Teaching with the Third Wave

New Feminists' Explorations of Teaching and Institutional Contexts

A book series by ATHENA

Edited by Daniela Gronold, Brigitte Hipfl and Linda Lund Pedersen

Edited by
Daniela Gronold, Brigitte Hipfl and Linda Lund Pedersen

Teaching with the Third Wave
New Feminists' Explorations of
Teaching and Institutional Contexts

Teaching with Gender. European Women's Studies in
International and Interdisciplinary Classrooms.

A book series by ATHENA

Titles in the Series:

CONTENTS

Preface

The idea of writing this book emerged when the prospectus of the ATHENA book series "Teaching with Gender" was discussed within WeAVE in the autumn of 2008. The title for this volume, "Teaching with the Third Wave – New feminists' explorations of teaching and institutional contexts", was settled quickly and supported with great enthusiasm by the group; this was because it is closely linked to the self-understanding of WeAVE and the aims within the network. WeAVE is a European gender studies network for students, post-graduate students, PhDs, post-doc researchers, and junior teachers that was formed inside the Thematic Network for European Women's Studies, ATHENA.[1] The term WeAVE is a play on the two themes that represent the core of this network: "The image of weaving refers to the connectivity and interaction which WeAVE aims to create. Similarly, the WAVE capitalised in the title points towards a new third wave feminist generation, the future of European gender studies."[2] The idea of addressing the challenges involved in practicing a feminist pedagogy from the perspective of young scholars in gender studies was met with great enthusiasm. Almost all the authors have been involved in WeAVE and have been reflecting on their particular situatedness and what that means for teaching/knowledge transfer under current conditions. The result is a collection of texts where contemporary young feminists examine both their particular position as instructors in feminist/gender studies and what in their minds need to be addressed, added or worked through in pedagogical contexts. The contributions cover a broad field, including theoretical perspectives as well as specific case studies ranging from the academic classroom to teachers in-service-training and the training of economic, social and political players. Hence this book especially addresses young scholars who already have been involved or will be involved in teaching/transferring feminist knowledge in different pedagogical contexts; but it also invites other readers to reflect on their generational position and on their teaching practices.

This book would not have been written and published without the hard work of the authors and the encouragement and ongoing support of the series-editors of "Teaching with Gender", Noemi Kakucs, Andrea Petö, Annika Olsson and Berteke Waaldijk. We would like to express our heartfelt gratitude.

---

[1] http://www.weave-network.eu
[2] Quoted from Weave's Manifesto, cf. www.weave-network.eu

Furthermore, we are much obliged to the Swedish feminist (video) performer Catti Brandelius alias Profesora and the photographer Åse Bengtsson who have provided us with the great cover picture for our volume.

Daniela Gronold, Brigitte Hipfl, Linda Lund Pedersen

Introduction

Daniela Gronold, Brigitte Hipfl and Linda Lund Pedersen

The question is what does the notion of the Third Wave cover? And what are the challenges and implications for a feminist pedagogy of teaching gender from a Third Wave perspective? The attempt to pinpoint a definition of Third Wave feminisms is a rather risky one since definitions within feminisms generally tend to leak. Historically, Third Wave feminisms emerged in the United States in the 1990s as a result of the struggles of Second Wave feminists and the women's movements. At that time "feminism [was] a given, and the idea of gender equality [was] taken for granted."[1] The term Third Wave was made popular by two quite contradictory publications by Naomi Wolf and Rebecca Walker. Whereas Wolf argued for a postfeminist version of liberal feminism,[2] Walker recognising in "Becoming the Third Wave"[3] that "the fight is far from over", positioned herself in opposition to a postfeminism that explicitly criticised feminists of the Second Wave. Indeed, she defined herself as being the "Third Wave," which implied a continuation of feminists' struggle for equality and female empowerment under current conditions.[4]

Third Wave feminisms' way of relating to Second Wave feminisms has been discussed intensely, especially as feminism has moved into academia and became a discipline amongst others. Third Wave feminism understood by WeAVE and the authors of this book is not a question of "breaking up" with Second Wave feminisms or an Oedipal killing of our feminist fore-mothers. Rather, in its attempt to face contemporary challenges, it is defined by the refusal of a singular feminism and demonstrates an awareness of different ways of doing feminism and being a feminist.[5] In this way, Third Wave feminism sees itself as a form of inclusiveness, opening up a space for young feminists who enjoy and celebrate the possibility of taking up multiple identities or even identities that formerly were considered contradictory within femi-

---

[1] Sarah L. Rasmusson, "Women's Movement 1990 – Present," in *Encyclopedia of American Social Movements* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 2003): 431.

[2] Naomi Wolf, *Fire with Fire: The New Female Power and How It Will Change the 21st Century* (New York: Random House, 1993).

[3] Rebecca Walker, "Becoming the Third Wave," *Ms.* 39 (January/February 1992): 41

[4] See also Leslie L. Heywood, "Introduction: A Fifteen-Year History of Third-Wave Feminism," in *The Women's Movement Today. An Encyclopedia of Third-Wave Feminism.* Volume 1, (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2006): xv-xvii.

[5] Rasmusson, "Women's Movement", 429.

nism such as career moms or identifying with "male" cultures.[6] Third Wavers situate gender issues within a broader concern for different forms of justice such as "environmental justice, economic justice, racial justice, and justice with regard to sexuality, religion, and physical ability."[7] Third Wave feminists are far from being a homogenous group, struggling to maintain strict mechanisms that distinguish between "us" and "them" and that are based on oppressive and mutually exclusive categories. Instead they advocate the acceptance of a model that embraces chaos and ambiguity in order to allow new alliances and commitments.[8]

Much has been written about the Third Wave's engagement with literature, music, culture and media. Apart from being critical of media representations the Third Wave focuses strongly on the production of media as a way to initialize social change. Magazines like *Bitch* or *BUST*, zines, websites, artistic interventions, such as the Guerilla Girls using graphics or Riot Grrrl music are just a few examples. In comparison, almost nothing has been written about teaching in the context of the Third Wave. The two-volume Encyclopedia of Third-Wave Feminism, for example, does not include teaching as a topic. In the US-context, Sarah Rasmusson explores the pedagogy of Third Wavers who feel that "they have more in common with students than with colleagues."[9] In the European context, it is Iris van der Tuin who theoretically and practically examines the generational position of a teacher of feminist/gender studies. Traditionally, teaching contexts are characterized by two positionings – the teacher(s) and the student(s) – that most often are related to age differences and corresponding power differences.[10] As for contemporary young feminists in academia, they teach students who are their peers with regard to age.[11] Often they are in a dual position of being students as well as instructors and lecturers, or they are finalising their grades while at the same time taking on teaching/training positions in non-academic contexts. In relation to this, van der Tuin refers in her chapter to the Swedish artist and performer Catti

---

[6] Heywood, "Introduction", xx.

[7] Heywood, "Introduction", xxi.

[8] Charlotte Krøløkke and Ann Scott Sørensen, *Gender Communication Theories & Analyses* (London: Sage Publication 2005), 17–8.

[9] Amber R. Clifford and Sarah Rasmusson, "PedaGrrl: Third Wave Feminist Professors and Their Pedagogy",(paper, Modern Languages Association, 2004, e-mail message from Sarah Rasmusson to authors on 26 February 2009).

[10] Therese Garstenauer, Josefina Bueno Alonos, Silvia Caporlae Bizzini, Biljana Kasic, and Iris van der Tuin. *Teaching Subjects In Between: Feminist Politics, Disciplines, Generations. Travelling Concepts in Feminist Pedagogy: European Perspectives* (York, England: Raw Nerve press 2006): 82.

[11] Garstenauer et al., Teaching Subjects In Between, 32.

Brandelius who is portrayed on the front page of the volume.[12] Brandelius, who performs different alter egos in her artistic work, highlights and at the same time transgresses the limits of women's social roles. On the cover page, she plays with the notion of women at the university by being depicted in her role as "Profesora" where she actually takes up the position of a university teacher. In a Third Wave manner, Catti Brandelius' work points at the arbitrariness of classifications and social categories.[13] Her work also points to institutions where rules are settled that allow women to be heard and taken serious.[14]

In this collection of essays, young feminist scholars reflect on one aspect of their situatedness as teachers of feminist/gender studies, namely their generational position. The texts attempt to draw a cartography of teaching/ transferring knowledge from a Third Wave perspective. Following Rosi Braidotti's advocacy of cartography as a way of accounting for one's location through alternative figurations, the contributions can be read as mappings of situated and embodied explorations of what it means for Third Wavers to teach gender and feminism and to be involved in knowledge production.[15] This particular map explores different geopolitical locations within Europe like Denmark, Greece, France, Sweden, Austria, Germany and The Netherlands, as well as to the US. Each paper presents an analysis of specific challenges for the teaching of feminism in particular places under contemporary conditions. Furthermore, each paper renders visible both how the pedagogical practices and feminist concepts being used are affected by the specifics of certain locations as well as by the authors' own experiences as young academics and newcomers in this field and their attempts to interconnect and rework the feminist concepts they were trained in. The threads that run through the book and link all the chapters are the thorough examination of the authors' situated position in different pedagogical contexts – from feminist academic settings to non-academic situations – and reflection on various pedagogical practices.

Regarding issues of teaching feminisms, this book's focus is twofold. On the one hand, the papers raise questions concerning the theoretical background and pedagogical practices in feminist classrooms and other places of knowledge transfer. In particular, the legacy of Second Wave feminisms is addressed and different ways of transforming and transgressing them are presented as exem-

---

[12] http://www.missuniversum.nu/uploads/images//profesora_3.jpg.
[13] Charlotte Krøløkke and Ann Scott Sørensen, 18-19.
[14] See also http://www.clg.se/catti-brandelius-en.aspx.
[15] Rosi Braidotti, *Metamorphoses* (Cambridge, Oxford and Malden: Polity, 2002), 2.

plary cases of Third Wave feminisms. On the other hand, a close look onto the institutional contexts of feminist pedagogy is taken. Although the emphasis clearly is on questions related to teaching in university settings, the challenges of transferring academic knowledge to adult education and to the business world are addressed as well. The difficulties of being positioned both 'within' and 'outside' academia and the struggle not to 'sell out' as a feminist become apparent. In the future more and more young academics may find themselves in the in-between position as gender studies become a more settled and integrated discipline in academia. Moreover, the papers make evident that the borders between the academy and the 'outside world' have always been permeable.[16] This is illustrated by referring to the Bologna Declaration of European Higher Education, the hegemony of neo-liberalism, the 'multi'- cultural classroom and the mediated, technological socio-cultural landscape. In addressing the challenges that emerge for teaching the Third Wave, the authors draw a multifaceted map which points to the power-relations that are at work at the different locations as well as to strategies of resistance and the introduction of alternative pedagogical practices. By doing so, the authors in this volume aim to break with the 'cannibalistic' reasoning of Western thought".[17] The defining element of all papers however, is the emphasis on a non-individualist, collective, and inter-subjective approach. The chapters are divided into two sections: theoretical perspectives (chapter one to three) and case studies (chapter four to seven).

Chapter one, "On Third Wave Feminism's Generational Logic and Practices of Teaching Gender Studies" by Iris van der Tuin can be read as the theoretical framework for this volume, which comprises and picks up different aspects of the Third Wave. Iris van der Tuin offers a formidable map of challenges that would enable us to think of a feminist movement that neither rejects ideas of earlier generations nor continues with the same self-understanding in terms of movements or "waves" as was the case before. In contrast to earlier feminisms, she offers an approach that allows for a highlighting of diversity and differences between and within the Second and Third Wave. In other words she outlines a cartography of feminisms set in the plural. Furthermore she gives examples of how an approach, that is affirmative in nature, can be put into practice in the classroom.

---

[16] Cf. Susan Stanford Friedman, *Mappings. Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), 7.

[17] Charlotte KrLøkke and Ann Scott Sørensen, 22.

The institutional context of Women's/Gender Studies that is dominated by neo-liberalism is the starting point of Angeliki Alvanoudi's chapter. In "Teaching Gender in the Neo-Liberal University", she refers to the so-called "scientific proletariat", the highly educated young people who are exposed to the flexible conditions of life-long learning. Consequently, she calls the neo-liberal university an "academic supermarket" in which Gender Studies are on the one hand challenged by processes of harmonization on a European level with the Bologna Declaration while simultaneously being strengthened by its structural implementation. In reflecting on this tension, Alvanoudi offers an optimistic perspective on the future of so called European Gender Studies.

The third chapter, "The Dilemma of Teaching "Critical Whiteness Studies" – How to transfer Knowledge on Whiteness as White Scholars at the White Academy " by Daniela Gronold and Linda Lund Pedersen, is a self-critical reflection on the standpoint of white feminists whose aim it is to refuse to reproduce structural racisms in their pedagogy and at the same time to face the limits of their ability to understand their own position. The focus of the chapter is on dismantling whiteness from within without abandoning post-colonial theory and the work of postcolonial thinkers, and just as importantly without cannibalising postcolonial knowledge. Teaching whiteness from within means starting from one's own experience, knowledge, position as part of a teaching methodology and simultaneously remaining a learner with regard to one's location.

Chapter four "This is not Therapy!" Un/expected Encounters in Memory Work. Notes from the Field of Feminist Teaching" is written by Mia Liinason. She takes up her experience of using memory work in her teaching, an approach oriented towards the examination of one's own experiences developed by Frigga Haug. This provides a starting point from which to reflect upon the challenges of transferring and translating the pedagogical tool of self-reflection into the contemporary feminist classroom. She points out how important it is for the feminist classroom that the spoken and unspoken agreements between different generations of feminists are taken into account. Furthermore, she reflects on the structural (im)possibilities to implement collective work more strongly.

Jennifer Lynne Musto is the author of chapter five, "Techno-Mindfulness and Critical Pedagogic Praxis in Third Wave Feminist Classroom Spaces". She also takes her experiences of teaching as a starting point and particularly draws

attention to the difference between Second Wave and Third Wave feminists in relation to the integration of technology and media into the feminist classroom. She suggests a kind of techno-mindfulness and a continuous reflection regarding how we engage with media and technology in pedagogical situations.

The sixth chapter, "Teaching Gender outside Academia: Training Economic, Social and Political Actors on Gender Equality in France" contributed by Soline Blanchard and Milka Metso is a report of the authors experience in creating the business "Valta Göra" which offers training and consulting regarding gender equality for French private and public organisations. The authors discuss the difficulties and advantages of their own positions of being inside and outside academia; and they present their creative strategies for transferring feminist ideas into professional contexts. This article is therefore exemplary of one of ATHENA's goals, namely to foster the relationship between the academy and societal stakeholders.

The last chapter, written by Solveig Haring and Anita Mörth School on "'School and Teaching from a Gender Perspective – Gender Sensitive Didactics'. Review and Evaluation of a Continuing Education Workshop for Austrian Grammar School Teachers" presents and reflects on an in-service-seminar in gender sensitive didactics for Austrian high-school teachers. Here the reader finds, on the one hand, a detailed description of the pedagogical practices that were used to sensitize the participants to various gendered positioning and to stimulate the exploration of alternatives. On the other hand, it presents the voices of the participants in the seminar regarding what they perceive that they have learnt in the seminar and what they would like to pursue in their own teaching.

The concept of feminist cartographies does not seek completeness nor does it envisage an entity composed of a particular number of issues. A reader of this volume may miss one or more aspects that she would think of as related to the Third Wave. However, in the awareness that a chapter on queer studies or reflections coming from critical men and masculinity studies would indeed be suitable for a book concerned with "Teaching Gender", the composition of themes in this volume can best be described as a particular cartography of the student network WeAVE whose members do not embrace all the facets of the Third Wave. This book is of interest for all readers who are themselves involved in teaching/transferring gender and feminist ideas, in and beyond the academy.

The chapters present new feminist explorations of teaching/transferring gender both from a theoretical perspective and through different case studies. Because of its focus on a Third Wave perspective, the topics that are addressed will also appeal to graduate students since they not only will help them to explore their own experiences as those being taught, but they will also invite them to join in future discussions and further developments in teaching/transferring gender and feminist ideas.

References

Braidotti, Rosi. *Metamorphoses.* Cambridge, Oxford: Polity, 2002.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Mappings. Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998.

