my own] production,” which is seemingly always a requirement of scholarship (Gingrich-Philbrook, 2000, p. ix). Reflexivity is also the cornerstone of critical teaching. Critical teachers engage reflexivity as an active mediation of their in-class practices and as a meditation on the effectiveness of their practices.

Close ethnographic detail and depth of analysis and argument provide a valuable corrective to “common-sense” views of the origins of success and failure, and expose the superficiality of quick-fix school reform and restructuring policies foisted on citizens as cures for “inefficiency” and “inequity” in education. (Lankshear, 1986, p. xx)

I fully practice what Denzin (1997) outlined as six levels of reflexive engagement: first a *subjectivist reflexivity* in which I engage in my own self-critique, second a *methodological reflexivity* in which I try to sustain and argue for a methodological purity, third an *intertextual reflexivity* in which I add my voice in relation to a larger conversation of these issues, fourth a *standpoint reflexivity* in which I claim both a subjective involvement while maintaining an objectified sense of purpose and process, fifth a *queer reflexivity* in which I identify myself as a “gendered subject with agency and self-identity,” and sixth a *feminist/materialist reflexivity* in which I question the very nature of writing about others in light of my own fragmented identity (pp. 217-224). Although these are characteristics of the poetic or narrative text, I find that they also establish meaningful orientations of teachers to students, curriculum, schools, the classroom experience, the process of publicly articulating experience, and our own dense particularities. Sataya Mohanty (1989) used the term *dense particularity* to refer to the specified variables of lived condition inclusive of race, culture, place, and time. Interpretive ethnography demands a reorientation to self in relation to time and space.

Ethnographers cannot be expected to know everything about a particular culture. So in writing interpretative ethnographies, teachers might focus on specific moments of experience to extrapolate meaning. Teachers might focus on those rare moments when teaching really works or those particular moments of conflict and struggle in the classroom.¹ “The history of such oppositional moments needs to be written, but it only becomes legible against the more hegemonic set of discourses and practices in which vision took shape” (Crary, 1999, p. 7). I focus on an in-class student performance that forced me to re-vision the nature of teaching and how my dense particularity as a Black, gay, male teacher demands a certain accountability on the part of students who negotiate the content of classroom experience in relation to their own lives and my material presence in the classroom.

Making this realization places me both on the inside of the outside and the outside of the inside of my own classroom experience. In her introduction to

Borders, Boundaries and Frames: Cultural Criticism and Cultural Studies, Mae Henderson (1995) offered a description that might appropriately capture the position/positionality of the teacher engaging an interpretive ethnography of the classroom experience. She said: "Forever on the periphery of the possible, the border, the boundary, and the frame are always at issue—and their location and status inevitably raise the problematic of inside and outside and how to distinguish one from the other" (p. 2).

Excursion #1: The Queen as King (or the Making of a Man?)²

I have attended gay clubs and seen women doing drag.
They are often dressed in men's suits, with false mustaches
and a Elvis-like charisma,
or Billy Idol like lust.

But this particular performance is different.
S/he walks onto the stage and the 5 to 1 ratio of male to female audience is quieted.
There is music in the background, but no one notices it.
All that I notice is he/r.
A sculpted body, a hard body.
S/he is not masked in elaborate make-up.
This is a performance of revelation not concealment.

S/he's not swaying with undulating hips, but walking with purpose,
"straight" with a control of focus,
taking up space,
booted feet landing firmly in he/r tracks.
S/he surveys the room and makes he/r mark.
S/he commands our attention.

The 1% of lesbians in the bar begin to hmoooo with delight—
the first of such sounds in the evening.
Unlike their critiquing whispers of the drag queens that preceded he/r,
they engage the performer in a methodical seduction that
is slightly lost on me, but not really.
Well maybe.

For you see, for me this is Victor Victoria—it is a woman, "pretending" to be man—
or is she? The tension that exists in my desire and my aesthetic appreciation
suspends me in that quarry.

S/he has short spiked hair that s/he passes her fingers through.
S/he's wearing a tight T-shirt "with her breast firmly under control."³
He/r shoulders are broad, he/r chin square.
S/he's wearing tight jeans.
One hand is strategically placed on he/r crotch—
but seemingly not as suggestion of what is not there—as in parody,
but a gesture to what is there—a signal to her sex;
pointing direction to desire.

With he/r other hand passing through he/r hair s/he looks like
either James Dean
or the Venus DeMilo
(if she had arms.)

He/rs is a performance of absence—
Signaling what is not there magnifies the potency of what is,
an organic masculinity.⁴

S/he has a slight mustache, just enough to seem “real.”

S/he has sideburns that frame an intense expression.

He/r body is unfettered.

S/he sits on a stool and spreads he/r legs
in that manly pose that suggests masculinity,
but really just signals comfort, confidence and control.

S/he mouths the words to some male love ballad,
and I believe he/r.

It’s not in the words, but in the delivery.

I see he/r care for detail and he/r focused attention to the women
in the audience.

He/rs is not a “performance” of masculinity,
like putting something on—
she has taken something off to reveal
an essence of directness and desire.

The performance is a moment in which a woman
strategically “transforms” herself to look like a “man.”
Yet s/he knows that the women looking at
he/r as a “man” knows that s/he is a woman—
the sexual object of their affection, mimicking the presumed image of
the feminine heterosexual gaze.

S/he also knows (she has to know) in the “gay bar”—

gay men are looking at he/r
as the object of their male desire.

Yet, s/he is a trickster—directing and redirecting gaze (gays).

I suspect that in the exclusively lesbian bar that the project is more direct,
the audience specific.

The song continues, but it doesn’t really matter,
it’s not what s/he says,
it’S what s/he does.

Well maybe not: *Little girls are supposed to be seen not heard. Right?*

He/r admirers approach the drag king and pay the monetary homage
that has become custom when in the company of royalty.

The men offer their appreciation of the aesthetic.

They are allowed to lean in and kiss he/r on a turned cheek.

Women who offer their appreciation are engulfed in a “manly” hug
with an appropriate display of affection.

The kiss and the touch are like secret fraternity/*sorority* signals
of membership and desire.