Garstenauer, Therese et al. *Teaching Subjects In Between: Feminist Politics, Disciplines, Generations. Travelling Concepts in Feminist Pedagogy: European Perspectives.* York, England: Raw Nerve Press, 2006.

Heywood, Leslie L. "Introduction: A Fifteen-Year History of Third-Wave Feminism," in *The Women's Movement Today. An Encyclopedia of Third-Wave Feminism. Volume 1,* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2006): xv–xvii.

Kroløkke, Charlotte, Scott Sørensen, Ann, *Gender Communication Theories & Analyses* (London: Sage Publication 2005).

Rasmusson, Sarah L. "Women's Movement 1990 – Present," in *Encyclopedia of American Social Movements* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe, 2003): 429–435.

Walker, Rebecca. "Becoming the Third Wave," in *Ms.* 39 (January/February 1992): 41.

Wolf, Naomi. *Fire with Fire: The New Female Power and How It Will Change the 21st Century.* New York: Random House, 1993.

On Third-Wave Feminism's Generational Logic and Practices of Teaching Gender Studies[1]

Iris van der Tuin

Abstract

In a teaching context, alongside gender and 'race'/ethnicity as influential axes of social differentiation, the age aspect is of great importance, due to the fact that, most often, the students and the teacher(s) differ generationally. This chapter argues that in contemporary gender studies, two generational logics can be found. A 'generational logic' should be seen as a temporary sedimentation of a perspective connected to, but not confined to 'age.' One such logic is identified here as a second-wave feminist conceptualization of generationality, which is specified as classificatory and representationalist. This is the logic that usually structures textbooks in gender studies as well as more traditional lecturing practices. The other is a third-wave feminist conceptualization, which is said to be affirmative and anti-representationalist. It is argued that the latter logic is beneficial for structuring the transfer of feminist thought when teaching gender studies in the first decades of the 21st century. This argument is made on the basis of a specific intersubjective relation between two generations of feminist scholars that third-wave feminism allows for. Here it becomes clear that a generational logic is not determined by age. A second-wave feminist can structure her teaching according to a third-wave feminist generational logic, which allows for a relation between teacher(s), feminist materials (very often of the second wave), and students that is not structured by Oedipalized competition. The way in which third-wave feminism's generational logic affects and is affected by the relation between the second-wave feminist teacher(s) and the third-wave feminist students is discussed in this chapter, first, theoretically/epistemologically, and second, with relation to some examples and best practices from the gender studies programme at Utrecht University.

---

[1] The author wishes to thank Rick Dolphijn for making the difference concerning the work presented here.

Introduction

Second-wave feminism is a grass-roots socio-political movement that gradually moved in the direction of the academy in the course of the 1970s and 1980s, first in the United States and Western Europe. In contrast third-wave feminism should be understood as both activist and academic from the start. Contemporary feminists who are below 30 years of age often state that they picked up and themselves started to generate feminist ideologies during their studies. The field of gender studies is both an outcome of and a breeding ground for women's movements in most parts of the U.S.[2] and Europe today. As a discipline gender studies has generated and employs feminist theories and methodologies for its research. Teaching gender involves the transfer of these theories and methodologies, as well as transferring a variety of insights into the situation of a variety of women (and men) through time and space. Whereas the importance of the generational transfer of feminist knowledge is an integrated part of gender studies, the concept of generation is usually questioned in feminist theory. This questioning is not directed at referentiality (i.e reference to specific, predetermined age groups), or what I will call, following Karen Barad, 'representationalism', but *generationality as such* is looked at with great suspicion by gender studies' theoreticians. Judith Roof has forcefully summarized the criticism the concept of feminist generationality has received: "Importing the full force of Oedipal rivalry, recrimination, and debt, generation is neither an innocent empirical model nor an accurate assessment of a historical reality. Rather, generation reflects and exacerbates Oedipal relations and rivalries among women, relies on a patriarchal understanding of history and a linear, cause-effect narrative, and imports ideologies of property."[3] The following rough sketch provides the parameters of this discussion which contemporary feminist theory, or what I will call 'third-wave feminist theory,' has begun to break through. Third-wave feminist theory is equally critical of generationality, while simultaneously affirming its impact (i.e. it wants to rethink the notion).

Knowledge transfer amongst feminists is nowadays usually situated within the field of gender studies. Gender studies is, in turn, the result of the epistemic turn in second-wave feminism which marked the starting point

---

[2] Gender studies is used here as the equivalent or abbreviation of women's/ feminist/ gender studies.

[3] Judith Roof, "Generational Difficulties; or, The Fear of a Barren History," in *Generations: Academic Feminists in Dialogue*, ed. Devoney Looser and E. Ann Kaplan (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 71.

for the long march of feminists through the academy. The field of gender studies is generally celebrated for its sustainability in the present, its constant emphasis on feminist genealogies, and its future-oriented nature. Whereas grass-roots feminist activism is said to have slowly faded away in most First-World countries, gender studies or academic feminism is characterized as an epistemic project that is here to stay. Instances of knowledge transfer are, however, following Plato, defined in generational terms; teaching involves seniors and juniors, that is, masters and disciples. Nonetheless, taking into consideration the fact that the transfer of knowledge in the current-day West is taken to be generational, and that the issue is on the feminist agenda, feminist generationality, both as an empirical phenomenon and as a conceptual frame, is looked at with a critical eye.

The conceptualization of generation that is criticized, yet simultaneously re-affirmed (see below) in the work of Roof and others forms the starting point of this chapter. I will argue that by questioning representationalist understandings of generationality rather than generationality as such, third-wave feminist theory qualitatively shifts the common treatment of generationality. Contemporary feminist theory succeeds in setting in motion such a paradigmatic shift by taking on an outlook that I call 'new materialist.'[4] The key to new feminist materialism is an anti- or non-representationalist outlook. The central claim of this chapter is that contemporary feminist theory should be credited for having created a conceptualization of generational processes that is different from earlier definitions of (feminist) generation. I argue that third-wave feminist theory breaks through non-feminist as well as feminist renderings of generationality by answering the question: what does the new, third-wave feminist concept of generationality look like? On what grounds can it be argued that this concept is of benefit for capturing precisely the transfer of feminist thought? Due to the fact that instances of generational transfer of feminist knowledge take place in the classroom, in this chapter I will go into the ways in which third-wave feminist generationality is played out in the gender studies classroom. In other words I will ask how third-wave feminism's conceptualization of generationality is played out in the classroom. This question has a double edge: the concept I talk about is affected by the classroom as well as affecting it.

---

[4] Cf. Iris van der Tuin, "'Jumping Generations:' On Second- and Third-Wave Feminist Epistemology," Australian Feminist Studies, 24 (March 2009): 17–31.

Second-Wave Feminist Generationality:
Patriarchal and Anti-Patriarchal Conceptualizations

The conceptualization of generationality that is featured in most (feminist) socio-political and theoretical imaginaries has two characteristics. First of all, generationality in analyses and understandings, such as Roof's, involves sequential negation. This is the well-known phenomenon that a newer generation is always already dualistically opposed to a previous one. Post-feminists such as Katie Roiphe from the U.S., and Malou van Hintum and Sanderijn Cels, who are from the Netherlands, as I am, famously argued in the 1990s against second-wave feminism in a manner that sets up a dualism between the two generations. This dualism allows for reductionist thought only; second-wave feminist theory becomes limited to sex-negativity, for instance, whereas the actual 'sex wars' of the 1980s entailed a battle between sex-negative *and* sex-positive feminist theories.

Secondly, the generationality involved is set up as narrative of progress. According to a generationality that is teleologically structured, a newer generation is always already positioned as *better than* a previous one. This teleological element is to be found in post-feminist argumentation (when sex-positiveness is said to have been 'finally' discovered in the late 1990s), but it is also a feature of the second wave. Second-wave feminism positioned itself vis-à-vis the 'more rudimentary' first wave and claimed theoretical sophistication by constructing difference feminism as well as deconstructive feminism as moves beyond the equality feminism ascribed to the first wave. In other words, the conceptualization of generation implies a classificatory practice. Generations are there for us to classify, that is, to select and list. The fact that generalizations are involved goes unrecognized; even the first wave was more complex than here constructed.

This classificatory practice as implied by the methodology of second-wave feminist and post-feminist generationality is a practice that is predicated on referentiality as well as negativity. Referentiality means that generationality is conceptualized in accordance with a notion of age groups. Generations are cohorts of persons, or, in this case, *women* born in a predetermined period of time. This is to say that I can never be a second-wave feminist, because I do not belong to the generation of baby boomers. I was born in 1978, and consequently, I am a member of the post-feminist generation. Negativity means

that the relations between generations-as-classes are per definition structured by conflict or competition. The 'post-' of post-feminism should be read as a 'beyond.'

I agree with Roof who understands the traditional conceptualization of (feminist) generationality as a detrimental classificatory generationality that lures women back into Oedipality, that is, predetermined gender roles. This is unfortunate since Oedipal relations are not exhaustive of relations between women, and more importantly even, referential Oedipality itself needs to be looked at very carefully. Contrary to Roof, however, I intend to acknowledge that *feminist theory itself*, beginning with the feminist theories coming out of the *second wave*, not only works *with* such a conceptualization, but has also laid bare its *problems*.[5] Second-wave feminist theory, as I will show below, has characterized the classificatory notion of generationality as patriarchal. Thus when third-wave feminist theory criticizes the concept of generationality, it works with rather than against second-wave feminist theory in a continuous, yet partial, that is *cartographical* way. Before I go into this, let me explain how second-wave feminist theory began to shift Oedipal generationality as early as in the 1970s.

Gayle Rubin and Adrienne Rich are among the founding mothers of the theory of patriarchy. The former's 'The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex' from 1975 discusses the parameters of patriarchy by employing Claude Lévi-Strauss' notion of the exchange of women in the feminist cause. In doing so, she construes an early feminist theory of patriarchy, and of the patriarchal interest in securing Oedipal relations. Rubin claimed: "If it is women who are being transacted, then it is the men who give and take them who are linked, the woman being a conduit of a relationship rather than a partner to it. (…) The relations of such a system are such that women are in no position to realize the benefits of their own circulation. As long as the relations specify that men exchange women, it is men who are beneficiaries of the product of such exchanges (…)."[6] As Rubin makes clear, feminist scrutiny exposes the circulation of women through the hands of men as patriarchal and unbeneficial for women. Women are as it were fenced in by the kinship system; they have no affirmative relations to other women (only competitive

---

[5] A similar evaluation of the work of Roof is presented in Astrid Henry, *Not My Mother's Sister: Generational Conflict and Third-Wave Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 183.

[6] Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), 174.

and conflictual ones), and since they only exist within the family structure, they exist in accordance with their relations with older men (fathers), men of their own age (husbands), or younger men (sons). In performing this analysis, Rubin theorized an important second-wave feminist insight: patriarchy (or 'the sex/gender system,' as she calls it) only allows for women to be defined in relation to men, and as such, there can only exist *discontinuities between women*. Rubin has shown that it is the form of social organization structured by the exchange of women (patriarchy) that engenders discontinuity or what I have called negation or 'dualism.' In addition to laying bare the foundations of the negative aspect of conventional generationality, Rubin has also shown that generationality in such a constellation must be referential. In other words the relations according to which women get to be placed in the social and familial sphere are always already determined, that is, the situation in which women find themselves is grossly over-coded.

Acting upon Rubin's conclusions, Adrienne Rich moved beyond the analysis of patriarchy to create a programme for feminism. In other words to smash patriarchy, we need to work on *continuities* between women. In *Of Woman Born*, Rich shows how a conceptualization of generationality can be built that is non-dualist and affirmative. In patriarchy the mother-daughter relationship has become a relationship of mutual exclusion despite the empirical fact that each mother is a daughter too, and each daughter may become a mother, Rich claims. This is true in a real as well as figurative sense: all women are mother and daughter alike, because women act to type in relating to other women. 'Mothers,' that is, and 'daughters' are also *figurations*, that is, they extend beyond empirical referentiality. In addition, mutual exclusion entails a hierarchical order according to which mothers are the equivalent of the 'eternal giver' and of the negative, and daughters are the equivalent of the 'free spirit' and of the positive. These equations are the *effect* of patriarchy, since "patriarchal attitudes have encouraged us to split, to polarize, these images, and to project all our unwanted feelings of guilt, anger, shame, power, freedom, onto the 'other' woman."[7] This empirical and figurative pattern should be subverted, because "any radical vision of sisterhood demands that we reintegrate them."[8] Her conclusion is that there might have been the 'deepest mutuality' between mother and daughter if patriarchy had not intervened, and that feminism

---

[7] Adrienne Rich, *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1976), 253.
[8] Ibid.

should aspire to create this mutuality.[9] Rich's work thus allows us criticize both the referentiality and the negativity of the patriarchal conceptualization of generation.

Rich's standpoint, like Rubin's 'The Traffic in Women,'[10] is that continuity between women will have to be restored, and this can be characterised as a feminism that is affirmative of sexual difference. Such feminism is now considered to be outdated[11] if we look to the well-known classifications of feminist thought.[12] Looking at this feminism carefully, however, allows me to show how it not only provides a *diagnosis* of Oedipal (feminist) generationality (as presented above), but also how it presents an *alternative conceptualization of generationality* as well as an *alternative methodology* for academic feminism. This double move is exemplary for third-wave feminism. As I will explain below, it is in the context of the feminist classroom that I have come to such an understanding of the work of my foremothers. The concept of generationality that I am talking about as a third-wave feminist academic is both non-linear and non-hierarchical, and its accompanying methodology consists of cartography.

Apart from critiquing referentiality and negativity, Rich critiques sequential negation and progress narrative (the characteristics of a classificatory methodology). All of this is encompassed in the following statement: "Without the unacclaimed research and scholarship of 'childless' women, without Charlotte Brontë (who died in her first pregnancy), Margaret Fuller (whose major work was done before her child was born), without George Eliot, Emily Brontë, Emily Dickinson, Christina Rossetti, Virginia Woolf, Simone de Beauvoir – we would all today be suffering from spiritual malnutrition as women."[13] Rich then affirms the importance of these writers' work, so as to reinstall continuity between women, that is, a conceptualization of generationality that shifts the patriarchal concept and practice reviewed above. This is also in contrast to the post-feminist habit of critiquing women who have come before us (and as a consequence repeating the patriarchal concept of Oedipal generationality). Rich wishes to think along a female line, which is not necessarily teleological.

---

[9] In another important publication, Rich has labeled this continuity 'the lesbian continuum.' Both Rubin and Rich have gradually moved to working on the intersection between patriarchy and compulsory heterosexuality. This shift lies beyond the scope of this chapter. See Adrienne Rich, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence," in *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, ed. Henry Abelove et al. (New York: Routledge, [1981] 1993), 227–54.

[10] In her later work Rubin moved away from this standpoint. I will not go into the queer Rubin in this chapter.

[11] Cf. Clare Hemmings, "Telling Feminist Stories," *Feminist Theory* 6 (August 2005): 115–39.

[12] See Alison M. Jaggar, *Feminist Politics and Human Nature* (Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1983); Sandra Harding, *The Science Question in Feminism* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986).

[13] Rich, Of Woman Born, 251–2.

This allows her to conceptualize a feminist generationality that is *affirmative* instead of negative. In addition, by bringing in cartography, feminism can also shift the referentiality of the negative concept of generation: cartographically or *diagrammatically* grouping feminists allows us to abandoning generations as predetermined age groups. It allows for the constitution of links between feminists on the basis of what their work does or allows us to do. The work is no longer seen as merely referential, that is, treated in a representationalist manner; allowing for taking into consideration what the work *does* allows us to move beyond where the work comes from, and what it, consequentially, is assumed to do. Cutting across age groups, a feminism of sexual difference, constrained by a focus on *women*, is indeterminate in its outcomes.[14] I might produce a text, give a lecture, or analyse a lecture by one of my own teachers in 2009 that does what a second-wave feminist text, analysis, or lecture was supposed to do in the 1970s. A second-wave feminist claim might be third-wave in that it does not work with sequential negation and progress narrative. And so on. Allowing for this by moving away from a classificatory logic, I want to claim, a generationality is constructed that is *generative* of feminist theories, methodologies, and insights, not always already generated in a referential and dualist sense, that is, buying into the parameters set by patriarchy. It is this conceptualization of generationality that structures third-wave feminist theory. It is important to emphasise that the concept gets constructed *when two generations of feminists work together*.

Third-Wave Feminist Generationality: Anti-Representationalist and Affirmative Conceptualizations

Third-wave feminism allows for a conceptualization of generationality that qualitatively shifts the patriarchal one several second-wave feminists bought into by following a classificatory logic. It also *stages* a non-dualist, Unoedipal relationality between two generations of feminists, that is, it *performs* the female line in Rich's spirit. Playful conceptualization continues the work of breaking through the referentiality and negativity that structures conventional (feminist) conceptualizations of generationality, and works towards a new concept predicated on anti-representationalism and affirmation. Anti-representationalist, affirmative

---

[14] Cf. Elizabeth Grosz, "Histories of a Feminist Future," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 25 (summer 2000): 1017–21.

generationality, in theory as well as in (teaching) practice, involves a feminism of sexual difference that affirms the mother-daughter relationship, empirically as well as figuratively, precisely because it does not make sense to negate it.[15] In other words, it does not embark upon what Rich has called a 'matrophobia.'[16] Negation entails remaining confined within the framework that one intends to shift, because, as Michel Serres has powerfully stated: "An idea opposed to another idea is always the same idea, albeit affected by the negative sign. The more you oppose one another, the more you remain in the same framework of thought."[17] This is clearly illustrated by the second-wave feminist *patriarchal* conceptualization of generationality. Intending to break through second-wave feminism as well as patriarchy, third-wave feminism exchanges negation for affirmation. The creativity that is necessary for this shift includes anti-representationalism. The theorists whom I call 'third-wave feminist' include Sara Ahmed and Claire Colebrook. Third-wave feminist practices are to be found in a teaching context, but also in the socio-political and cultural sphere. The music of for instance the U.S. band *Le Tigre* (particularly their song 'Hot Topic') and the *Profesora* project of the Swedish performer Catti Brandelius are exemplary instances. However, let me continue first with discussing the second-wave feminism of sexual difference that third-wavers work with.

Second-wave feminism of sexual difference came in two guises. First, there is thinking 'difference' according to the Anglo-American definition: of which the practice 'feminist standpoint epistemology'[18] was the famous epistemic outcome. Second, there was the feminism of sexual difference according to the French tradition. In the 1970s and 80s this work had, however, not yet become sedimented into the classifications of feminist theory that were so central to gender studies when post-feminism was hailed by its students and by young activists in the 1990s. Rosi Braidotti ended *Patterns of Dissonance*, her book-length study of radical French feminist theories of sexual difference, by asking whether the voices of the feminists under study had been heard.[19] The implied answer in the beginning of the 1990s was clearly: no, they had not. On the other hand, Rich, who is from the U.S., shows how the two traditions converge as well as diverge.

---

[15] Braidotti in Henry, *Not My Mother's Sister*, 11.

[16] Rich, *Of Woman Born*, 235.

[17] Michel Serres with Bruno Latour, "Third Conversation: Demonstration and Interpretation," in *Conversations on Science, Culture, and Time* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995): 81.

[18] Harding , *The Science Question*.

[19] Rosi Braidotti, *Patterns of Dissonance: A Study of Women and Contemporary Philosophy* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), 273.

The Anglo-American and the French tradition of sexual difference feminism both celebrate thinking with an origin in women's lives. The notion of 'women,' however, that features in feminist standpoint epistemology is sociological, mono-layered and hierarchically ordered (women can more or less unproblematically answer questions about their experiences), whereas French feminism allows for a non-hierarchical, multi-layered subject modeled on the humanities, including psychoanalysis. Braidotti famously stated in *Nomadic Subjects* that differences exist between men and women, within the category of women, and within each individual woman.[20] This is to say that whereas feminist standpoint epistemology assumed referentiality (women exist out there and can voice their experiences) and needed 'intersectionality'[21] to allow for further differentiation (black women, lesbian women, et cetera exist out there), French radical theorists of sexual difference such as Luce Irigaray worked from the crisis of reason (non-foundationalism: the Subject is dead) and could constitute theories of subjectivity that worked on difference *as such* (anti-representationalist difference as affirmation, that is, difference as moving away from the constant reproduction of the Same[22]). French sexual difference feminism differs from its mainstream Anglo-American counterpart, because it does not straightforwardly accept 'thinking from women's lives.' Both access to women's experiences and the celebratory nature of voicing *women's* experiences are questioned.

Irigaray has argued the following with regard to conceptualizing difference affirmatively rather than negatively:

> the operation of the negative, which typically, in order to move on to a higher level in the process of the becoming of self [*devenir soi-même*] must engage self and self in a dialectical operation, should instead engage two subjects, in order not to reduce the two to the one, the other to the same. Of course the negative is applied yet again to me, in my subjective becoming, but in this case it serves to mark the irreducibility of the other to me and not my subsuming of that exteriority into myself. Through this gesture, the subject gives up being one and singular. It respects the other, the two, in an intersubjective relation.[23]

---

[20] Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 160–8.

[21] Kimberlé Crenshaw, "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics," The University of Chicago Legal Forum (volume 1989): 139–67; Kimberlé Crenshaw, "The Intersection of Race and Gender," in *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement,* ed. Kimberlé W. Crenshaw et al. (New York: The New Press, 1995), 357–83.

[22] Cf. Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition* (New York: Columbia University Press, [1968] 1994).

[23] Luce Irigaray, "The Question of the Other," *Yale French Studies* 87 (May 1995): 18.

Here, thinking difference does not involve thinking hierarchical/asymmetrical difference, in a manner that re-affirms it by exchanging the negative for the positive sign. It produces the need to *map* (rather than referentially assume) subjectivity according to a new constellation.[24] Rich can be said to exemplify this mode of theorizing, and as such, she should be seen as a maverick within the Anglo-American feminist theory landscape. However support for this is clearly to be found in Virginia Woolf's famous statement in *A Room of One's Own*: "For we think through our mothers if we are women."[25] Thus Rich traverses the two traditions of thinking difference by not allowing her work to be assimilated by feminist standpoint theory.

Feminist standpoint theory, on the other hand, treats women as different from men (Braidotti's first layer of sexual difference), but does not necessarily work with differences between women (intersectionality or 'the black feminist standpoint'[26] was needed for this move) or with differences within individual women (by letting them speak, feminist standpoint theory assumed a clear and unified voice).

I want to continue by arguing that although canonizations of third-wave feminist theory suffer from a U.S.-bias,[27] Braidotti's worrisome remark about the low impact of the work of radical second-wave feminists of sexual difference needs no longer be made. Third-wave feminist academics (students and former students of a first generation of gender studies scholars) and activists have begun to work in the anti-representationalist, affirmative tradition of generational thinking, which was introduced by French feminists as well as some Anglo-American eccentric subjects who are all part of the first generation I just mentioned. What does the third-wave feminist work look like?

Third-wave feminism, in theory (Ahmed, Colebrook) as well as in practice (*Le Tigre*, *Profesora*), is neither a second-wave feminism nor a post-feminism. This is to say that it traverses the classifications of second-wave feminism that are so prominently present in mainstream gender studies teaching practices as well as the post-feminism that was featured in the academy and popular culture in the 1990s. 'Traversing' should be read here as 'extending across.'

---

[24] Braidotti, *Patterns of Dissonance*, 248.

[25] Virginia Woolf, *A Room of One's Own* (London: Vintage, [1929] 2001), 65.

[26] Cf. Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment* (London: Routledge, 1991).

[27] Cf. Anna Feigenbaum, "Review of Different Wavelengths: Studies of the Contemporary Women's Movement by Jo Reger," *Journal of International Women's Studies* 9 (May 2008): 326–9.

To traverse the classifications of feminist theory means that third-wave feminism cannot be slotted into one of the previous classes, and does not work according to classification either. A third-wave feminist theory is neither an equality feminism nor a difference feminism, nor is it a deconstructive feminism. It is neither a feminist empiricism nor a feminist standpoint theory nor a feminist postmodernism. Third-wave feminist theory extends across these classes by affirming their existence (not negating them), while simultaneously shifting them. To extend across, then, involves a dis-identificatory practice that is characteristic of third-wave feminism.[28] By claiming that my feminist theory is *not* (one of) the classes of second-wave feminist theory, I affirm the existence of the classes, but move beyond them. The particularity of third-wave feminist theory is that it allows me to move beyond second-wave feminism in a non-teleological manner. Let me give an example.

Positioning myself as a third-wave feminist materialist when writing and lecturing I *affirm* the second-wave feminist materialism (feminist stand-point epistemology) that I do *not* follow in my work. I constitute a *new* feminist materialism that is neither second-wave materialist nor materialist in the patriarchal (e.g. Marxist) sense. Third-wave feminist materialism extends beyond both categories in its constitution of a new epistemology. In fact, third-wave feminist materialism has acted upon Donna Haraway's diagnosis of second-wave feminist theory. In 'Situated Knowledges: *The Science Question in Feminism* and the Privilege of Partial Perspective'[29] Haraway has shown how feminist empiricism and feminist postmodernism make out a so-called 'non-exhaustive opposition.'[30] By acting on what feminist empiricism and feminist postmodernism share (a correspondence theory of truth, for instance) the commonality is first affirmed (constituting a continuity between women who have seemingly divergent epistemological preferences) and then shifted (moving into the direction of an anti-representationalist epistemology, that is, a new feminist materialism, which focuses on the making of scientific statements thus moving away from their alleged reflection of nature or academic culture).[31]

---

[28] Henry, *Not My Mother's Sister*, 7.

[29] Donna Haraway, "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective," Feminist Studies 14 (Fall 1988): 57–99.

[30] For the term 'non-exhaustive opposition' see Lynn Hankinson Nelson, "Epistemological Communities," in *Feminist Epistemologies*, ed. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter (New York: Routledge, 1993), 121–59.

[31] For the particular example of correspondence theories of truth (representationalism) and anti-representationalism see Karen Barad, *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2007).

In methodological terms, one could say that Marxist materialism and second-wave feminist materialism as well as feminist empiricism and feminist postmodernism have a place on the third-wave feminist map, but that these epistemic classes do not exhaust the map. Third-wave feminist theory shows that Marxist materialism is not exhaustively shifted by second-wave feminist materialism, since the latter tradition buys into the assumptions of the former by negating them. The same pattern is at work concerning feminist postmodernism's supposed shifting of feminist empiricism. Where Marxist materialism is patriarchal, second-wave feminist materialism reinstates patriarchal assumptions by arguing against them. Moreover where feminist empiricism is representationalist, feminist postmodernism reinstates representationalist presuppositions by arguing against them. Not working on the (negative) relational nature of a negation allows for the unwanted assumptions to infiltrate the supposedly new feminist theory. Extending across Marxist materialism and second-wave feminist materialism as well as feminist empiricism and feminist postmodernism following a methodology of mapping or cartography allows third-wave feminist theory to constitute a qualitative shift.[32]

I have specified the methodological consequences of an affirmative conceptualization of generationality as cartographical.[33] This methodology breaks once and for all with the classificatory strategy, or tree-like structure, traditionally linked to generationality as a genealogical "logic of tracing and reproduction."[34] Cartography is an embedded and embodied, that is, *situated* practice[35] that does not let itself to be defined according to sequential negation and progress narrative. Its structure is rhizomatic rather than tree-like. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari have written the following about this structure: "Unlike the tree, the rhizome is not the object of reproduction: neither external reproduction as image-tree nor internal reproduction as tree-structure. The rhizome is antigenealogy. (…) In contrast to centered (even polycentric) systems with hierarchical modes of communication and preestablished paths, the rhizome is an acentered, nonhierarchical, nonsignify-

---

[32] Cf. Rick Dolphijn and Iris van der Tuin (under review). "Pushing Dualism to an Extreme: On the Philosophical Impetus of A New Materialism."

[33] Cf. Iris van der Tuin and Rick Dolphijn (under review). "The Transversality of New Materialism."

[34] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, [1980] 1987), 12; cf. Ohad Parnes et al., *Das Konzept der Generation* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2008).

[35] Rosi Braidotti, *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002).

ing system without a General and without an organizing memory or central automaton, defined solely by a circulation of states."[36]

An example of a generational argument structured according to a cartographical logic that is rhizomatic is to be found in Teresa de Lauretis's inaugural lecture paradoxically entitled 'Feminist Genealogies.'[37] (I use this article often when I teach gender studies.) De Lauretis presents an argument about women, writing, and silence/ madness following *her own* cartography of feminists: Elena Lucrezia Cornaro Piscopia, Anna Maria van Schuurman, Belle van Zuylen, and Virginia Woolf, but also Rosi Braidotti, Shoshana Felman, Audre Lorde, and Angela Davis. The situatedness involved should not be understood in an individualist way (as in De Lauretis placing herself center-stage, that is, assuming a Subject) nor should it be read as predetermined (De Lauretis' location is effectuated in the mapping exercise). The cartography being situated simply means that it is affirmative in nature and easy to access for every reader (it can be adjusted, changed, added to, questioned, … in an affirmative way). The list of feminists De Lauretis works with sets in motion a disciplinary, *embedded* circulation as well as an empirical one *that she embodies*. Additionally, the work presented has no progress narrative structure: the analysis of women and writing traverses the theories used (it extends across them) and can be said to produce a rhizomatic account. Hierarchies are neither created nor relied upon. De Lauretis presents a *circulation of women's ideas* in order to bring forward an analysis of the topic in question that is singular (it does not affirm previously existing analyses). The intersubjective approach can be repeated easily, yet there is no reason for others to follow the same female line, the same circulation pattern or cartography. The map presented is in no way representationalist; neither the theories relied upon and shifted nor the claims referenced and made refer to something that exists 'out there,' something that is traced. Making the argument entails staging a relationality that is partial in Haraway's sense of the term. Despite the fact that De Lauretis is, referentially speaking, a member of the first generation of gender studies scholars, her work is utterly useful for contemporary gender studies teaching practices, and can break through that referentiality. It can be said to be as exemplary of third-wave feminism as the work of Ahmed, Colebrook, *Le Tigre*, and *Profesora* is. De Lauretis teaches us how a generationality that is third-wave plays out. Using

---

[36] Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, 21.

[37] Teresa de Lauretis, "Feminist Genealogies: A Personal Itinerary," *Women's Studies International Forum* 16 (January-February 1993): 393–403.

the work of De Lauretis in class and asking students to follow in her footsteps and construct their own cartographies is an instance of employing third-wave feminist generationality in the classroom. In doing so, De Lauretis is affirmed as a foremother (her work is part of the course syllabus), but the students' response to it (the construction of their own cartographies) affect classroom dynamics also. De Lauretis does not present a classification of feminist thought that teachers and students are tempted to memorize thus effectuating a hierarchy/asymmetry between the generations. The intersubjectivity that is effectuated instead is a promising instance of a shift in generational logic.

Third-Wave Feminist Practices of Teaching Gender Studies

Deleuze and Guattari write that a rhizomatic model or cartographical methodology does not involve a negation of the tree-like model or classificatory methodology: "We employ a dualism of models only in order to arrive at a process that challenges all models. Each time, mental correctives are necessary to undo the dualisms we had no wish to construct *but through which we pass.*"[38] Their position is similar to the practice of dis-identification according to which second-wave feminist theory is traversed by third-wave feminists. This implies that teaching according to a third-wave feminist generational logic, which can be done by gender studies scholars throughout, does not mean that the classifications of second-wave feminist theories or epistemologies are necessarily (to be) left behind. In my own teaching of feminist classics or feminist theories for the undergraduate and graduate gender studies programmes of the Faculty of Humanities of Utrecht University in the Netherlands I explain equality feminism, feminisms of (sexual) difference, and deconstructive thinking as well as feminist empiricism, feminist standpoint theory, and feminist postmodernism precisely so as to be able to *traverse* the feminist canon. A feminist canon – set up according to a classificatory logic in most textbooks available for undergraduate students and written by the first generation – is not affirmed nor do I ask my students to reject/ argue against the work presented or approach followed in those books. The teaching I am involved in is dis-identificatory: it allows for practices according to which such identifications with certain feminisms and certain feminist approaches as are always already made come to be traversed.

---

[38] Deleuze and Guattari, 20; emphasis added.

Let me end this chapter by providing two concrete examples from my teaching practice. The examples are intended to demonstrate how a gender studies classroom can be and has been constructed on the basis of third-wave feminism. They should also show how two generations of gender studies scholars *work together*.