(RE)VISIONING THE ETHNOGRAPHIC SITE

The classroom is a cultural site. It is a space that is socially negotiated and socially constructed. "Approaching place as a socially constructed, 'meaningfully constituted in relation to human agency and activity' may offer a way of overcoming the methodological and conceptual tensions between totally 'unhooking' identity and culture from place and constructing them as place-bound" (Caftanzoglou, 2001, p. 21).⁵ Yet unlike traditional ethnographies where the ethnographer travels to the wilds of exotic sites crossing disparate geographical borders in search of the other or crossing over to the metaphorical "wrong side of the tracks" in search of experiences other than their own—the classroom is ever present in the experience of teachers and students.

The classroom is a site in which diverse lived experiences and disparate ways of being and knowing come together to negotiate the sometimes collectivizing cultural practices of traditional education. The teacher thus becomes the ethnographer of her own experience and that of the classroom environment. "Context has always seemed to be the ethnographic long suit. . . . Context opens the way for the ethnographer to present human social behavior as more, rather than as less complex, to keep explanations from becoming simplistic or reductionist" (Wolcott, 1999, p. 79). The classroom becomes a space for tracking these movements.

A space exists when one takes into consideration vectors of direction, velocities, and time variables. Thus space is composed of intersections of mobile elements. It is in a sense actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within. Space occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it, and make it function in a polyvalent unity of conflictual programs or contractual proximities. . . . In short, space is practiced place. (de Certeau, 1984, p. 117)

The classroom as a practiced place offers rich opportunity for interpretive ethnographic reflections and analysis by teachers. And whereas the work of Peter McLaren (1993, 1998) called our attention to the classroom as a cultural space, interpretive ethnography offers a journey into the personal experiences and reflections of teachers within that space.

A STUDENT PERFORMING DRAG IN THE CLASSROOM

I received the analysis paper for his prose performance in my beginning oral interpretation of literature class, and I was amused by his selection, an excerpt from Meryl Cohn's (1995) *Do What I Say: Ms. Behavior's Guide to Gay and Lesbian Etiquette*.⁶ This is a trade book in the camp etiquette genre. He constructed his performance around his envisionment of Ms. Behavior, an overly

exaggerated hyperbolic drag queen dishing out advice to the would-be drag queen and the ill-advised “natural” woman.

I was amused when he pranced into the performance space like a high-stepping carnival performer on 6-inch stiletto heels, his stylized version of femininity. Other than his shoes and his affected manner, his drag was suggestive, as all drag is suggestive. He wore black corduroys and a red shirt—of the “polo” variety. He resisted shaving his facial hair—a vandike (his male drag). If the dualism of his appearance forestalled the believability of his drag, he circulated pictures of himself done up—his face beat with make-up, full dark lips, wearing a larger than life black wig and a form-fitting black dress that emphasized his ample bosom. The size of his faux breasts and the thinness of the dress revealed a white brassiere—a documented fashion faux pas that competed against his pedagogical credibility on drag etiquette.

In this performance I am disturbed and amused at how he reconstructs the audience from students in the classroom to audience members at a drag show, blurring the lines—knowing that the classroom is always a sight of performance and drag is always relative. And I begin to think about the shifting roles of teacher-student, performer-audience, spectacle and spectators in the classroom. I begin to think, similar to Jane Gallop (1992), that “pedagogical positions are like drag performances” (p. 217).

I am intrigued by this pedagogical performance. He continues to instruct the class on the proper decorum for being a drag queen. His method calls attention to the spectacle of instruction while it speaks to the spectacle of gender performance. But I am less interested in his campy delivery—this bigger than life queen who has found he/r way on the runway of my classroom—with unsuspecting and captive viewers. I am more interested and amused by the other students in the class. They are a motley crew. During previous discussions related to issues of sex/sexuality/gender, they have silently asserted their heterosexuality by performing *het-texts*, stories of male-female desire, masculine zeal, and fatal femininity, as if to extend the expected heteronormative standard of gender performance into my classroom as an insurgent act of performative resistance against what they know is my queer identity.

I am musing on their response to Ms. Behavior. They giggle and guffaw as she walks in her stiletto heels, allowing the point and balance of that performative act to dictate her body gesture. They issue embarrassed smiles when s/he talks about the dilemmas and challenges of finding size 15 pumps. They direct resentful stares when she speaks of the negotiation of dressing rooms—praying for a sign that says “unisex” so that s/he does not have to make the choice. But he, the performer, has made some clear choices.

I see one of my het-boys sitting in the back of the room. In class he previously did a performance of Hercules—his idealized masculine idol in a text called “The Choices of Hercules” (Baldwin, 1993) from *The Book of Virtues* edited by William J. Bennett (1993). In his performance (of gender), he

preened and flexed his sculpted physique and beamed over an idealized feminine construct in the text. He is eye candy for the girls in the class (and for some of the boys). But now Hercules is cowering in the corner, his body angled to the wall as he takes sneak peeks at the spectacle of femininity that is Ms. Behavior. Ironically, in his own performance text, his character makes a choice between two women; the first called Labor, the second is called Pleasure. Where as Pleasure was “beautiful as a summer day” (p. 391), Labor “was not as beautiful as the other, [but] had a countenance pure and gentle” (p. 392). He chooses Labor over Pleasure.

Ms. Behavior speaks about the labor that is gender performance. Yet Hercules is performing resistance, for while in both his performance and the one he is viewing, woman is what Parama Roy (1995) called a “concept-metaphor” (p. 119). His performance uses the construction of woman to “set off his [own] masculinity and heterosexuality . . . [and thus] he could not sanction the presence of femininity in the male” in performance—thereby questioning the very construct of gender performance and his own identity (p. 119). Hercules looks back and forth between the picture in his hand, the drag queen—every bit the femme fatale—and the male in performance—they are the same and not the same. He smiles, then passes the pictures on quickly, as if embarrassed—this time refusing to make the choice of Labor over Pleasure.

And I am musing at the women in the class who perform a tensive audiencing of their drag queen big sister. S/he both challenges their comfort in femininity and confirms the constructedness of femininity and their own enculturation into a cult of beauty. When Ms. Behavior instructs them on the danger of blue eye shadow, the negotiation of their first pair of heels, and the process of finding the right dress—they nod and giggle like sorority girls acknowledging secret fashion tips.

At the end of the performance all students rush to ask questions. The men want to know about the negotiation of wearing heels (and how long it took him to learn). The women confirm the performance of gender—not this man/teacher in drag but how his instruction parallels their own performance of gender. They begin to spin story, sharing their own personal successes and failures. Yet, to find their comfort in the complex issues of gender performance and sexuality—as presented by Ms. Behavior—they must reject the pedagogical trigger of their body memory as same and not the same. They invalidate the meaningfulness of the message by relegating the performance as spectacle—as they say, “That was funny. You’re so funny.”