In the course 'Historiography of Feminist Ideas,' which was set up by a first-generation gender-studies scholar (Prof. Rosi Braidotti) and which I have also taught with the third-wave feminists dr. Cecilia Åsberg and Eva Midden, MA, I begin by asking the students to list their Top 5 of feminists. This exercise, which Braidotti invented, I make them do at home, but we discuss it in class. The text by De Lauretis serves as reading material for the first session. I proceed by asking a random student for her Top 5, and write the names on the white board. This I do several times, which results in a cartography or several cartographies of feminists. Because of the fact that cartographies are easy to access, that is, they are non-directive, I will ask at a certain point what the students think of the map(s) on the white board. What is the definition of 'feminism' that pops up? Which feminists are missing? Which kinds of women are overrepresented? What are the problems with representation? These questions usually lead to thought-provoking discussions which show that the students know a lot already about feminism, that is, they identify (with) a certain feminism. This is knowledge which gets to be traversed along the way. A third-wave feminist methodology is constituted and followed by means of familiarizing the students with such a cartographical discussion at first, and by reading the work of some of the feminists on the cartography immediately afterwards. This occurs however before the classifications of feminist thought are discussed through textbook reading. The reading material and textbooks remain by and large similar to those that would be used in a second-wave feminist class, but the way in which we approach the primary and secondary material is different, that is, structured along the lines of a third-wave feminist generational logic. As the teacher I intend to participate in the discussions thus creating an intersubjective space. Although it is I who have designed the class and its syllabus, I do not claim 'good' or 'bad' readings of texts. This is to say that the situatedness of the students' readings and my guidance is on the menu throughout the sessions. I make explicit that it is my role as the teacher to structure thoughts and annotate discussions, especially by referring to situated knowledges, but I do not use *a* reading of texts or *a* mapping of feminists to

set the standard. The textbook as an academic instrument is addressed along these lines as well – the classification presented there as well as the genre of the textbook is seen through the lens of (generational) situatedness.

A second example is the book *Doing Gender in Media, Art and Culture*, which I edited together with Prof. Rosemarie Buikema, the current director of gender studies at Utrecht University.[39] It was a conscious choice to edit this book together, that is, we set up an intergenerational editorial team, so as to be able to produce a book that is structured along the lines of third-wave feminism. This is not to say that third-wave feminism is 'owned' by a younger generation of scholars (referentiality), or that the work of second-wave feminists has to be ignored or left out (negation). Buikema has worked with younger scholars for many years now, which has resulted in a productive cross-fertilization. Earlier we saw that a text by De Lauretis can exemplify third-wave feminist methodologies. Also, the epistemology of third-wave feminism does not allow for negation of earlier works and approaches. Dis-identification, as I explained in this chapter, entails an affirmation of feminism, whether of the past, present, or future so as to prevent Oedipal plotting from being repeated. An intergenerational editorial team, however, makes it easier to explicitly re-flect upon generational dynamics while producing a publication, and this is especially urgent in the case of a textbook where the authors are prone to be seduced by its canonical format and structure.

Doing Gender in Media, Art and Culture does not work with classifi-cations of feminist theories, but does not deny their importance either. The book embarks upon a re-writing of the history of gender studies via a series of 'woman warriors', whose life stories are written up in the chapters of the book. *Via* these stories and *via* the ways in which the stories of the warriors have been told in gender studies, the book tries to canonize gender studies while simulta-neously shifting the canonization by means of a cartographical methodology. The labels that have become stuck to the warriors, that is, the labels used to identify them within the field of gender studies are problematised affirmatively and in such a way that the author and the reader make up a new story about the heroine in question that dis-identifies with, that is, passes through and shifts previous stories, academic and non-academic. For instance, employing several exercises in untangling and peeling-offs of several layers of signification

---

[39] Rosemarie Buikema and Iris van der Tuin, ed., *Doing Gender in Media, Art and Culture* (London: Routledge, 2009).

Buikema tells the story of Sarah Baartman. Circling around the so-called 'True story of Baartman' and never really approaching it, Buikema performs a reading strategy that is third-wave feminist. The other authors of the book, who have written about warrior figures as diverse as Simone de Beauvoir, Barbie, Peter Pan, Florence Nightingale, the cyborg, and Maria Magdalena, embark upon similar readings and re-readings.

Teaching gender studies according to a third-wave feminist generational logic is affirmative about the (academic) feminist legacy that sprang out of second-wave feminism and its epistemic twist, but does not treat this legacy as clear-cut and 'out there.' Following a cartographical methodology that performs an affirmative and anti-representationalist generationality, third-wave pedagogy allows students and teachers to work on the circulation of women's ideas rather than to re-affirm the circulation of women through the hands of men. Insofar as third-wave feminism is not structured round matrophobia, it can be both a practice and an epistemology that avoids dismissing the work of previous generations. Shifting Oedipal generationality however, third-wave feminism in theory and teaching practice allows for students to affect (canonical writings on) feminist theory and to be affected by it. Third-wave feminism empowers students in a non-individualist, *intersubjective* manner.

References

Barad, Karen. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2007.

Braidotti, Rosi. *Patterns of Dissonance: A Study of Women and Contemporary Philosophy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

Braidotti, Rosi. *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Braidotti, Rosi. Metamorphoses: *Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002.

Buikema, Rosemarie and Iris van der Tuin, ed. *Doing Gender in Media, Art and Culture*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Collins, Patricia Hill. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* (volume 1989): 139—67.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "The Intersection of Race and Gender" in *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings That Formed the Movement*, ed. Kimberlé W. Crenshaw et al. (New York: The New Press, 1995), 357--83.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Difference and Repetition*. New York: Columbia University Press, [1968] 1994.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, [1980] 1987.

Dolphijn, Rick and Iris van der Tuin. "Pushing Dualism to an Extreme: On the Philosophical Impetus of A New Materialism." Under review.

Feigenbaum, Anna. "Review of Different Wavelengths: Studies of the Contemporary Women's Movement", by Jo Reger, *Journal of International Women's Studies* 9 (May 2008): 326--9.

Grosz, Elizabeth. "Histories of a Feminist Future." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 25 (summer 2000): 1017--21.

Haraway, Donna. "Situated Knowledges: *The Science Question in Feminism* and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies* 14 (Fall 1988): 575--99.

Harding, Sandra. *The Science Question in Feminism*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986.

Henry, Astrid. Not My Mother's Sister: Generational Conflict and Third-Wave Feminism. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.

Hemmings, Clare. "Telling Feminist Stories." *Feminist Theory* 6 (August 2005): 115--39.

Irigaray, Luce. "The Question of the Other." *Yale French Studies* 87 (May 1995): 7—19.

Jaggar, Alison M. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Sussex: The Harvester Press, 1983.

Lauretis, Teresa de. "Feminist Genealogies: A Personal Itinerary." *Women's Studies International Forum* 16 (January-February 1993): 393--403.

Nelson, Lynn Hankinson. "Epistemological Communities," in *Feminist Epistemologies*, ed. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter (New York: Routledge, 1993), 121--59.

Parnes, Ohad et al.. *Das Konzept der Generation*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2008.

Rich, Adrienne. *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience and Institution*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1976.

Rich, Adrienne. "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence," in *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, ed. Henry Abelove et al. (New York: Routledge, [1981] 1993), 227—54.

Roof, Judith. "Generational Difficulties; or, The Fear of a Barren History," in *Generations: Academic Feminists in Dialogue*, ed. Devoney Looser and E. Ann Kaplan (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).

Rubin, Gayle. "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975).

Scott, Joan W. "Experience," in *Feminists Theorize the Political*, ed. Judith Butler and Joan W. Scott (New York & London: Routledge, 1992), 22--40.

Serres, Michel with Bruno Latour, "Third Conversation: Demonstration and Interpretation," in *Conversations on Science, Culture, and Time* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995): 77-123.

Tuin, Iris van der. "*Jumping Generations:' On Second- and Third-Wave Feminist Epistemology.*" *Australian Feminist Studies*, 24 (March 2009): 17--31.

Tuin, Iris van der and Rick Dolphijn. "The Transversality of New Materialism." Under review.

Vuijsje, Marja. *Joke Smit: Biografie van een feministe*. Amsterdam & Antwerpen, Atlas, 2008.

Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. London: Vintage, [1929] 2001.

Teaching Gender in the Neoliberal University[1]

Angeliki Alvanoudi

Abstract

In this paper the author explores the institutional higher education context of Women's/Gender Studies in Europe and addresses a number of epistemological and political issues interrelated with processes of neoliberalization ('enterprise-university') which concern teachers of Women's/Gender Studies. In particular she focuses on the Bologna process which aims at harmonizing different EU higher education systems and its implications for the institutionalization and teaching of European Women's/Gender Studies. According to the author, the positive aspects of this process include the increase of the field's institutional power and the promotion of issues of European diversity, while the negative aspects include issues of canonization of the field and issues of neoliberalization. She explores the latter through the way the concepts of interdisciplinarity, flexibility/mobility and European-ness are used by feminist and neoliberal discourses. The author attempts to deconstruct the academic feminism/feminist activism division, theorizing the act of teaching gender as a sort of academic politics which involves radical re-appropriations and the vision of an alternative higher education.

Introduction

Where do Third Wave feminist scholars teach gender? What is the institutional context of Women's/Gender Studies? Although such questions may sound simple, their answer carries rather strong and complex political, epistemological, practical, and ethical connotations for feminist scholars. We teach gender in a male-dominated and monodisciplinary academic context which is currently being structured by neoliberal economics. This is precisely what constitutes the Third Millennium context in which Third Wave feminists find themselves. In this paper I focus on the university's neoliberal character in late

postmodern capitalism and the implications of this development for the institutionalization and teaching of Women's/Gender Studies. This is to assume that the Third Millennium coincides with a qualitative shift in the university's organization, operation and knowledge production. I argue that there are a number of crucial epistemological and political issues interrelated with processes of neoliberalization which concern the field's present and future as well as its critical orientation and content(s) and that these by necessity concern Third Wave feminists.

Locating Women's/Gender Studies institutionally

Universities are institutions with a dialectical relationship to the economy and the organization of the mode of production in society at large. During modernity and the historical period of capitalism there have been different kinds of universities emerging out of different types of production relations. The university of 'homo universalis' was formed in a world of free competition and 'free will' derived from the Renaissance and the rise of nation-state, while the Humboldtian university, which is well-known for its division of disciplines, was linked with the period of Industrial Revolution, Taylorism and Fordism. In late postmodern capitalism there has been a shift with regard to the character of paid work or what is counted *as* work. Besides hand-labor, intellectual labor has become the new source of surplus value; every aspect of human life and activity, including thought, imagination, creativity, feelings, communication, and language, has become an object of capitalist exploitation, thereby suppressing the division between time of production and non-production and constructing a new sort of flexible 'scientific proletariat'.[2] In the globalized neoliberal world (and in the EU context in particular), knowledge constitutes a new commodity of extreme value which must be subjected to the economic, social, political and ideological needs of the free market. Epistemological questions such as 'Who produces knowledge, who controls knowledge, and whose interests are served?', which have always been key to feminism, return in our postmodern neoliberal era as commodities which are interrelated with the intellectual labor being produced within neoliberal universities.

The basic feature of neoliberal universities is their deep engagement with the commodification of knowledge and for this reason they have often

---

[2] Michael Hardt & Antonio Negri, *Empire* [trans. by N. Kalaitzis] (Athens: Scripta, 2002).

been described as 'academic supermarkets'.[3] Here, I conceptualize neoliberal universities through the metaphor of the 'enterprise-university'. Universities work like enterprises which receive customers/consumers (*students*), sell commodities (*knowledge, education*) at high or low prices (*fees*), search for sponsors (*external funding coming from the market*), and shape their products according to the needs of their sponsors (*market-oriented knowledge production*). This conceptual metaphor serves to describe a general tendency of neoliberalization that affects universities variously in different national contexts.[4] In enterprise-universities students are not just customers who buy the commodity of knowledge; they also end up being commodities themselves, namely, a new sort of properly-trained labor force, a 'product' which is necessary for the free market world. Teachers and researchers constitute the 'scientific proletariat' working in enterprise-universities. Universities of late postmodern capitalism aim at standardizing and controlling intellectual labour through the modularization of knowledge which neutralizes knowledge itself by breaking it into pieces (e.g. systems of accreditation, ECTS). Being deeply embedded in the context of the free market world, enterprise-universities tend to reproduce neoliberal ethics: individualism and utilitarianism.

This is the general institutional context where Women's/Gender Studies scholars, both seniors (Second-Wave feminists) and juniors and students (Third-Wave feminists), come to perform their work and teaching.

The European context

European universities are typical members of the 'enterprise-university' archetype, leading their own institutional lives in the economic and political context of the EU. National contexts of higher education in present-day Europe are shaped by a new political force which is related with the process of neoliberalization of European universities: the Bologna Declaration of European Higher Education Area. The Bologna Declaration, which was signed on 1999 and will be concluding by 2010, aims at 'harmonizing' different EU higher education systems in order to create Europe-wide cooperation and competition. Given its

---

[3] Maria Puig de la Bellacasa, "Flexible Girls: A Position Paper on Academic Genderational Politics," in *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. III, ed. Rosi Braidotti, Ilse Lazaroms and Esther Vonk (ATHENA/ Utrecht University, 2001), 106.

[4] For example, in the UK universities have been totally privitized, while in Greece or in France universities still remain significantly independent from the free market demands. In Greece this is also the result of the recent massive students' and professors' movement against neoliberal education reforms.

European scope and its neoliberal character, the implementation of Bologna raises a number of crucial issues for the institutionalization and teaching of European Women's/Gender Studies. Some of these issues have already been addressed in the debate that took place between Clare Hemmings and Mary Evans in the *European Journal of Women's Studies.*[5] Here I will be drawing partly on this debate.

In general terms, the Bologna process aims at 'harmonizing' the European higher education system through a) unified higher education degree structures in all EU member states (3 years for a BA, 2 years for a Master and 3 years for a PhD), b) university subject benchmarks, c) a universal system of accreditation (ECTs), d) quality assurance policy, e) mobility of staff and students within the EU, and f) the development of a European curriculum.[6] When reading the aims it becomes obvious that Bologna offers an opportunity for rethinking and redesigning curricula and knowledge production in Europe. Bologna's critical orientation towards higher education is of great interest for both Second Wave feminist academics who have criticized the foundations of sciences and knowledge production through the lens of feminist empiricism, feminist standpoint epistemology or feminist postmodernism[7] and for Third Wave feminist academics who, in the light of the enterprise university context, need to revise the work of the former in order to transform patriarchal and monodisciplinary academic structures and contents.

But besides being interesting, is Bologna also useful? European Women's/Gender Studies scholars are inevitably confronted with this question. I believe that *teaching gender* in present-day Europe entails *our* (both Second Wave and Third Wave feminist academics') collective *positioning* towards the positive and the negative aspects of the Bologna process regarding the present and the future of European Women's/Gender Studies.

---

[5] Clare Hemmings, "Ready for Bologna? The Impact of the Declaration on Women's and Gender Studies in the UK," *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13, no. 4 (2006): 315–323; Mary Evans, "Editorial Response," European Journal of Women's Studies, 13, no. 4 (2006): 309-313; and Clare Hemmings, "Tuning Problems? Notes on Women's and Gender Studies and the Bologna Process," *European Journal of Women's Studies* 15, no. 2 (2008): 117–127.

[6] Isabel Carrera Suárez and Laura Viñuela Suárez, "The Bologna Process: Impact on Interdisciplinarity and Possibilities for Women's Studies," *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, NORA 14, no. 2 (2006): 103-104.

[7] Sandra Harding, *The Science Question in Feminism* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986).

European Women's/Gender Studies vis-à-vis the Bologna process

Positive aspects

The positive influences of the Bologna process on European Women's/Gender Studies can be summarized as two main points: a) increase of the institutional power of the field, and b) foregrounding issues of European diversity.

The first point is related with European benchmarking. According to Hemmings, European benchmarks "might (…) allow the field visibility and credibility in institutional fights for survival".[8] The recognition of Women's/Gender Studies as a distinct research and teaching category at a European level will increase institutional 'security' and recognition in national contexts where the field has already achieved a certain degree of institutional autonomy (e.g. UK, The Netherlands, the Nordic countries) and this recognition will also facilitate acceptance of the field in national contexts where it has been only integrated into existing disciplines (e.g. Greece, Italy, Spain or France). Considering the lack or absence of national support for the institutionalization of Women's/Gender Studies in certain local contexts, European tuning[9] will provide feminist academics with enormous help. This becomes pretty clear in the Greek context where I am presently located. As Pavlidou has pointed out, in spite of numerous proposals and the serious efforts of feminist academics to achieve more permanent forms of institutionalization of Women's Studies in the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, the Greek Ministry of Education was only forced to change its policy towards Women's Studies after the EU suggested that 10% of the education budget from the 3rd Community Support Framework should be spent on measures promoting gender and equality.[10] What the Greek experience shows is that 'external' mediations (the EU in our case) may be a catalyst in certain inflexible and conservative local contexts.

The discussion about the increase in the field's institutional power brings the Second Wave feminist *integration/mainstreaming* vs. *autonomy* debate to the

[8] Clare Hemmings, "Tuning Problems? Notes on Women's and Gender Studies and the Bologna Process", 120.

[9] For an overview of what tuning is and for its use in European Women's/Gender Studies see Berteke Waaldijk, "What is 'Tuning' and what is it at stake for Women's/Gender Studies", in the *Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. VIII, ed. Berteke Waaldijk, Mischa Peters and Else van der Tuin (ATHENA/Utrecht University, 2008), 123-127; Clare Hemmings, "Discussing Tuning", in the Making of European Women's Studies, Vol. VIII, ed. Berteke Waaldijk, Mischa Peters and Else van der Tuin (ATHENA/Utrecht University, 2008), 128-130.

[10] Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, "Women's Studies in Greece: An Update," in The Making of European Women's Studies, Vol. VII, ed. Rosi Braidotti and Berteke Waaldijk (ATHENA/Utrecht University, 2006), 179; and Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, "Gender Studies at Greek Universities: Assessment and Perspectives," [in Greek] in Gender Studies: Trends/Tensions in Greece and Other European Countries, ed. Pavlidou (Thessaloniki: Zitis, 2006), 16.

front. A strong motivation offered to feminist academics for implementing Bologna lies in the potential for achieving greater autonomy for the field. The integration/autonomy debate is contextually framed[11] and for this reason it is too complicated to be dealt with in a few lines. Thus I only focus on one of its related aspects, the epistemological ones, and I argue that in the long run Bologna might be linked with the promotion of interdisciplinarity (though not in an uncontested way, see the next section). While the integration/mainstreaming strategy leads to the integration of Women's/Gender Studies into existing disciplines leaving disciplinarity unchallenged, the autonomy strategy leads to autonomous centers/departments at universities, providing them with separate budgets, freedom to define and develop their own programs, award degrees on all levels (BA, MA, PhD), appoint professors, promote interdisciplinary feminist work and develop innovative pedagogies and assessment methods.[12] While integration may end up as various forms of invisibility,[13] autonomy allows for more free space for women's thinking and critical reflection. In addition, the institutional autonomy of Women's/Gender Studies is linked with epistemological issues concerning the *disciplinization* of the field. Is Women's/Gender Studies a *new discipline*? And if it is, should it be defined as a *post-disciplinary discipline*[14] which is differentiated from traditional disciplines through its use of *interdisciplinarity*?[15] Unlike Second Wave feminists who have been struggling for the field's institutionalization and legitimization, Third Wave feminists find themselves in a field which, as Dölling and Hark acknowledge, has "moved from the margin to the center."[16] In this context, inter- or transdisciplinarity are considered to be the means for critically reexamining feminism, describing the new kinds of social relations that emerge in our post-

---

[11] Clare Hemmings analyses how the integration vs. autonomy debate has been negotiated differently in different national contexts in her paper "The Life and Times of Academic Feminism," in Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies, ed. Kathy Davis, Mary Evans and Judith Lorber (London: Sage, 2006), 16-21.

[12] Ibid., 16; and Nina Lykke, "Women's/Gender/Feminist Studies — A Post-disciplinary Discipline?," in *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. V., ed. Rosi Braidotti, Edyta Just and Marlise Mensink (ATHENA/Utrecht University, 2004), 100.

[13] Rosi Braidotti, "Key Terms and Issues in the Making of European Women's Studies," in *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. I., ed. Rosi Braidotti and Ester Vonk (ATHENA/Utrecht University, 2000), 30-31.

[14] Lykke, "Women's/Gender/Feminist Studies — A Post-disciplinary Discipline?", 96

[15] Sabine Hark, "Magical Sign: On the Politics of Inter- and Transdisciplinarity," Graduate Journal of Social Science 4, no. 2 (2007), 14.

[16] Irene Dölling and Sabine Hark, "She Who Speaks Shadow Speaks Truth: Transdisciplinarity in Women's and Gender Studies", *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 25, no. 4 (2000), 1195. This claim should be understood in relation with specific national/local contexts. For example in Greece Third Wave feminist academics need to give institutional fights in order to sustain the field's integration which has been achieved by Second Wave feminist academics, and move on with establishing the fields' autonomy.

industrial world and producing feminist knowledge which will be critical of the dominant order and of its own epistemological foundations in the spirit of antifoundationalism.[17] These hotly debated issues within Women's/Gender Studies are inevitably foregrounded by the Bologna process.

The second positive impact of the Bologna process on European Women's/Gender Studies is its emphasis on issues of European diversity. According to Hemmings, the European tuning debate "necessarily foregrounds both international differences and similarities within the field, and situates these as institutional as well as theoretical questions".[18] Some of these questions include the English language hegemony and issues of cultural translation which have been central within feminist European networking, and especially within ATHENA's initiatives to advance the collaboration between European universities and the development of a European interdisciplinary curriculum in Women's/Gender Studies. Braidotti argues in her article "The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction in European Feminist Practices" that the project of setting up Women's Studies in a European perspective has to deal with issues of cultural and linguistic diversity in Europe which foreground differences among women.[19] For this reason, European Women's/Gender Studies has been conceptualized as a transcultural and transdisciplinary enterprise which requires an open, dialogical mode of interaction among Women's Studies teachers and researchers cooperating in European networks.[20] European tuning seems to be a necessary prerequisite for students'/staff's mobility and interaction in the new European context, which can provide the institutional space for the sort of dialogue and cooperation mentioned above.

Negative aspects

The negative aspects of the impact of the Bologna process on Women's/Gender Studies can be summarized through two general points as well: a) issues of canonization of the field, and b) issues of neoliberalization.

---

[17] Ibid., 1195, 1197.

[18] Hemmings, "Tuning Problems? Notes on Women's and Gender Studies and the Bologna Process", 118.

[19] For example, the different uses of the terms 'gender/sex' across different European languages expose the different feminist cultures that exist in Europe and the pressure of the Anglo-American dominance. See Rosi Braidotti, "The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction in European Feminist Practices," in *Thinking Differently: A Reader in European Women's Studies*, ed. Gabrielle Griffin and Rosi Braidotti (London and New York: Zed Books, 2002), 285-307.

[20] Ibid.

In her editorial response to Hemmings, Evans highlights the risk of having the field of Women's/Gender Studies canonized, standardized and homogenized through European benchmarking and quality assurance policies.[21] Hemmings also acknowledges that the disciplinization of the field through European benchmarking and tuning may end up as canonization.[22] Establishing a canon of course is not to be theorized as necessarily a 'bad' thing since a 'canon' may be related to the field's greater institutional autonomy. Still, following Hemmings's argumentation, I want to draw our attention to a number of 'tricky' questions concerning issues of canonization that need to be answered by feminist scholars who deal with Bologna: who will decide what is the 'right' kind of Women's/Gender Studies to be taught; which intellectual and national voices will be dominant; who will write Women's/Gender Studies benchmarks; who is considered to be a Women's/Gender Studies expert, and who will define and control what counts as feminist knowledge? For instance, will it be a small number of white privileged feminist academics coming from a European metropolis? Will it be the EU bureaucratic institutions? And how can we be sure that this latter will not be the case? This is the first serious tension to be resolved.

The second tension is what I consider to be the 'hardest' part of the Bologna process, namely its neoliberal nature. Here I would like to focus on three *oxymoron schemas/concepts* that emerge from the parallel use of identical terms by feminist and neoliberal discourses in order to denote different meanings/concepts. These terms are *interdisciplinarity*, *flexibility/mobility*, and *European-ness*.

Both neoliberal educational reforms and feminist radical transformations of knowledge production seem to favour the notion of interdisciplinarity, in opposition to the long monodisciplinary tradition of academic institutions. Hark argues that inter- and transdisciplinarity "function as magical signs, empty signifiers meaning whatever their users want them to mean".[23] For example, in the Bologna context interdisciplinarity is related with the reorganization of study programs in accordance with the modularization of knowledge. In this sense, according to Hark, interdisciplinarity is conceptualized as an element of the market-oriented neoliberal education, and

---

[21] Evans, "Editorial Response", 312.
[22] Hemmings, "Tuning Problems? Notes on Women's and Gender Studies and the Bologna Process", 123.
[23] Hark, "Magical Sign: On the Politics of Inter- and Transdisciplinarity", 13.

as a good strategy to be adopted by enterprise-universities in order to increase their competitiveness, prestige, and funding.[24] There is a big difference between this latter approach to interdisciplinarity and the feminist one. Women's/ Gender Studies scholars conceptualize interdisciplinarity as a practice of transgressing "borders between disciplinary canons and approaches in a theoretical and methodological bricolage that allows for new synergies to emerge", to quote Lykke,[25] and produces new critical and liberating forms of knowledge. This notion of interdisciplinarity is not identical with the one being promoted by neoliberal education policies.

Liinason & Holm distinguish between two kinds of interdisciplinarity which signify different kinds of knowledge-seeking strategies: 'instrumental' and 'cognitive' interdisciplinarity.[26] The former aims at problem-solving and it is mostly connected with the applied sciences, while the latter handles questions of fundamental understanding and is mostly related to critical interdisciplinarity or transdisciplinarity. According to Liinason & Holm, neoliberal education policies tend to promote instrumental/utilitarian interdisciplinarity, which fits perfectly with the model of vocational training/specialization for the labour market and the prioritization of applied science, without challenging disciplinarity.[27] In contrast, within the framework of Women's/Gender Studies, interdisciplinarity has been understood in terms of cognitive interdisciplinarity, as a radical research and pedagogic practice/position, a sort of experimental openness which provides the essential 'conceptual space' for the examination of the hybrid networks that are constructed through the intersections of gender, sexuality, class, ethnicity, and age, and the socio-cultural hierarchies and power relations of inclusion and exclusion. Feminist interdisciplinarity aims at deconstructing the disciplinary identities and borders which constitute naturalized cultural historical products that represent power relations. In this sense, 'interdisciplinarity projects' are dangerous for the monodisciplinary regimes of modern universities as these projects involve a lot of hard work and change at a cognitive/conceptual level for which there is hardly any 'real space' within the profit-oriented neoliberal academic structures. Based on my teaching experience as a co-teacher in 'Practicing Interdisciplinarity in European

---

[24] Ibid., 12-13.
[25] Lykke, "Women's/Gender/Feminist Studies — A Post-disciplinary Discipline?", 97.
[26] Mia Liinason and Ulla Holm, "PhD's, Women's/gender Studies and Interdisciplinarity," *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, NORA 14, no. 2 (2006): 118.
[27] Ibid, 122-123.

Gender Studies',[28] I agree with Pavlidou's position that interdisciplinarity can only be materialized through a feminist academic community of practice which shares common knowledge and background presuppositions, a strong commitment to a common endeavor and the will to negotiate power relations between disciplines and individuals.[29] This process of building an interdisciplinary feminist academic community of practice takes a lot of time and hard work, which is not easily found in our competitive and career-oriented academic times. It also entails an on-going questioning of every participant's 'individual/ personal' power that derives from her/his disciplinary authority. This process of self-questioning requires the development of strong feminist ethics based on dialogue, sharing, generosity, and collaboration. These qualities are directly opposed to the dominant utilitarian, competitive, and individualistic ethics of enterprise-universities.

Interdisciplinarity is not the only 'magical sign' that we have to deal with. Here I would like to borrow Hark's notion of a 'magical sign' in order to describe two additional concepts, flexibility/mobility and European-ness. Flexibility and mobility are considered to be the ideological emblems of enterprise-universities. This new 'trend' is compatible with –or imposed by– the ideology of the European neoliberal economy which considers life-long training and flexibility to be the only solution to the problem of European competitiveness in the globalized capitalist world. Employability is associated with flexibility and adaptability to the constantly changing needs of the labor market. Flexible workers in life long training are the ones who will survive. They will probably change their job more than once during their lives, wandering in the labour market like travellers with no destination. Again, there is a big difference between neoliberal and Third Wave feminist meanings of 'flexibility' and 'mobility'.

Puig de la Bellacasa theorizes the mobility and flexibility to be found in European feminist networks in turn as "a feminist project entailed by net-

---

[28] 'Practicing Interdisciplinarity in European Gender Studies' has been an experimental intensive course which was designed and co-taught by members of the Interdisciplinarity group (part of the working group Travelling Concepts, Athena 3) at Radboud University, Nijmegen (23 June-4 July 2008). See Sabine Grenz and Maria Pereira "Practicing Interdisciplinarity in European Gender Studies – Report on the International Introductory Gender Studies Course," in *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. IX (ATHENA).

[29] Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, "Interdisciplinarity: Queries and Quandaries", in *Travelling Concepts in Feminist Pedagogy: European Perspectives* (York: Raw Nerve, 2006) www.travellingconcepts.net; Eniko Demeny, Clare Hemmings, Ulla Holm, Paivi Korvajärvi, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou and Veronica Vasterling, *Practicing Interdisciplinarity in Gender Studies*, (London: Raw Nerve, 2006), 64-66.

working desires and alliance needs"[30] and as "a kind of survival politics"[31] within academia. This allows Third Wave feminists to transform dominant discourses while avoiding "capitalism's cannibalistic incorporation".[32] Feminist theory is also familiar with the concepts of flexibility and mobility through feminist deconstruction and materialist philosophies, where these concepts appear under the names of nomadism, fluidity, non-fixity of boundaries, transgression, transformation, multiplicity, difference or becoming-woman.[33] For example, feminists may theorize mobility through the figurations of alternative subjectivities, such as Haraway's figuration of the 'cyborg'; a figuration conceived as a connection-making entity which blurs binary divisions between nature and culture, human and machine, male and female.[34] Another alternative would be Braidotti's figuration of the 'nomad' which is conceptualized as a transgressive identity and a site of multiple connections, allowing feminists to think through and move across established categories and levels of experience.[35] Feminists may also understand flexibility as a 'mimetic strategy' in Irigaray's terms which allows women to move in spaces of exile and mutation and re-appropriate them. In this context, being mobile and flexible is part of a political process of subverting phallogocentrism and be-coming a collective political and epistemological subject. Feminist notions of flexibility and mobility theorize difference as a positive/affirmative category and for this reason they cannot be held to be compatible with late postmodern capitalism's reproduction and exploitation of differences as negative others.[36] In the beginning of the 3rd Millennium, Third Wave feminists are confronted with biological essentialism's and racism's exclusionary and reductionist ideas of difference, as well as with the challenges generated by the beginning of a global economic crisis which, in my opinion, signifies the historical failure of late postmodern capitalism. We face a new period of increased unemployment, poverty and social insecurity in which gender, ethnic and class differences are

---

[30] Maria Puig de la Bellacasa, "Flexible Girls: A Position Paper on Academic Generational Politics", 103.

[31] Ibid., 104.

[32] Sara Bracke (2000, 160) in Maria Puig de la Bellacasa, "Flexible Girls: A Position Paper on Academic Generational Politics", 104.

[33] Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994); Rosi Braidotti, *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002); Luce Irigaray, *The Speculum of the Other Woman* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985); and Luce Irigaray, *This Sex which is not One* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985).

[34] Rosi Braidotti, "Feminist Philosophies," in A Concise Companion to Feminist Theory, ed. Mary Eagleton (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003), 209.

[35] Braidotti, Nomadic *Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*, 35-36.

[36] Braidotti, *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming*, 1-10.

expected to play a central role as colonized negative others.[37] In this context, Third Wave feminists need to theorize difference as a positive category and work on a politics of affirmation, which will liberate us from the monologic economy of patriarchy and capitalism.