For them, spectacle is something that amuses, shocks, and dumbfounds—but does not inform. Spectacle is only something that draws attention and marks the difference between the normal and the not normal, performance and performativity, the thing and the thing done—establishing distance between the drama of the actor and the aesthetic distance of the spectator. For this audience, Ms. Behavior “troubles the performative boundaries that separate laboring novice and transcendent virtuosic [female], reconceiving the

typical plot of spectacular, autonomous agency to which such bodies [fe/male] are generally consigned" (Hamera, 2000, p. 150).⁷

And it is in that moment that I must intervene. I intervene knowing that I am going to make a spectacle of myself—but hoping that they don't see me exclusively as a gay identified man coming to the rescue of a drag queen in distress. BUT that they see me as their teacher (who is gay) engaged in a moment of instruction—which can also be a moment of rescue and recovery. I feel the need to address his performance as it meets the assignment, his performance as a construction and deconstruction of femininity, and how this relates to the nature of their comments. I feel the need, as I often feel the need, to deconstruct my position as teacher in moments in which the sociopolitical aspect of curriculum or course content comes in tension with the personal aspects of how I carry myself in the world and things that I value. I need to remind them that for our purposes, performance has to be *dulce et utile*, sweet and useful—the aesthetic crafted with intention. Similar to my teaching, which must be carefully crafted to inform about content matter while signaling larger issues of decorum and the social politics that dictate our lives.

How does the performance of Ms. Behavior inform us? Of course we knew the presenter was gay, he's mentioned it often. I have created a space where that is commonplace. For surely if I am going to be comfortable in my own gay identity, I must find ways to fuse that aspect of myself with everything else that I am, including my role as teacher—and thus give space for others to walk in relative ease in the classroom. It is not my desire to flaunt the implicit and or explicitness of my difference but to present myself as authentically as I can, to be fully present in the classroom, and to use the fullness of my identity as the tools with which I teach.

His performance of gender helps to denaturalize the everydayness of gender performance. He magnifies the constructedness of gender by placing his body on those illusory borders that separate and signify what it performatively means to be a "woman" and what it performatively means to be a "man." As teachers, we also place our bodies in the instructional gaps negotiating the tensions that often exist between our teaching persona and the fullness of our being. Our sexualized and racialized bodies always signal a history, an enfolded knowledge that may or may not, to our students, inform our pedagogy and our orientation to the subject matter.⁸ Yet in this pedagogical performance, we come to see not only how Ms. Behavior narrates gender performance but how we are implicated in that process as actors and spectators, engaging our own performance and reviewing the performances of others.

His performance opens up a space where we can come to question the very notion of "misbehaviors" as they relate to the expected performances of sex, sexuality, and gender—reduced to issues of heteronormativity. Knowing, of course, that within a technocratic construction of education,⁹ the teaching body—the body of the teacher—is constructed as straight—if not neutered—

conferring intellectual knowledge without “libidinal complications” (Roy, 1995, p. 119). The pedagogical performance of Ms. Behavior forces us to realize that as teachers/performers in the classroom, we are trapped in the spectral gaze of our students. We are positioned somewhere in the binary between parody and reality, between the real and not real, and the choices between our personal Pleasure and the Labor of pedagogy.

Excursion #2: Drag Droppings (or the Making of a Woman)

The performative arena of a male drag show is like no other.
The female “impersonator”/performer receives
 many accolades for his illusion,
For his construction and deconstruction of masculinity and femininity,
 in the site of the gay bar where that is the ongoing embodied activity.

What does it mean to be a man watching a man in drag?
What does it mean to be a man pretending to be a woman while men watch?
 It is a fabricated farce.
 It is a moment of suspended disbelief.
 But this is not Victor Victoria.

The viewer knows that it is a man pretending to be a woman,
 not a woman pretending to be a man pretending to be a woman.
It is the embrasure of a gay aesthetic,
 a grass roots theorizing on potential male performativity
 and the subversion of a delimiting possibility of masculinity.

The performance is a moment in which a man strategically transforms himself
 to look like a woman.
 Yet he knows that the men looking at him as a woman
 know that he is a man—the sexual object of their affection,
 mimicking the presumed image of the masculine heterosexual gaze.

In the dressing room the drag queen adds padding in strategic places in order
 to simulate feminine features.
 Creating hips where straight lines existed.
 Creating an ass where a flat bottom has lingered.
 Creating breasts where a hairy chest might have been.

With make-up applied, he slenderizes his manly nose
 into that of a petite fem.
He gives the illusion of high cheek bones, full lips and eyes that pop out
 maybe with vibrantly colored lens.
His body is shaved, plucked, cropped and topped with a wig or
 an elaborate head dress.
He dons an after-five gown—for of course that is what “real” women wear
 in this UnReal performative arena.

He steps into the pumps as he steps into his identity-transforming himself
 from Burt or Victor to Priscilla, Victoria or Eartha Quake
 or some other transgendered earth shaking transformed persona.

With his penis "firmly under control,"
 he stands on his spot waiting for the music to signal his entrance.
 The music begins.
 The curtain opens.

He assumes the appropriate feminine persona—
 based on the outfit and the music of course—
 because a lady is always properly aligned.

To the beat of the music he either shakes and shimmies,
 or sachets and saunters into the arena.

With hoops, hollering and applause the men in the audience,
 some who look like men and others who are drag wanna bees,
 validate the transformation, the illusion, the performance of hyper-
 femininity and suppressed masculinity.

Those who are so moved, approach the drag queen and pay the monetary homage
 that has become custom when in the company of royalty.

In the course of he/r performance,
 a vigorous gyrating of hips and tits to a rock 'n' roll beat
 or a statuesque crooning of a love ballad,
 (undoubtedly by Celene Dion or Madonna),
 the drag queen may drop a dollar bill or an earring;
 a tassel from he/r dress or any other part of he/r pastiched image.
 These are called "drag droppings."

Though the typical gender performances in this arena are subverted—
 chivalry is not dead in a gay bar.

A courtly gentleman from the audience will always offer assistance.

In exchange he may be rewarded with a kiss or the simple touching of finger tips,
 accompanied by the diverting of eyes
 and the coy smile that signals a shy feminine mystique,
 which we are told is the mark of a "true" lady.

A TEACHER PERFORMING DRAG IN THE CLASSROOM

When Jane Gallop (1992) talked about "pedagogical positions as drag," she was talking about "role-playing." She was talking about the sensuousness of "getting off on 'playing teacher.'" And she was talking about the tensions between "oppos[itional] pairs teaching/sex, understanding/conflict, duty/gratification, experience/representation, gender-blind/hypergendered, reality/pretense, labor/play" (p. 217). Drag for her is literally teetering on the line between the her and not her—in the "infantile pedagogy" of her childhood remembrances and in her dailiness as a "Full profes-

sor" (p. 215). She engaged an uncomfortable struggle with the notion of teachers and students as lovers, the inability to delineate pedagogical desire from carnal lust, or pedagogical incest with students—whether imagined or realized.

Although Ms. Behavior possessed her own appeal, my construction of teaching as drag has nothing to do with a lustful desire for my students or my inability to tease out the differences between the enjoyment of pedagogical engagement and an inappropriate desire for my students. For me, the notion of pedagogical drag is about representation. It is about a carefully crafted teaching persona that is either designed to foreground aspects of the personal or to cover them up. It is about those moments of slippage or detection in the classroom when either by accident or intention we reveal our biases or our students detect our biases and articulate their detection through questions of fairness. In my construction of pedagogical drag, I am interested in those active pedagogical moments of response in which teachers are engaged in the dual process of constructing their personal gender/sexual identity as it relates to in-class performances. Similar to Gallop (1992), I am interested in how student questions seek a clarification between the oppositional pairs of bias/desire, affinity/rejection, and pedagogy/propriety.

In a written evaluation and reflection on the performance given by Ms. Behavior, Hercules questions whether I was easy on the performer (in my critique) and harsh on the class because he is gay (and because, he suggestively writes, you are gay). He questioned whether the performance met the criteria of the assignment and whether the choice of material could be considered "literature." Although he vigorously defended himself against accusations of homophobia, he also questioned whether the character presented in the performance was believable and whether the selection and the manner of presentation was celebrating, if not advocating, a subversive and delinquent homosexual agenda. His concerns question the risks of pedagogy and what Pamela Caughie (1999) also referred to as "pedagogy at risk" and the notion of "promoting politics" in the classroom, as if the classroom is not always and already a site of cultural and political proliferation (p. 62). But his concerns are questioning my personal politics as related to the issue of my sexuality.

As I ponder his questions, I see myself standing up in front of the classroom with my pressed white shirt, appropriately matched tie, nicely creased pants, intellectually sleek glasses, and appropriately didactic manner (my professional drag)—talking through the issues of this performance as filtered through the assignment and audience response. As I am standing in front of the class engaged in the pedagogical performance of commentary and critique, I am thinking about the imaginary picture of myself in drag that is circulating around the room, the me and the not me.¹⁰ Somewhere between my praise of the performance and the admonishment of the audience, the students see my biases and my allegiances. They see the imaginary slip of my drag subjectivity showing, if not literally dragging beneath the presumed

objectivity of the teacher.¹¹ And I wonder if for them, somehow, my queer identity competes against my pedagogical credibility.

Somewhere between my comments on the selection and my clarification of the issues lies the me and the not me. The gay man in me has challenged the impression of the straight teacher and the sanitized nature of classroom discourse around issues of sex, sexuality, and gender that had so often signaled my classroom experience as a student. This knowledge was considered dangerous. "Many kinds of knowledge are dangerous: dangerous because they destabilize established common-sense world-views, dangerous because they pull the veil away from oppression, discrimination and suffering, making for uncomfortable confrontation with these issues" (Epstein & Sears, 1999, p. 1).

And now in the classroom, I am trapped in the tensive negotiation of viewing and responding to performances of sexuality and sexualized performances and how my own desire and disdain becomes a politicized variable. Yet I know that this is not a trap as much as it is the quest of good pedagogy—to question not only what to teach and how to teach it—but why. The condition of tensiveness does not signal strife and resistance as much as it reveals the contrasts and conflicts in which teachers infuse their teaching; an academic intellectual knowing tempered with a personal sense of being in the world.

So I must respond to the questions and accusations of the student and my own.

RESPONDING TO QUESTIONS IN DRAG

Dear Student—

In this class I speak from the position of the teacher and a person in the world. In this class I speak with the express intent in clarifying issues, challenging thoughts, and encouraging critical introspection. In this class I speak as a teacher who has accomplished some degree of academic accomplishment, but not at the expense of the person that I am or would like to be.

In this class I speak as a teacher, but as a teacher who is Black and a teacher who is gay. My academic knowledge is filtered through the person that I am. Sometimes that knowledge influences other aspects of my life, but most often the history of my being, the history of being Black in this country, the history of being gay in this country tempers and directs my understanding of academic issues and directs my teaching. It happens to help recoup the past and redirect the future. So my comments related to Ms. Behavior are not designed to promote a "homosexual agenda" but a critical examination of the performance as it met the assignment and the accompanying social critique it offered on the construction of gender.

While I appreciate your questions, I would ask that you reflect on why you asked the questions. Does the performance of "misbehavior" challenge you in some way that questions your notions of the normal? Would you prefer to silence such dissent? To question whether Ms. Behavior or I are trying to promote a homosexual agenda is also to have us question whether you are promoting an agenda of heteronormativity that would deny our voice, and therefore you become some legislator of what is moral and normal. Are you setting your-

self up as the arbiter of good taste? And since I am Black and Ms. Behavior is Latino and we are gay and you are a straight White man asking the questions, should these be factored in our discussion as well?

How does this performance work in tension with your own? Here I am speaking directly to your performance of prose, not the constructedness of your gender performance. Do you see the relationship between this text and your own choices, "The Choices of Hercules"? Can you engage in that critical endeavor?

PERFORMING PEDAGOGY/ INTERPRETING EXPERIENCE

As a teacher of performance studies located in a department of communication studies, I am deftly aware of the importance of compassionate yet critical commentary to my students. The intentions are grounded not only in a quest for humanity but to promote the idea that our students become better without becoming bitter. Like so, an interpretive ethnography must be grounded in an ethic of care. It is not engaged in a narcissistic process of sense making as the fulfillment of inward desires, it must engage the critically reflexive process for the benefit of self and other, whether the other is characterized as the student or other teachers.