The third oxymoronic 'magical sign' is European-ness. We refer to Bologna as a 'European' process and to 'European' Women's/Gender Studies in the 3rd Millennium. Still the word 'European' does not have identical referents in both usages. In the Bologna context European is identified with the EU as a geopolitical formation determined by neoliberal policies and the vision of a military super-power. European in this sense is synonymous with exploitative capital-labor relations, competition, whiteness, masculinity and exclusion. Feminists, on the contrary, conceive Europe as a critical notion which foregrounds difference and diversity, denotes multiculturality and multilingualism and distances itself from ethnocentrism, nationalism, xenophobia, racism and sexism.[38] In the light of transnational feminism in the 3rd Millennium, Europe is to be conceived of as a supra-national project –instead of a super-power totalitarian machine– which addresses our different gender, ethical, racial, and class locations and denies the homogeneous notion of a 'universal sisterhood'.[39]

Women's/Gender Studies as a privilege (?) - the virus of neoliberal ethics

There are two additional aspects related with neoliberalization processes to be dealt with in this section.

The first aspect is related to the private character of higher education. Enterprise-universities impose clear class barriers, since their access to them is not free being only allowed to students who can afford paying fees.[40] The privatization of higher education and the increase in fees make education a privilege for the lucky few, instead of establishing education as a universal

---

[37] Angeliki Alvanoudi, "Golden Boys, Marxist Ghosts and Nomadic Feminism," *European Journal of Women's Studies* 16, no. 2 (2009): 181-184.

[38] Gabrielle Griffin and Rosi Braidotti, "Introduction: Configuring European Women's Studies," in *Thinking Differently: A Reader in European Women's Studies*, ed. Griffin and Braidotti (London and New York: Zed Books, 2002), 9-12; and Braidotti, "The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction in European Feminist Practices", 303.

[39] Rosi Braidotti, "The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction in European Feminist Practices", 302.

[40] Again this aspect of enterprise-universities varies across different European national contexts. For example, the Greek universities are still controlled by the state, therefore students pay no fees. Fees have been recently introduced in some MA programs in Greece due to the impact of processes of neoliberalization.

human right. Women's/Gender Studies, being part of this academic structure, cannot avoid imposing fees on their students and thus reproducing the class divisions which are usually interrelated with gender, ethnic or racial divisions (the majority of poor people are expected to be women, black or Asian immigrants/refugees). Given the above conditions, is it possible that we are developing the field of Women's/Gender Studies on the premise of the exclusion of the Other, the poor, lower working class women, namely the majority, whose access to higher education is being denied? And if this is the case, are we creating a feminist academic elite, causing a significant de-radicalization of the field's political force? I am certainly not suggesting that feminist academics are responsible for any inequality that exists in present-day academia. Besides, to quote Braidotti, given our long historical exclusion from political and intellectual rights, we are 'relatively newcomers'[41] in the academic world. Still, every time we enter into a classroom in order to teach gender, being happy that we women are not the 'daughters of educated men' (as Virginia Woolf said) any more but educated women who educate other women, we should also keep in mind that this is a classroom of minorities and various sexual, class and ethnic others.

The second issue to be addressed here is linked with neoliberal ethics. Feminist researchers and academics, PhD and MA students constitute a new form of 'scientific proletariat' working under flexible conditions, with low salaries (or no salaries in the case of most PhDs in Greek academia), struggling to survive in a very competitive and individualistic academic arena. One cannot avoid asking whether this sort of neoliberal academic ethic in any way affects the work we do in Women's/Gender Studies. Have we remained immune from the neoliberal virus of utilitarianism or careerism? Is this competitive academic context leaving any 'open space' for feminist academics to act freely, become generous with each other and develop alternative feminist pedagogic cultures? How are issues of power and prestige dealt with between feminist academics? Is there a risk of becoming the victims of the very academic structures we wish to change?

---

[41] Braidotti, "Key Terms and Issues in the Making of European Women's Studies", 24.

*Implications for teaching gender: deconstructing the academic feminism/
feminist activism division / radical re-appropriations*

Some of the tensions which have already been described are certainly part of the price one has to pay for choosing the path of institutionalization. However, this does not mean that European feminist scholars/teachers should abandon their academic positions and projects because they run the risk of being infected by neoliberal viruses; quite the opposite I would say. Feminist academics should start developing *multiple strategies* which will guarantee both the field's autonomy and radicality. Here I want to link this political urgency with my own location as a Third-Wave feminist scholar.

My motivating question in writing this paper is associated with our role as Third-Wave feminists/teachers in relation to the present and the future of European Women's/Gender Studies. Why do Third-Wavers enter the academia? Why do we seek for academic careers and why do we become teachers in Women's/Gender Studies? What is the feminist future(s) that we, as Third-Wavers, envision? Drawing on my location as a Third-Wave feminist situated in a disciplinary context (linguistics) in the Greek academy which has been struggling for years against both privatization and a deeper neoliberalization and which still lacks permanent forms for the institutionalization of Women's/Gender Studies, I want to defend a multiplicity of strategies as a feminist political choice. I conceptualize multiplicity as 'flexibility', as the ability to move 'in' and 'out'; as being integrated but always remaining a critical outsider. In the Greek context, multiplicity or flexibility is understood in terms of the *critical* implementation of the Bologna process which secures Women's/Gender Studies' institutional autonomy without totally adopting Bologna's neoliberal rationale. I consider flexibility to be a feminist choice for the accomplishment of a political vision (utopia) of an egalitarian education that is not market-oriented and which is deeply transformed by feminist knowledge.

Being raised in the historical era of late postmodern capitalism where intellectual labor has been the basic source of capitalist exploitation, I tend to see the academic feminism/feminist activism-social movement debate as a remnant of modernity, linked with Second-Wave feminist discourses. As such it fails to keep up with the historical changes that have taken place in late post-modern capitalism regarding the mode of production and the advanced role of intellectual labor. Taking into account that intellectual capital is *the* capital in late postmodern capitalism and that knowledge is the new valuable commodity

of capitalist exploitation, we need to foreground issues of knowledge and power (what is knowledge and who can be a knower?), that is we need to highlight feminist epistemological issues, as the new *loci* of social and political struggle and subversion. In our postmodern neoliberal world, politics can happen in those contexts where intellectual labor is being standardized and controlled, that is in the universities.[42] In this sense, academic feminism (theory)/feminist activism (politics) binary proves to be deeply problematic and for this reason it needs to be deconstructed and reconstructed from a Third-Wave feminist perspective.

In my opinion, this deconstructive and reconstructive move can re-signify the 'political' and help us move beyond nostalgia or pessimism concerning the lost political force of Women's/Gender Studies.[43] In order to help academic feminism detach itself from stories of betrayal or elitism and acquire new political meanings, I suggest that we, in the 3rd Millennium, start theorizing academic feminism and our work as teachers in Women's/Gender Studies as a sort of feminist academic *politics* which take place within the critical epistemic project of Women's/Gender Studies. Feminist academic politics deal with issues of feminist epistemology (knowledge and power, women's discrimination and exclusion through science, women's self-representation and self-determination) as well as with questions about the role and the future of higher education. In this sense, Braidotti's questions in her article "Key Terms and Issues in the Making of European Women's Studies" are considered to be highly relevant: "what vision of the university do we espouse from within Women's Studies?", "what kind of education values do we uphold?", "do we consider Women's/ Gender Studies to be a laboratory for the reworking of the scope and function of higher education?" and "what view of the human subject do we defend in a context of increasing Macdonaldization of culture?".[44]

Feminist academic politics can start answering these questions through the *symbolic re-appropriation* of the 'magical' signs-concepts which circulate in neoliberal and feminist discourses and which we teach in Womens'/ Gender Studies courses. Interdisciplinarity, flexibility, and European-ness need to be re-appropriated and re-signified from a feminist perspective.

---

[42] In no way, do I mean to reduce the significance of other forms of political action which take place outside the academia. My aim is to show how blurred the boundaries have become between academic feminism and feminist activism in our postmodern era.

[43] Robyn Wiegman, "Feminism's Apocalyptic Futures," *New Literary History* 31 (2000): 805-825.

[44] Braidotti, "Key Terms and Issues in the Making of European Women's Studies", 24-25.

These re-appropriations cannot be achieved by individual agents. In opposition to individualistic neoliberal ethics, we need to start (or continue) building on feminist *collectivities* within the academia, feminist European networks, and feminist academic communities of practice, starting from the classroom and the pedagogic praxis itself, which will function as *loci* of resistance to hegemonic structures. Instead of trying to give back to the field its old (read Second-Wave) 'political glow', I suggest that we, Third-Wave feminist scholars/teachers, start elaborating different concepts of the political which will attribute a new kind of radical political force to the field of Women's/Gender Studies.

References

Alvanoudi, Angeliki. "Golden Boys, Marxist Ghosts and Nomadic Feminism," *European Journal of Women's Studies* 16, no. 2 (2009): 181-184.

Braidotti Rosi. *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Braidotti, Rosi. "Key Terms and Issues in the Making of European Women's Studies." In *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. I., eds., Rosi Braidotti and Ester Vonk, 23-36. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University, 2000.

Braidotti, Rosi. "The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction in European Feminist Practices." In *Thinking Differently: A Reader in European Women's Studies*, edited by Gabrielle Griffin and Rosi Braidotti, 285-307. London and New York: Zed Books, 2002.

Braidotti Rosi. *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002.

Braidotti Rosi. "Feminist Philosophies." In *A Concise Companion to Feminist Theory*, edited by Mary Eagleton, 195-214. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

Demeny, Eniko, Clare Hemmings, Ulla Holm, Paivi Korvajärvi, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, and Veronica Vasterling. *Practicing Interdisciplinarity in Gender Studies*. London: Raw Nerve, 2006.

Dölling, Irene and Sabine Hark. "She Who Speaks Shadow Speaks Truth: Transdisciplinarity in Women's and Gender Studies." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 25, no. 4 (2000): 1195-1198.

Evans, Mary. "Editorial Response." *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 13, no. 4 (2006): 309-313.

Grenz, Sabine and Maria Pereira. "Practicing Interdisciplinarity in European Gender Studies – Report on the International Introductory Gender Studies Course." In *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. IX (ATHENA) (forthcoming).

Griffin, Gabrielle and Rosi Braidotti. "Introduction: Configuring European Women's Studies." In *Thinking Differently: A Reader in European Women's Studies*, eds., Gabrielle Griffin and Rosi Braidotti, 1-28. London and New York: Zed Books, 2002.

Harding, Sandra. *The Science Question in Feminism*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1986.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. *Empire*. [trans. by N. Kalaitzis] Athens: Scripta, 2002.

Hark, Sabine. "Magical Sign: On the Politics of Inter- and Transdisciplinarity." *Graduate Journal of Social Science* 4, no. 2 (2007): 11-33.

Hemmings, Clare. "The Life and Times of Academic Feminism." In *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies*, edited by Kathy Davis, Mary Evans and Judith Lorber, 14-34. London: Sage, 2006.

Hemmings, Clare. "Ready for Bologna? The Impact of the Declaration on Women's and Gender Studies in the UK." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13, no. 4 (2006): 315–323.

Hemmings, Clare. "Tuning Problems? Notes on Women's and Gender Studies and the Bologna Process," *European Journal of Women's Studies* 15, no. 2 (2008): 117–127.

Hemmings, Clare. "Discussing Tuning." In the *Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. VIII, eds., Berteke Waaldijk, Mischa Peters and Else van der Tuin, 128-130. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University, 2008.

Irigaray, Luce. *This Sex which is not One*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Irigaray, Luce. *The Speculum of the Other Woman*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Liinason, Mia and Ulla Holm. "PhD's, Women's/gender Studies and Interdisciplinarity," *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies*, *NORA* 14, no. 2 (2006): 115-130.

Lykke, Nina. "Women's/Gender/Feminist Studies — A Post-disciplinary Discipline?." In *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. V., edited by Rosi Braidotti, Edyta Just and Marlise Mensink, 91-101. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University, 2004.

Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula. [in Greek] "Gender Studies at Greek Universities: Assessment and Perspectives." In *Gender Studies: Trends/Tensions in Greece and Other European Countries*, ed., by Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, 13-26. Thessaloniki: Zitis, 2006.

Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula. "Interdisciplinarity: Queries and Quandaries." In Travelling Concepts in Feminist Pedagogy: European Perspectives (York: Raw Nerve, 2006) www.travellingconcepts.net

Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula. "Women's Studies in Greece: An Update." In *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. VII, eds., Rosi Braidotti and Berteke Waaldijk, 178-185. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University, 2006.

 Puig de la Bellacasa, Maria. "Flexible Girls: A Position Paper on Academic Genderational Politics." In *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. III, edited by Rosi Braidotti, Ilse Lazaroms and Esther Vonk, 95-111. Utrecht: ATHENA/ Utrecht University, 2001.

 Suárez, Isabel Carrera and Laura Viñuela Suárez. "The Bologna Process: Impact on Inter-disciplinarity and Possibilities for Women's Studies." *Nordic Journal of Women's Studies, NORA* 14, no. 2 (2006): 103-114.

Waaldijk, Berteke. "What is 'Tuning' and what is it at stake for Women's/Gender Studies." In the *Making of European Women's Studies*, Vol. VIII, eds., Berteke Waaldijk, Mischa Peters and Else van der Tuin, 123-127. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University, 2008.

Wiegman, Robyn. "Feminism's Apocalyptic Futures." *New Literary History* 31 (2000): 805-825.

The Dilemma of Teaching Critical Whiteness Studies – How to Transfer Knowledge on Whiteness as White Scholars at the White Academy

Daniela Gronold and Linda Lund Pedersen

Abstract

This chapter is a self-critical reflection on the standpoint of white feminists whose aim it is to refuse to reproduce structural racisms in their pedagogy and at the same time to face the limits of our ability to understand our own position. The focus of the chapter is on dismantling whiteness from within without abandoning postcolonial theory and the work of postcolonial thinkers and, just as importantly, without cannibalising postcolonial knowledge. Teaching whiteness from within means starting from one's own experience, knowledge, position as part of a teaching methodology and simultaneously remaining a learner with regard to one's location.

  We also formulate the consequences for teaching in feminist settings where students are often expected to be female, young, white and middle class.

> The kind of work I [Toni Morrison]
> have always wanted to do requires me to learn
> how to maneuver ways
> to free up the language
> from its sometimes sinister,
> frequently lazy,
> almost always
> predictable employment
> of racially informed
> and determined chains.[1]

Our aim in this chapter is quite like Toni Morrison's ambition, namely to find ways to navigate free off racial stereotyping and hierarchical categorization. In contrast to Morrison, our struggle starts from the privileged location of white people.

---

[1] Toni Morrison, *Playing in the dark – whiteness and the literary imagination*, (New York: Vintage books 1992): xi.

We are both white scholars who grew up and currently live in the increasingly racialized and neo-nationalistic societies of Austria (Daniela Gronold) and Denmark (Linda Lund Pedersen).[2] With few exceptions, we mainly teach white students from the same country in our classrooms at the university.[3] With regard to race and people affected by racism in this context, race is often invisible or considered as not significant since white people tend to refer to people of other skin colours than white as coloured. Furthermore, as we will examine more closely below, in these countries race and racism is largely removed from white people's consciousness by the grand narratives of the nation state while simultaneously being covered by categories such as culture, ethnicity or religion. The challenges in our teaching comprise the colour-blindness of white people, including our own, and the invisibility of whiteness as a racial category in the perception of white people. This takes up Ruth Frankenberg's observation that it is only white people as a group who lack awareness of their own skin colour – individuals from other groups will immediately identify a white person as being white.[4]

Our chapter is the fruit of a long, ongoing discussion of racialization and our own embodiment as individuals and more specifically our roles as scholars within racial structures. In our latest research projects, we have both examined the public debates in our national contexts in relation to the constructed "other" and dealt with methodological enquiries into the contested field of gender and race/ethnicity.