In many ways, interpretive ethnography in the classroom must engage in what Lipman, Sharp, and Oscanyan (1980) called in their project *Philosophy in the Classroom* "a morally imaginative process."

Hence, this process is defined through the following six characteristics: (1) thinking creatively; (2) envisaging the various ways in which an existing unsatisfactory situation might be transformed; (3) anticipating the goals which a more individual or moral community might seek; (4) considering alternative ways to reach each goal; (5) selecting the preferred ways; and (6) planning implementation of the objectives. (pp. 172-173)

And in the process, as John Van Maanen (1995) said in *Representation in Ethnography*, "evidence must be offered up to support arguments whose pedigree must be established in a way that will convince at least a few readers that the author has something credible to say" (p. 23).

Within interpretive ethnography, similar to all forms of ethnography, there is a tensively held moral obligation toward the subjects of reflection and the intention of the reflection and commentary. Norman Denzin (1997) told us:

The ethnographer's moral tales are not written to produce harm for others. The ethnographer's tale is always allegorical—a symbolic tale that is not just a record of human experience. This tale is a means of experience for the reader. It is a vehicle for readers to discover moral truths about themselves. More deeply, the ethnographic tale is a utopian tale of self and social redemption, a tale that brings a moral compass back into the readers (and the writer's) life. (p. xiv)

And in this sense, interpretive ethnography works in alignment with compassionate care that always guides and undergirds good teaching. An ethic of care that is designed to inform and engage without harming, to promote and deter without silencing, to offer information and knowledge—knowing that it is an offering and not a mandate. And in this way, capitalizing on the teachings of Paulo Freire, Marguerite and Michael Rivage-Seul (1994) stated:

For in its transcendental form imagination places critical human subjectivity rather than institutional preservation at the center of the possible. In Freire's terms it is the drive to humanization, and is comprehensively historical because the process treats human beings as subjects who relativize or historicize their institutional reality, not as objects relegated simply to fulfilling ahistorical institutional requirements. (p. 47)

The intimate engagement of reflection and description that is interpretive ethnography demands a felt involvement that cannot help but motivate and transform the author and those who read it. So, to make interpretive ethnography meaningful beyond the scope of the individual experience, the insights gathered must be translated into action; it must be used to transform our educational praxis and the experience of students. This

demands that we work toward developing a pedagogy organized around a language of both critique and possibility, one that offers teachers the opportunity to deconstruct their own teaching practices, and beyond this, to create pedagogical practices that take up the radical responsibility of ethics in helping students to confront evil and imagine a more just society. (Rivage-Seul & Rivage-Seul, 1994, p. 100)

Excursion #3: Gender Markings

On March 1, 2000, I performed a program titled "Gender Markings" at the University of California at Santa Barbara (UCSB). The performance was scheduled as the last event of Black History Month and the first event moving into Women's History Month. The event was sponsored by four organizations: the UCSB Multi-Cultural Center, the Center for Black Studies, the Queer Resource Center, and the Queer Student Union. The positioning of my body and the performance at these intersections created varying expectations for those in attendance and pulled me in multiple directions. For some it was an entertainment event, for others it was about representation, and still for others it was a pedagogical moment—all of these expectations converge in the traditional classroom. The audience was mixed, with me reading a lot of same-sex couples and a series of singles—older and younger. There was a mixture of faculty and students with pens and pads taking notes.

In the performative presentation I included the two pieces on drag performance mentioned before: "The Queen as King (or the Making of a Man?)" and "Drag Droppings (or the Making of a Woman?)." After the performance a

highly “*masculinized-pretty-dyke-girl*”—with short cropped hair, spiked in the front, with a chiseled jaw line, wearing a black leather coat draped over a white t-shirt, sitting up front with her legs crossed in square fashion asked me a question. She said something like: “I am very interested in your depiction of drag king performance. Could you talk about that some more?” I answered her by saying that in interviews with drag king performers, Volcano and Halberstam (1999) noted that the performers suggested that the difference between male and female impersonation is that the male impersonators (women performing men) “has to take things off . . . while the female impersonator has to add things” (p. 35).

When asked, “What is a Drag King?” Volcano and Halberstam (1999) replied, “anyone (regardless of gender) who consciously makes a performance out of masculinity” (p. 16). Volcano and Halberstam continued to say,

I had been doing (female) drag for years. It was only by making a “performance” out of femininity that I was able to inhabit a female persona, a femme suit that was seldom a comfy fit. But when I donned a Drag King persona it didn’t feel like much of an act. I was astounded by how natural it felt to be a guy and be free of the anxieties I had lived for years around not passing as a “real” woman. (pp. 16-21)

So, the question of feminine and masculine identity construction in drag performance circles is seemingly reduced to the layering of the effect or paring down of the effect. “The drag king takes what is so-called natural about masculinity and reveals its mechanisms—the tricks and poses, the speech patterns and attitudes that have been seamlessly assimilated into a performance of realness” (Volcano & Halberstam, 1999, p. 62). Hers is a performance of absence—signaling what is not there magnifies the potency of what is; an organic masculinity. The performative challenge of masculinity thus becomes to simulate a kind of raw simplicity and natural macho charisma. “A Drag King is a performer who makes masculinity into his or her act (yes there can be male Drag Kings),” those men who parody the very notion of what has been socially constructed as masculinity for the amusement or approval of others (Volcano & Halberstam, 1999, p. 36). Within the radical performative arena of drag there is a resistance to the notion of gender as fluid, “as a recreational pursuit or as no more than a choice between different wardrobes” (Volcano & Halberstam, 1999, p. 39). These women, most of whom are lesbians, are not merely exploring but embodying meaningful components of their own gendered selves. Many of whom seek to not only “blur the lines between on and off stage, but that porous boundary [that] shifts and warps” their reality (Volcano & Halberstam, 1999, p. 41).

Later in our discussion the “*masculinized-pretty-dyke-girl*” in the audience cites Judith Halberstam and Del LaGrace Volcano, as do I. She has done the homework on her own identity construction. She seems to appreciate my commentary. In our discussion she does a reading of my performance of

viewing drag king performance. In her observation, she forced me to acknowledge what is my seemingly contradicting desire—but not really. She forces me to see that the “gay boy” in me appreciates the aesthetic of drag queen performance and the layering of identities; the subversion and the sometimes salacious deliciousness of the feminine mystic recreated and embodied in drag on the male body. It is also the “gay man” in me whose desire for the masculine attracts me to drag king performance. But unlike in drag queen performance, my appreciation for the drag king turns into desire—even though I acknowledge the layered limitations of that aesthetic.

I find in talking to this “masculinized-pretty-dyke-girl” that although both depictions are respectful and celebratory, the documentation of my spectatorship is different because I am positioned differently at each performance event. At drag queen performances I am implicated as a gay man in the company of gay men engaging in queer performance that simulates the heterosexual gaze (men looking at women)—how queer is that—but not really. In her essay “Desire Cloaked in a Trenchcoat,” Jill Dolan (1993) offered some thoughts on the difficulty of the female spectator of pornography geared for the male gaze in which the female image (body) is the object of lust. She said:

According to the psychoanalytical model, since male desire drives representation, a female spectator is given two options. She can identify with the active male and symbolically participate in the female performer’s objectification, or she can identify with the narrative’s objectified female and position herself as object. (pp. 124-125)

I am want to rework this quote playing on the male drag performer’s objectification of women, or maybe more specifically, the objectification of femininity and how the gay male “straight-acting” spectator positions himself as spectator.

Although the notion of a straight-acting gay may seem like an oxymoron, it nonetheless serves as a reoccurring description of the gay man who does not identify as feminine in his daily carriage, and hence masculine—as those terms are narrowly placed as a dichotomy. The phrase *straight acting* is also coded language that begs the question of performative sexuality, social conformity, and the notion of gay men passing as straight by assuming the socially sanctioned “heterotropes” of masculine performance, engaging what Judith Butler (1993) called “compulsory heterosexuality” (p. 275). Scott Dillard (1997) also told me “we often, if not exclusively equate the masculine in men with heterosexuality and the feminine in men with homosexuality” (p. 1).

Performative heterotropes of masculinity might easily be defined in opposition to what I like to call the stereotypical and often parodied homotropes of queer identity. I used the term *homotropes* to refer to the recurring expressive attempts used by queers to identify themselves or those stereotypical ways in which we are presented within heterosexual spheres. The performative refer-

ences might include lisps, sibilant *ss*, limp wrists, oversensitivity, the use of double entendre, snapping, throwing shade, swishy walking, chants such as “we’re here and we’re queer,” references to bull-daggers or queens, truck-driving dykes or hairdressing fags, the reductive positioning of desire as in the references to someone as a “top or bottom” (pitcher or a catcher), and so on. Similarly, I use this term as Moe Meyer (1994) argued that Camp is “the total body of performative practices and strategies used to enact a queer identity” (p. 5) and consequently, I would add, to identify someone as queer, whether appropriately and respectfully applied or not. Meyer said, “it is the only process by which the queer is able to enter representation and to produce visibility” (p. 11).

But nonetheless, the question in the moment is how does the straight-acting, hence masculine, gay man position himself in the audience of drag queen performance? He is given two options. He can identify with the active male in performative drag. Thus, he symbolically participates in the parodic recreation/commentary on femininity, thereby furthering the objectification and alienation of women in this performance of desire. Or, he can identify with the narrative’s objection, which is to acknowledge the sexualized suggestion of dualism, male and female, “simulacra and simulation”—which is also to acknowledge that the projected simulation is a reflection of a male image of the female that does not exist (Baudrillard, 1981/1994).

The act of gay men dressed in drag performing for other gay men is less about women and more about the situated desire of the performative aesthetic. Diana Taylor’s (1994) description of performance as a strategy said that it “allow[s] for agency, which opens the way for resistance and oppositional spectacles” (p. 14). I use her articulation to comment both on the spectacle of drag performance and the spectacle of audiencing drag performance. And similar to Roland Barthes’s (1978) entangled articulations borrowed from Lacan, the viewing of drag “does not transmit a meaning, but fastens onto a limit situation: ‘the one where the subject is suspended in a specular relation to the other’” (p. 148).

On the other hand, in drag king performances, I am not only implicated in queer company, but the specificity of my desire is evoked in their performance. I am reminded by Jill Dolan (1991) that “the gaze in performance, although not as carefully controlled as in film, is also based in a narrative paradigm that presents gender and sexuality as a factor in the exchange of meanings between performers and spectators” (p. 14). Whether I am the “ideal audience” for drag king performance is questionable. My attraction to the embodied performance of masculinity is forestalled by the reality of the sexed person in performance. And it is in this way, knowing that my own slip might be showing, I skirt my way around Judith Butler’s (1993) conversations of drag. For although they signal the nature of my discussion, they do not easily accommodate, contain, or explain the “variety of receptions drag might have for different audiences” (Brown, 2000, p. 34).¹²

So, in responding to the highly “masculinized-pretty-dyke-girl”—the lesbian woman spectator of my gay male spectatorial report—as a gay man I must actually admit my desire for women pretending to be men, performing desire for the spectators most appreciative of that aesthetic. I must admit that in my performance, my description of the drag king is imbued with that desire, whereas my description of the drag queen is an appreciation of the performance, void of a visually stimulated sexualized desire for the feminine.

And in this pedagogical moment of question and answer, I also come to realize that the specificity of this question is not so different from the types of exchanges that teachers often have with their students. The questions are always geared toward unveiling that which is concealed, and the answers are always a careful negotiation of the personal and the public.

CONCLUSIONS

Interpretive ethnography places value on the seeing and reflecting on experience.

This ocular epistemology presumes the primacy of visual perception as the dominate form of knowing. Perception, however, is never pure. It is clouded by the structure of language that refuse to be anchored in the present—the site of so-called pure essence. (Denzin, 1997, p. 34)

The ethnographer always realizes his or her subjective position in relationship to his or her participants, his or her coresearchers, the focus of his or her desire and reflection.

Using Denzin’s (1997) construction of standpoint reflexivity, the critical narrator is then who acknowledges his or her own positionality in the telling and the told. He or she acknowledges that he or she “produces a partially situated text that opens up a previously repressed, ignored, or overinterpreted corner of cultural life” (p. 221). Hence, interpretive ethnography is a personal and critically reflexive process. And, “it is a situation-specific, author-specific, fallible method. It asks more questions than it pretends to answer, and its chief product is a perspectival understanding of the truth created by and constituted in a transient rhetoric” (Goodall, 1994, p. 151).