Who "we" are

Our first meeting was within the NOISE Summer School in Ljubljana 2004, where we were engaged in discussions on *New European Identities and Mediated Cultures: Revisiting the Politics of Location*, as the title of the course indicates.[5]

---

[2] Peter Hervik, "On the new Racism in Europe", in ETHNOS (Vol. 69: 2 June 2004): 149-155 and Sevgi Kilic, Sawitri Saharso and Birgit Sauer. "Introduction: The Veil: Debating Citizenship, Gender and Religious Diversity", in *Social Politics* (vol. 15:4 2008) : 397-410

[3] The exception we have in mind here is Linda Lund Pedersen's experience of teaching a course on 'Gender, Body and Sexuality in Scandinavia' to US-American undergraduate students in Denmark. The students seem to be more aware of categories concerning races-issues. This is not to say that they had a more critical approach to races and divisions of races but they did not have a distanced attitude to discuss races

[4] Ruth Frankenberg, *The social construction of whiteness*, (London: Routledge 1993).

[5] NOISE stands for the Network Of Interdisciplinary Women's Studies in Europe and is made possible by a grant of the EU Lifelong Learning Programme (Erasmus Intensive Programmes, DG Education & Culture). Starting in 1994, the NOISE Summer School has been a successful yearly event, giving students and teachers the opportunity to exchange their knowledge in the field of Women's Studies in an international context. (http://www.genderstudies.nl/index.php?pageid=6 located last on 14. April 2009)

The two clusters – *Diasporic cultures: De/constructing Home: Migration and Border-Crossing in Europe* and *The Black Venus in Europe: Legacies of Empire* – might be seen as a foreshadowing of our common interests until today. Since our first meeting in Ljubljana our academic and personal lives have been interwoven. In 2005 we were both studying in the Women's Studies Programme in Utrecht. Today we are the coordinators of the Student Forum of ATHENA – WeAVE. This chapter is the offspring of a feminist friendship that crosses multiple borders: national, disciplinary, and language.

The construction of the "other"

In our latest research projects, we both examined the process of "othering in the public" debates with regard to the construction of "foreigners/guests" in our countries of residence, Austria (Daniela Gronold) and Denmark (Linda Lund Pedersen). The Austrian study focused on media representations of Chechen asylum seekers in the Austrian province of Carinthia in two local daily mainstream newspapers. These representations were made up of three bouts of intensive reporting (August 2006, January 2008, and July/December 2008/January 2009) which suggest a troublesome relation between long-term white Austrian residents and asylum seekers. The Danish case study investigated the hegemonic representation and stereotypization of the "other" by dominant majority media which can be connected to the particular historical and socio-political "self"-and-"other"-understanding in Denmark. This included expectations with regard to the local norms and values pertaining to gender relations. The Danish research is embedded in a larger European project (VEIL: *Values, Equality and differences in Liberal Democracies, Debates about Muslim Women's Headscarves in Europe* (2006-2009) conducted in eight countries (Germany, France, Austria, The Netherlands, England, Greece, Turkey and Denmark).[6] The aim of this project was firstly to map and compare the conflicting and fundamental values and political ideas in European liberal democracies that emerged in the course of various debates in the public sphere; these concerned Muslim headscarves/body coverings. The second aim was to explain the discrepancies and similarities in the national values and norms that had been

---

[6] The VEIL-project is an EC project under the 6. frame- program (2006-2009) Prof. Birgit Sauer and Prof. Sieglinde Rosenberger (both from University of Vienna) are the main coordinators of the research project. The Danish research team involve Prof. Birte Siim, Ålborg University, Dr. Rikke Andreassen, Malmö University and MA. Linda Lund Pedersen. www.veil-project.eu.

mapped in the first part of project. The researchers elaborated on the critical frame analyses of debates that occurred in the public sphere and examined the saliency of the headscarves' discussion in Danish public debates from 1999 until the present.[7] The qualitative analysis showed how the Danish participants in the headscarves' debates had a tendency to position themselves easily as 'neutral' observers and commentators.[8]

Both research projects demonstrate strong affinity with Critical Whiteness Studies since they investigate the dominant public debates' aim to uphold a hegemonic order that is sustained by the power of invisibility: i.e. whiteness as 'neutral' or invisible. We were both concerned with avoiding depictions that would reproduce stereotypical images of the non-belonging "other" and instead critically analysed mechanisms used by the dominant majority groups that translated minority groups within the national borders into the position/language of the "other" within the nation state.

In the last two years we had several opportunities to present parts of our research at different conferences, where we have, directly or indirectly, referred to Critical Whiteness Studies.[9] The reactions to our project-presentations were rather frustrating. In the worst case scenarios we encountered people who ignored the critical dimension of our study with regard to the dominant majority groups and in the best cases our presentations aroused irritation related to the perspectives that emerged from our presentations. For instance, at the "Power and Resistance"-conference in Oslo, 2008, in connection with the presentation (by Linda Lund Pedersen) of the headscarves' debates in Denmark questions such as the following were raised, we quote: "Don't you care about veiled women's sexuality?" or "Don't you care about the oppression of veiled women?". The questions seemed to imply that since these issues were not taken up in this presentation it was not really feminist. However, the focus in the presentation was on the debates and not veiled women. At the "Feminist Research Methods"-conference in Stockholm, we presented a part of this chapter to a feminist audience concerned with research methods and focused on the importance of the self-reflectivity of white researchers. The responses to our presentation focused on the individual case studies.

---

[7] Sevgi Kilic, Sawitri Saharso and Birgit Sauer. "Introduction: The Veil: Debating Citizenship, Gender and Religious Diversity", in *Social Politics* (vol. 15:4 2008): 397–410.

[8] Linda Lund Pedersen, "Kønsforskellen og Neutralitet" (eng. Sexual Difference and Neutrality), in *Kvinder, Køn og Forskning* (Vol. 4 : 2008), 38–49.

[9] "Power and Resistance"-conference in Oslo, January 2008, Women's World Conference, Madrid, July 2008, Barcelona, November 2008, "Feminist Research Methods"-conference, February 2009.

We did not receive feedback or even questions on our reflections upon a self-critical research methodology. Based on such experiences, we started to think about *how to reach people with the kind of knowledge provided by Critical Whiteness Studies*. Therefore, our discussions of how to work with Critical Whiteness perspectives as a white researcher and, how to develop a research methodology in the sense of Critical Whiteness Studies was complemented by the following question: How to teach Critical Whiteness Studies in predominately white settings?

In relation to teaching Critical Whiteness Studies, we were struggling with the question that emerged namely what is that prevents or obscures the possibility for people to understand the particular research perspective of our presentations. Did we fail to pay attention to the background of our different audiences? Or did we fail to meet their expectations concerning a critique on power relations? The answer is complex, if answerable at all.

One possible explanation is related to the function of hegemonic power. Those in power hold a normative position and are consequently marked as "normal" and "invisible" whereas those who are considered to be on the margins are marked as "different" and therefore "visible".[10] Critical Whiteness Studies particularly address exclusion based on racialisation and ethnicity, cultural and religious differentiation. Visibility of the "other" is often connected to skin colour, clothing and categorises people as being "black", "red", "yellow", "brown", whereas the "white" marker remains invisible. Much research has been conducted into discovering which white researchers study those on the margins; and such research that analyses representations and debates about the "other" in order to trace the effort by the dominant majority group to sustain their favourable position may cause irritation. However, knowledge provided from a critical whiteness perspective is not entirely new and, in the case of our presentations, it would have required us to assume completely uninformed audiences.

Critical Whiteness Studies were established in the 1970s in the Anglo-American context and have entered European universities in the 1990s.[11] However, knowledge regarding the implications of whiteness for racialisation and racisms provided by Black theory and postcolonial theory was avail-

---

[10] Eske Wollrad, *Weißsein im Widerspruch* (Königstein/Taunus: Ulrike Helmer Verlag, 2005).
[11] Gabriele Griffin and Rosi Braidotti, "Whiteness and European Situatedness", in *Thinking Differently. A Reader in European Women's Studies*, Gabriele Griffin and Rosi Braidotti, ed. (London and New York: Zed Books 2002): 225, Wollrad, *Weißsein im Widerspruch*, 48–9.

able much earlier; therefore the perspectives raised by our researches are not new.[12] The incomprehension in white feminist contexts with regard to such critical perceptions might lie in the particular history of white feminisms. White feminisms, as Dagmar Schultz reflects, have a history of dealing with patriarchal structures in order to obtain equal rights in a hegemonic system that traditionally privileges men over women.[13] Doing so, Schultz shows that such a perspective obscures the fact that this only applies to white men's privilege over white women and does not work in the same way, when it involves men of colour and white women. Consequently, white feminists rather identify themselves as victims of unequal power relations than as people who uphold a position, which is equally involved in power production and the stratification of class and ethnical groups.[14] Furthermore, the construction of women as victims in general needs to be re-visited by white women in order to understand their stake and participation in discrimination and the reproduction of hegemonic power. In relation to this, Critical Whiteness theory, by rejecting an essential idea of womanhood, offers important starting points for teaching Critical Whiteness Studies in a feminist context. Instead it scrutinizes the different experiences of women from varying racialized, ethicized, and religious or class backgrounds.[15]

In this context, the German feminist, Protestant theologian Eske Wollrad challenges the common use of the term gender as a category to describe the oppression of women. From her perspective the term covers up other mechanisms of oppression such as "race" and class. The term "gender", Wollrad argues, allow white women to conveniently avoid the issue of racial discrimination, if they want to. Women outside white-middle class-feminist spaces are at best invited to be incorporated.[16] Furthermore, a simple focus on women as victims of patriarchy hinders an understanding of white women's participation in sexism and the oppression of men who are marked by ethnicity or class. In a study of white German women involved in feminist movements, Nora Räthzel shows that the tendency of white women to perceive men as a threat of their security turns out to be particularly detrimental for men of colour. These white women, who all

---

[12] Wollrad, *Weißsein im Widerspruch*, 48–9; Stuart Hall, *Ideologie, Identität, Repräsentation – Ausgewählte Schriften 4*, (Hamburg: Argument Verlag, 2004).

[13] Dagmar Schultz, "Witnessing Whiteness – ein persönliches Zeugnis", in *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte*, ed. Eggers, Kilomba, Piesche, Arndt (Münster: Unrast Verlag), 514–29.

[14] Beverley Skeggs, *Class, Self, Culture* (London: Routledge 2004), 1–2 & 27–44.

[15] Wollrad, *Weißsein im Widerspruch*, 100–3.

[16] Wollrad, *Weißsein im Widerspruch*, 102.

considered themselves as anti-nationalist, claimed to feel threatened by the masculine sexuality of the migrants and hence referred to the nation state as being responsible for securing their protection from the migrant men.[17]

Another reason why the Critical Whiteness perspectives in our presentations might have been misunderstood, as the ensuing discussions revealed, might lie in the different ways of understanding "race" and racism, ethnic, cultural and religious discrimination in different cultural and national contexts. The fact that the lingua franca at international conferences is English and that presentations are given in an interdisciplinary context may contribute to improper translations of terms and terminologies. For instance, the term "race" as used in an Anglo-American context carries different meaning than in a Danish and German-speaking context, where "race" (Danish: Race/ German: Rasse) has been abandoned as a suitable concept in academia. The reason for this seems that since the end of World War II, it has been proved to be extremely tricky to accuse somebody of being a racist.[18] Andre Gingrich shows in an analysis of the Austrian context that even today the person who accuses somebody of being a racist is likely to be in more trouble than the one who is accused.[19] Instead of "race", Denmark and German-speaking countries rather employ the concept of Xenophobia (German: *Fremdenfeindlichkeit*, Danish: *Fremmedfjendsk*), which refers to neo-conservative and neo-nationalist tendencies rising with the end of the Cold War and the influx of migrants from Eastern Europe.[20] Discrimination in this context is perceived as a problem arising between groups of white people and, therefore, somewhat different from the conventional problem of "racism". The denotation of Critical *White*ness Studies may also be misunderstood in a context where the history and presence of Black Austrians, Germans, but also Danes, Norwegians, Swedes, etc. is concealed by the self-image of seemingly white nations or white Europeans. The imagined national community of these countries is based on the idea of ethnic homogeneity and is in effect a racist structure because it a priori excludes non-white people.[21]

[17] Nora Räthzel, "Nationalism and Gender in West Europe: the German case", in *Crossfires: Nationalism, Racism and Gender in Europe*, ed. Lutz, Phoenix, Yuval-Davis (London: Pluto Press 1995): 180–1.
[18] Peter Hervik, 149–155
[19] See Andre Gingrich, "Concepts of Race Vanishing, Movements of Racism Rising? Global Issues in an Austrian Ethnography", in *ETHNOS* (Vol. 69:2, June 2004): 156–176.
[20] Gingrich, 166
[21] See Benedict Anderson, *Die Erfindung der Nation – Zur Karriere eines folgenreichen Konzepts* (Frankfurt/New York: Reihe Campus).

Using the example of Germany Wollrad examines how some nations still imagine their national communities as being related through bloodlines (ius sanguinis) although this concept has always been challenged by migration and immigration. This is why German people who are identified as Black continue to be considered as "optic" foreigners.[22] Breda Gray observes similar tendencies in her analysis of exclusion in Great Britain.[23] She takes Irish women in Great Britain as an example, and shows that, in contrast to Black people and because they look the "same" as the dominant white majority group, nobody would have recognised them as "different" as long as they did not speak and could be identified as "different" through their Irish accent.

In connection to teaching Critical Whiteness Studies, we consider a thorough reflection upon national grand narratives to be an important starting point. This helps us to understand Critical Whiteness perspectives and compare them with contemporary representational policies of self-and-other. The reactions to the presentation of the Austrian case study at the "Power and Resistance-Conference" in Oslo offered important insights into the importance of raising awareness of different cultural and national contexts where the meaning of "self-and-other" is produced. [24] The audience from the Nordic context were irritated by the representation of Chechen people in the Austrian media. While the Nordic researchers were concerned with public representational policy that links Chechen people closely to their Islamic background, the Austrian media did not draw attention to religion as a marker of identity for this group. Austrian national grand narratives almost exclusively connect people with Turkish background to Islamic religious expression and others and a similar connection is not made to others who share the Islamic religious faith. In the case of Chechnya then, Austrian media representations are not able to make a link to historical relations or memories. The later discussions in the panel revealed different historical relations to Chechens and to Islam in Austria and the Nordic countries as well as differences in notions about refugees and the responsibility of the nation states.

As a rationale for teaching Critical Whiteness Studies and in order to question the "normal" perception of hegemonic (racial) order in one's own cultural context, we find it useful to compare representations of similar migrant groups

---

[22] Wollrad, *Weißsein im Widerspruch*, 131.

[23] Breda Gray, "'Whitely scripts' and Irish women's racialized belonging(s) to England", in *European Journal for Cultural Studies* (5: 3, 2002), 257–274.

[24] The conference was organised by the FEMM-network and took place in January, 10-11, 2009.

in different countries. Obvious differences in representations of migrants and asylum seekers in countries that are possibly perceived as similar in a united Europe – such as Norway, Denmark and Sweden compared to Austria – may be able to function as an eye opener and means to understand the strategic use of racialized and ethicized differentiation. In this connection, for instance, we note that, in contrast to Austria, the Nordic context links notions of victimhood closer to the family context of migrant families where Chechen women are perceived as being threatened by their male relatives. Furthermore, the Nordic media showed more awareness of the structural problems of the states that turn migrants into victims.

Benedict Anderson's concept of *imagined communities* offers a useful framework for understanding the particular relationship of a nation to its groups of migrants. Stuart Hall refers to Anderson's concept as a meta-narrative that integrates a collective into the past, present and future and connects the people within the state.[25] This narrative provides one group with powerful forms of identification by means of symbols and a representational system and excludes others.[26] Exclusion of groups of people is often linked to a particular historical memory. Hall explains particular memories function as originating stories that have precedence over others and serve an important function in determining how community is imagined.[27] Rosi Braidotti and Gabriele Griffin locate a tendency that they call the desire to "forget to forget".[28] Maria Todorova highlights the importance of historical remembrance in creating conflict by writing: "In the Balkans they were killing over something that happened 500 years ago; in Europe, with a longer span of civilized memory, they were killing over something that happened 2,000 years ago".[29] However, historical antagonism does not necessarily lead to war and historical memory also includes amicable loyalty and is able to shed light on the particular relationship to groups of foreign residents within a nation.