Similar to Belsey’s (1980) notion of the interrogative texts, in interpretive ethnography, “the subject is held in place in the discourse by the use of ‘I,’ but the ‘I’ of this discourse is always a ‘stand-in,’¹³ a substitute for the ‘I’ who speaks” (p. 85). But that acknowledgement does not negate the worthiness of the venture; in fact, it enhances accountabilities and the efforts on the part of the teller to be true to the story that is told and to offer critical insights of the experience. “The tensions that guide the ethnographic writer’s hand lie between the felt improbability of what you have lived and the known impos-

sibility of expressing it, which is to say between desire and its unresolvable, often ineffable, end" (Goodall, 2000, p. 7).

If the classroom is a cultural site and a geographical local, how do teachers map their experience in the classroom? How do we articulate and describe our travels and what we have learned? Maps articulate place and positionality, they offer direction to determined destinations. In *Mapping Reality: An Evolutionary Realist Methodology for the Natural and Social Sciences*, Jane Azevedo (1997) stated:

Not only are the form and the content of maps interest-related, so too are the methods used to produce each map. These methods are also affected by background assumptions about the nature of the area being mapped. A map is a formal representation of selected features and relations in the world that preserves relationships of particular interest. Each map, then, can be seen as a model. Models have a relationship not only to their subject (the territory, in the case of geographic maps) but to their source. The source for a three-dimensional replica of the Earth is a sphere. (p. 109)

What is the source model of our classroom practices? What guides the nature and content of our pedagogy? And although it may be easy to repeat the tired aphorism that "the classroom is a microcosm of society," to what degree are teachers cartographers, mapmakers designing their own desire for the classroom? The notion of interpretive ethnographies of the classroom helps teachers to acknowledge their own designs on the classroom; places where they have located the landmarks of their own desire and how this becomes manifested and inscribed on the bodies of their students.

In my own performative scholarship, I find myself trapped betwixt and between, in that liminal space of scholarship and my own highly personal and critical processes. I know that I am involved in the construction of messy texts. Denzin (1997) described messy texts as

texts that are aware of their own narrative apparatuses, that are sensitive to how reality is socially constructed, and that understanding that writing is a way of "framing" reality. Messy texts are many sited, intertextual, always open ended, and resistant to theoretical holism, but are always committed to cultural criticism. (p. 224)¹⁴

Hence for me, drag performance and gender performance are messy texts—texts that cannot signal or signify a singular author.

And to what degree are all scholarly documents messy? The nature of what we do as teachers and scholars is always messy—messy with self-disclosing personal insights and disguising them as research; messy with supporting our own felt experiences with a litany of other voices in the reference pages, footnotes, or the backstages of our own scholarly performances. They are messy because when we deal with anything related to human nature, we are mandated to get our hands dirty, to get involved and process through experience. "Experience is the flesh that dresses the skeleton of our identities,

identities which overlap each other, cancel each other out, reinforce each other, and provide texture, a topography, of the 'self'" (Ibanez, 1997, p. 111). So, we all are involved in creating messy texts, the messy business of articulating experience and presenting ourselves in the world.

NOTES

1. See the special issue of *Communication Education* (Volume 42, Number 4, 1993), "When Teaching Works: Stories of Communication in Education."

2. Throughout this excursion I use the back slash (/) to both disrupt and illuminate the gender roles being enacted in this scene. It is a visual cue and reminder to the reader of the subversive nature of gender performance being enacted. I maintain this technique even when the latent personal pronoun seems inappropriate—because of course, drag performance calls into question notions of what is and what is not "appropriate" in the social construction of meaning and identity.

3. I attribute the construction of this phrase to Teresa Carilli (1997) in a presentation made at the National Communication Conference.

4. Volcano and Halberstam (1999) described the drag king, Justing Kase, a female Elvis impersonator, as having "a kind of organic Drag King aura; he wears very little facial hair (maybe slightly exaggerated sideburns) and he builds on a sturdy butch image" (p. 60). Halberstam (1998) explored the notion of organic masculinity further in *Female Masculinity*.

5. Here she cites Tilley (1994, p. 10).

6. His cutting is from chapter 10, "Donning a Dress, Do Real Men Do Drag?". Sergio's (the student in this performance) drag name is Sabrina.

7. In this quote, Judith Hamera (2000) was actually referring to dancer/choreographer Naoyuki Oguri.

8. Tony Morrison (1972) used the construction of "genderized, sexualized and racialized" to describe the world context in which she writes—"unencumbered by dreams of subversion or rallying gestures at fortress walls" (pp. 4-5).

9. According to technocratic models,

conceptualize teaching as a discrete and scientific understanding, embrace depersonalized solutions for education that often translate into the regulation and standardization of teacher practices and curricula, and rote memorization of selected "facts" that can easily be measured through standardized testing. As such the role of the teacher is reduced to that of an uncritical, "objective," and "efficient" distributor of information. (Leistyna, Woodrum, & Sherblom, 1996, p. 1)

10. Here I am capitalizing on Judith Hamera's (1993) argument when she wrote about

the conflation of the body and identity and, in turn, foregrounding the "impossibility of obliterating the 'difference' that comprises representation"—specifically here, the difference between the "me" (my body/identity), the "not/me" (*not* my identity), and the "not-not me" (*maybe* my body/identity and maybe not). (p. 54)

In this construction she cited Margulies (1993, p. 58) and Schechner (1985, p. 112).

11. Roger Baker (1994) cited

Eric Partridge in his *Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English* who says [drag] describes "the petticoat or skirt used by actors when playing female parts" and suggests that the word derives from "the drag of the dress (on the grounds), as distinct from the non-dragginess of trousers." (p. 17)

12. Please note that in making this comment, Brown (2000) was referencing the arguments of Bell, Binne, Cream, and Valentine (1994) and the volume edited by Andrew Parker and Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick (1992).

13. Belsey (1980) here cited Miller (1977-1978, pp. 25-26).

14. Within the original quote, Denzin (1997) cited Marcus (1994, p. 567).

REFERENCES

- Azevedo, J. (1997). *Mapping reality: An evolutionary realist methodology for the natural and social sciences*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Baker, R. (1994). *Drag: A history of female impersonation in the performing arts*. New York: New York University Press.
- Baldwin, J. (1993). The choices of Hercules. In W. J. Bennett (Ed.), *The book of virtues* (pp. 390-392). New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Barthes, R. (1978). *A lover's discourse*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation* (S. F. Glaser, Trans.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. (Original work published 1981)
- Bell, D., Binne J., Cream J., & Valentine G. (1994). All hyped up and no place to go. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 1, 31-37.
- Belsey, C. (1980). *Critical practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, W. J. (Ed.). (1993). *The book of virtues*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Brown, M. (2000). *Closet space: Geographies of metaphor from the body to the globe*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex."* New York: Routledge.
- Caftanzoglou, R. (2001). The shadow of the sacred rock: Contrasting discourses of place under the Acropolis. In B. Bender & M. Winer (Eds.), *Contested landscapes: Movement, exile and place* (pp. 21-35). New York: Berg.
- Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 22(1), 5-12.
- Caughie, P. L. (1999). *Passing and pedagogy: The dynamics of responsibility*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Cohn, M. (1995). *Do what I say: Ms. Behavior's guide to gay and lesbian etiquette*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Crary, J. (1999). *Techniques of the observe: On vision and modernity in the nineteenth century*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- de Castell, S., & Bryson, M. (1997). Introduction: Identity, authority, narrativity. In S. de Castell & M. Bryson (Eds.), *Radical interventions: Identity, politics, and difference/s in educational praxis* (pp. 1-11). New York: State University of New York Press.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (1997). *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices in the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Denzin, N. K. (1999). Interpretive ethnography for the next century. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 28, 510-519.
- Dillard, S. (1997, April). *Pass, passing and making passes*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Central States Communication Association, St. Louis, MO.
- Dolan, J. (1991). *The feminist spectator as critic*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Dolan, J. (1993). Desire cloaked in a trenchcoat. In J. Dolan (Ed.), *Presence and desire: Essays on gender, sexuality, performance* (pp. 121-134). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Epstein, D., & Sears, J. T. (1999). *A dangerous knowing: Sexuality, pedagogy and popular culture*. London: Cassell.
- Gallo, J. (1992). Knot a love story. *Yale Journal of Criticism*, 5, 209-218.
- Gingrich-Philbrook, C. (2000). The personal and political in solo performance: Editor's notes. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 20, vii-x.
- Goodall, H. L., Jr. (1994). *Casing a promised land: The autobiography of an organizational detective as cultural ethnographer*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.
- Goodall, H. L., Jr. (2000). *Writing the new ethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.
- Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Hamera, J. (1993). Emotional/theoretical responses to HIV education through the performance of personal narratives. In F. Corey (Ed.), *HIV education: Performing personal narrative* (pp. 51-58). Tempe: Arizona State University Press.
- Hamera, J. (2000). The romance of monsters: Theorizing the virtuoso body. *Theatre Topics*, 10, 145-153.
- Henderson, M. G. (1995). *Borders, boundaries and frames: Cultural criticism and cultural studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Ibanez, F. (1997). From confession to dialogue. In S. de Castell & M. Bryson (Eds.), *Radical interventions: Identity, politics, and difference/s in educational praxis* (pp. 107-130). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Irigaray, L. (1985). *Speculum of the other woman*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Lankshear, C. (1986). Forward. In P. McLaren (Ed.), *Schooling as a ritual performance: Towards a political economy of educational symbols and gestures* (pp. viii-xxii). New York: Routledge.
- Leistyna, P., Woodrum, A. S., & Sherblom, A. (Eds.). (1996). *Breaking free: The transformative power of critical pedagogy* (Reprint Series No. 27). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review.
- Lipman, M., Sharp, A. M., & Oscanyan, F. S. (Eds.). (1980). *Philosophy in the classroom* (2nd ed.). Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Marcus, G. E. (1994). What comes (just) after "post"? The case of ethnography. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 563-574). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Margulies, I. (1993). Delaying the cut: The space of performance in *Lightening Over Water*. *Screen*, 34(1), 54-68.
- McLaren, P. (Ed.). (1993). *Schooling as a ritual performance: Towards a political economy of educational symbols and gestures*. New York: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. (1998). *Life in school: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Meyer, M. (1994). *The politics and poetics of camp*. New York: Routledge.
- Miller, J. A. (1977-1978). Suture (elements of the logic of the signifier). *Screen*, 18(4), 24-34.

- Mohanty, S. P. (1989). Us and them: On the philosophical bases of political criticism. *Yale Journal of Criticism*, 2(2), 1-31.
- Morrison, T. (1972). *Playing in the dark: Whiteness and the literary imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Parker, P., & Sedgwick, E. K. (1992). *Performativity and performance*. New York: Routledge.
- Rivage-Seul, M., & Rivage-Seul, M. (1994). Critical thought and moral imagination: Peace education in Freirean perspective. In P. L. McLaren & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *Politics of liberation: Paths from Freire* (pp. 41-61). New York: Routledge.
- Roy, P. (1995). As the master saw her. In S. E. Case, P. Brett, & S. Forster (Eds.), *Cruising the performative* (pp. 112-129). Bloomington: Indiana Press.
- Schechner, R. (1985). *Between theater and anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Simon, R. (1992). *Teaching against the grain: Texts for a pedagogy of possibility*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Spradley, J. P., & McCurdy, D. W. (1972). *The cultural experience: Ethnography in complex society*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Taylor, D. (1994). Opening remarks. In D. Taylor & J. Villegas (Eds.), *Negotiating performance: Gender, sexuality, and theatricality in Latino/a America* (p. 14). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Tilly, C. A. (1994). *A phenomenology of landscape: Places, paths, and movements*. New York: Berg.
- Van Maanen, J. (1995). *Representation in ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Volcano, D. L., & Halberstam, J. (1999). *The Drag King*. London: Serpent's Tail Press.
- Wolcott, H. F. (1999). *Ethnography: A way of seeing*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira.

Bryant Keith Alexander is an associate professor of performance and pedagogical studies in the Department of Communication Studies at California State University, Los Angeles. His research interest is in identity construction as influenced in the nexus of race, sex, sexuality, gender, cultural performance, and pedagogy. His essays have been published in Text and Performance Quarterly, Theatre Topics, Callaloo, Beacon Best 2000: Best Writing of Men and Women of All Colors, and a number of collections of essays. He has upcoming essays in Qualitative Inquiry, Theatre Annual, Cultural Studies-Critical Methodology, Journal of Homosexuality, and the edited volumes Black Queer Studies and Communicating Ethnic and Cultural Identity.