What had happened in Austrian public representation policies, where historical relations to Chechnya were absent until recently, was the creation

---

[25] Stuart Hall, "Kulturelle Identität und Globalisierung", in *Widerspenstige Kulturen*, eds. Hörnig, Karl H. and Rainer Winter (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch, 1999), 393–441.
[26] Kathryn Woodward, *Identity and Difference*, (London: Sage Publication, 1997).
[27] Stuart Hall, "When was the 'Post-Colonial'? Thinking at the Limit", in *Divided Skies, Common Horizons*, eds. Curti, Lidia and Iain Chambers (London), 250–1.
[28] Rosi Braidotti and Gabriele Griffin, "Whiteness and European Situatedness", in *Thinking Differently. A Reader in European Women's Studies*, eds. Griffin, Gabriele and Braidotti, Rosi (London/New York: Zed Books, 2002), 232.
[29] Cited Maria Todorova, *Imagining the Balkans* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press), 6.

of a link to already existing stereotypes to well-known groups of foreigners in Austria. A connection was drawn between Chechen male asylum seekers and violence, criminality, aggressive masculinity and a lack of civilized behaviour.[30] Representations of male Chechens were, in other words, used in a similar way to images that are usually attached to migrants from the "Balkans". Here, the policy of media representation is supportive of a move to attach an unknown group of foreigners to a group with a long historical relation to Austria and is thus able to establish a sense of "security" for the dominant majority society by "taming" the new group through the images of well-known foreigners.[31] As a consequence of this, Austrian representations of a specific group of foreigners (Chechens) may cause irritation in another context where historical memories regarding the group are different (i.e. Scandinavia that has another relationship with Chechens – seeing them more as the victims of Russian imperialism).

In Austria migrant women from Chechnya have been largely neglected by media representation policies and as a consequence Islam was not highlighted through comments on the visibility of the headscarves or body coverings in public. Here it is interesting to notice that although Austria is a very right-wing oriented country, it is one of the few EU-European countries where the debates concerning the rules surrounding Muslim attires are absent. In Denmark, on the other hand, the Muslims' headscarves and body coverings have been the predominant signifier of the "other" and undanishness.[32]

In our research projects, we deal with both exclusion and discrimination within groups of white people and within national communities that are imagined as white collectives. On the basis of a dualistic understanding of the world order, "white" or "whiteness" is often considered to require "Black" or "Blackness" as its equivalent or opposite. In contrast, Critical Whiteness Studies do not support a binary relationship between the terms, nor do they support the idea of fixed or essential identities. Critical Whiteness Studies emphasize "white" and "whiteness" as referring to the experience of privilege and superiority.[33] Since the term Black was provided with meaning by the Black Power Movements in the 1960s and highlights the common experience of oppression it is able to embrace the experience of

---

[30] This example is based on a study examined by Daniela Gronold, "'Wer denkt an die Opfer?' – Repräsentationen tschetschenischer EinwandererInnen in der österreichischen Mediennation", in MedienJournal (32:3, 2008), 31–40.
[31] Daniela Gronold, 39–40.
[32] Sevgi Kilic, Sawitri Saharso and Birgit Sauer, 400–1.
[33] Wollrad, *Weißsein im Widerspruch*, 19–20.

all people of "colour" even including groups of non-privileged white people. However, the writing of the terms Black and white is not used homogenously and needs some explanation at this point. The term Black is written in capital letters, because it alludes to the concept of resistance embedded in the common consciousness. For this reason we abandoned the option to spell the term white with a capital letter, because we do not want to emphasize resistance or to appropriate the critical potential of Black theories and movements.[34]

An example of teasing out whiteness from its shelter of invisibility

The "Alienbus"[35] is part of an artistic project by the Colombian painter Carlos Alberto Reyes Florez. In this he uses the alien as a figurative-metaphor for the experience of being the "other", the "unwanted guest" and the "stranger" in the framework of a "white" capitalist/colonialist and globalised world which is represented by the airplane.[36] The project offers many entrance points that enable us to develop a feminist stance with regard to Critical Whiteness Studies.

---

[34] The spelling of the term white in capital letters is criticised as being a white appropriation of Black political engagement. See: Wollrad, *Weißsein im Widerspruch*, 20, or *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte*, ed. Eggers, Kilomba, Piesche, Arndt (Münster: Unrast Verlag).

[35] We thank Lars Kraemmer (from artmoney.org) and Carlos Reyes (artist) for giving permission to use the "alien-bus" image.

[36] Localized the 28/02/2009 on http://alien-art-project.blogspot.com/2007/03/art-money.html

The alien's green colour tells of the visibility of the "other", who is always exposed to the gazes of those whose hegemonic position allows them to consider themselves "normal" and not marked by "otherness".[37] Furthermore, the green colour is an abstraction of the notion of skin colour. It shows the artificial construction behind "othering" rather than determining a particular skin colour or even suggesting that the green stands exclusively for skin colour. The shape and bodily feature do not emphasise a particular gender in the "other". The "stranger" can be seen as female or male, child or adult, hetero-, bi- or homosexual, "white" or Black or "brown" or "yellow" or "red". The example here also shows the "alienation" of the "other" since she/he/it is outside the airplane and therefore in a very vulnerable position, whereas people inside the airplane can be considered as "safe" or at least we can believe that in case of emergency they will be provided with assistance which can increase their chances for survival. Through the shelter given by the airplane, the people are highly homogenised in terms of being insiders – though divided amongst themselves by the ability to pay for extra services. The shelter of the airplane protects these people and they are invisible in the painting. The most visible figure in the painting is the person outside since she/he/it is excluded from taking up a seat among the other passengers. From inside, the passengers are hardly able to see the person excluded. Many of them would not even know of the person outside or be aware of the difficult and dangerous situation the "stranger" is in. Some may know of the existence of the "alien" and consider this "blind passenger" a parasite who illegally takes advantage of "their" system, whereas some may feel sorry for the inconvenient situation of the "other" or even try to do something to help the person outside.

As we have indicated, feminists learned to deconstruct power structures, but white feminists often tend to be blind to their own participation in reproducing unequal power relations. Including the stance of Critical Whiteness Studies into white feminist perspectives is associated on a personal level with uneasiness and resistance. A critical whiteness perspective demands a re-thinking of white feminists' privileges and a dismantling of such unequal power relations within groups of feminists as are caused by differences in, for example, ethnicity, race, sexuality, financial means and class. Of course, white feminisms have included these categories in their analyses in order to explain particular problems related to their situatedness. The critique by scholars

---

[37] The print in this volume only allows for a "white" and Black but in the original painting the figure/Alien is green.

involved in Critical Whiteness Studies aims to extend the use of these categories. Eske Wollrad, for instance, argues that gender is given priority over ethnicity, race or class instead of being only one essential factor in the understanding of gender relations within a white context. [38]

If we return to the example of the "alienbus", this means the following: Being in the airplane is a privileged place; no matter what "insiders" decide they will have to start from their (racially) privileged position from inside when deciding whether: to remain unaware, to stay inside, or to help the "other", to risk taking a look at the outside, to tell people around them about the person excluded, or even to try get to know the ones who are excluded, etc. – Being white means inevitably being privileged within the racist structure of the society no matter whether one is an outspoken racist or not. Hence, the normality implied in the hegemonic position of whites seduces one into believing that the "other" is the problem instead of looking at the complicity of this "normality" in the "othering" of people who do not fit in or who belong to a visible minority within white (normative) society.[39]

Critical Whiteness Studies then are about understanding white privilege as a white person and our chapter treats the question: How to learn about our own whiteness and how to teach Critical Whiteness Studies to white feminist students? Donna Haraway taught us that neutrality – the view from everywhere or the disconnected subject – is the trick of the gods, while not being neutral means being open to critique, and thus more vulnerable. On the other hand, the standpoint of subjugated knowledge is not unproblematic. Feminism or feminist awareness demands some sort of objectivity or objective knowledge.[40] For this reason one important task for us[41] is the way of thinking about how we can negotiate with different standpoints in order to develop a broad set of tools for teaching Critical Whiteness Studies both allows us to deal with different critiques of our own positions and also gives us the insight necessary to teach within the frame of a situated perspective. This is a process within which we are becoming more informed about our own position as researchers and teachers – and its significance for the research outcome and the students.

---

[38] Eske Wollrad, "Weißsein und Bundesdeutsche Genderstudies", in *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte*, ed. Eggers, Kilomba, Piesche, Arndt (Münster: Unrast Verlag), 416–7.

[39] Of course this is more complex than we have described here, but our aim is to critical contest the comfort zone of white feminists who is not confronted with their racial embeddedness prima facia.

[40] Donna Haraway, *Reinvention of Nature* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 142–3.

[41] "We" and "us" are referring to the authors of this chapter where nothing else is mentioned.

Implications of teaching Critical Whiteness Studies

From our perspective, Gabriele Griffin made a very interesting comment to the concept of teaching Critical Whiteness Studies by saying that we have to be careful not to continue to deal with identity politics in our research and methodology – which feminisms claim to have surpassed years ago.[42] Sometimes it seems as if we are searching for an identity as researchers as well, both when we are doing research and also teaching. In relation to this, our main question is how to realize our own demands in our academic work. If whiteness is considered as the "norm" – and people privileged by hegemonic power can find it hard identify traces of supremacy and evidence of whiteness can easily be dismissed, how can we, as white researchers, excavate the privileges of whiteness? How can we as a consequence teach Critical Whiteness Studies in order to make privileged (white) students aware, without absorbing non-privileged students only by putting them on the margins? Or fall into the problems of tokenism? How can we study or teach Critical Whiteness Studies as white scholars or students without falling into the trap of approaching "the other" as the problem?[43] How can we avoid speaking on the behalf of people with a different skin colour than white; assuming that white skin colour is the mode of common experience for all whites? How to speak about whiteness and people of different skin colours without engendering them once more as a homogenous groups or the "exotic others"? In the next part of our analysis, we will discuss such questions based on our own research from which we further work out suggestions for approaching the issues in the learning situation or classroom.

Although we consider this field as being crucial for feminist studies and the inquiry into power relations, we are aware that we are not immune from any (self-)suspicion of engaging in racial stereotypization just because we work with Critical Whiteness Studies. On the contrary, it is a challenge for us to investigate Critical Whiteness theory and face our own blind angles at the same time when discussing our work with each other, with our supervisors, with an academic audience which listens to our presentations, and with friends who all have different standpoints and personal stories related to processes of in- and exclusion as well as of racialization. Being committed to theories like Critical Whiteness Studies is difficult as it is accompanied by a lot of questions and

---

[42] We quote Gabriele Griffin from her keynote speech at the "Feminist Research Conference" in Stockholm, February 4-6, 2009.
[43] Manning Marable, 49.

insecurity about one's self. We have realized that we need to be extremely precise and cautious about how much we can expect other people to understand.[44] In the process, it has become more obvious why many white people resist serious reflection over their privileged position. Raising the awareness that whites in a normative position are always privileged by social and cultural structures is a difficult task for us as white scholars. It deeply questions our understanding of ourselves and we are sometimes pursued by feelings of guilt and the loss of security. We struggle with the suspicion that it may not be possible to take up a subjectivity that does not reproduce a white patriarchal system in one way or the other. Some scholars of Critical Whiteness would say that it is indeed impossible. Taking such a possibility into consideration, we need to question the expertise that we use to legitimatize our interest in teaching such a subject. How will we introduce ourselves with regard to this issue? Are we credible as teachers if we say that we may be detected as suffering from hegemonic blindness if we invite our students to critically look at our standpoints as teachers? Should we expose ourselves to critique from the beginning?

Manning Marable, among others, emphasises that "Whites who live in a racist environment have a supreme luxury: They never have to talk about *being white.* When something is viewed as the norm, there's nothing unusual about it, there is nothing to talk about. [45] In other words, "white" people only have to deal with racisms if they want to. Dagmar Schultz adds to this line of argumentation that white people who engage in issues of racial discrimination can leave the subject for a while, when it starts to be tough for them.[46] Starting from there, we wonder what we as researchers and teachers of Critical Whiteness expect from other researchers and students as well as from ourselves. Do we want everyone to be sensitive regarding racial relations and power structures and to be deeply self-critical? If so, do we end up in a moralistic position towards other whites, if not from our own perspective since we perceive becoming sensitive for colour- and power-blindness as extremely important, but from the perspective of our students who will then reject the contents in our classes? Do we need to be aware of falling into the trap of humanist altruism, which our theoretical standpoint rejects? These thoughts are particularly important, when reflecting on how to teach white-

---

[44] http://www.missuniversum.nu/uploads/images//profesora_3.jpg.
[45] Manning Marable, 45.
[46] Dagmar Schultz, "Witnessing Whiteness – ein persönliches Zeugnis", in *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte*, ed. Eggers, Kilomba, Piesche, Arndt (Münster: Unrast Verlag), 514–29.

ness to people with different backgrounds and varying access to the issue. Somehow we will need to acknowledge the difficulties white students will face by learning the meaning of white racisms and be aware of possible resistances to the issue and to reflect over our own resistances with regard to the topics that will come up.

It seems to us that the common discourse on racism – that turns the "other" into a problem and affirms the position of a white person as "normal" – is strongly integrated in people's perspectives and therefore a kind of "reality" we have to be aware of. Here, we are challenged by the problem of providing an environment where people are able to start from their current situatedness as well as by deciding where to draw up borderlines to perspectives which can be identified as actually racist or a repetition of stereotypes and prejudices. This is a point that we often discussed between ourselves when we were reflecting on how to deal with racist comments or jokes in our everyday lives. To what degree should we try to start from such examples or disregard them as bringing racial structures into the classroom, which is a hindrance to rather than being fruitful for a critical approach? Personal experience is important, but also difficult to abstract since experience is so close to ones' subjectivity. Therefore, we need to find a way to work on an understanding that allows people to see that experience is singular and already interpreted; Critical Whiteness theory offers important knowledge and perspectives to extend this framework of interpretation.

One of our aims is to try to disrupt the way students continue their "thinking as usual"[47] with regard to white racial privileges. As Juliane Strohstein reflects in her essay about being a white tutor in a mainly white classroom, teaching whiteness, it is all too easy to avoid the pain related to the encounter with one's own structurally racist position.[48] She had to face the feedback of non-white tutors who also attended her class and who considered that she tended to cover the seriousness of the actual theoretical approach by means of jokes which created a mood of release as well as encouraging bonding both among white students and between the students and herself. Instead of focussing more on feelings of unease, she reflects that she had offered a guarantee that the white privileged students would still remain "safe" in their privileged position.

[47] Cf. Emo Gotsbacher, "Schimpfklatsch und fremdenfeindliche Normalität. Identitätspolitik im Schatten der inneren Dynamik von Ausländerdiskursen", in *Trennlinien. Imaginationen des Fremden und Konstruktionen des Eigenen*, ed. Berghold, Menasse and Ottomeyer (Klagenfurt: Drava), 47–76.
[48] Strohstein, Juliane, "Als *weiße* Studierende in einer weißen Universität: erste Positionierungen", in *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte*, ed. Eggers, Kilomba, Piesche, Arndt (Münster: Unrast Verlag), 506–13.

However, although we want to involve (white) people personally, we do not want them to run away from our course. We need to find a kind of balance between dismantling feelings of (in-)security and providing enough security and trust to enable people to speak and reflect about whiteness. Here, security, even if "uneasy", might be established through our own involvement in self-reflection and in exposing ourselves to new and therefore "unsafe" ways of thinking. Instead of building upon bonding based on simple security, we want to work on a bonding based on the acknowledgement of each other's partial (self-)understanding with relation to white privileges and based on a common commitment to open ourselves up to our "blind spots".

White settings, as it is suggested in the example of the last paragraph, make the position of a white scholar much more secure than does an environment with students of different backgrounds. Thus, challenges in an only-white classroom are familiar and in this sense "secure" for white scholars who are teaching whiteness. For example, a possible bonding to provide security between white students would be extremely discriminatory towards non-white or white, but non-privileged, students and would support a well-known dichotomy. Such a situation would immediately pinpoint the limits and borders of our own implication. Teaching Critical Whiteness in classrooms with students of different (colour, cultural) backgrounds necessitates the inquiry into mechanism of "saming" and "othering" as well as at investigating the actual differences. Here we do not necessarily target the differences in cultural backgrounds, but look at differences of experience, perspectives and at needs in regard to re-approaching the hegemonic order of racial relations.

In order to start tracing such questions, we became interested in "Feminist Memory Work" and using it for a critical self-approach on whiteness. Traditionally Memory work has been used to raise awareness concerning the role of gender or more specifically femininity on a personal level, but it has recently been appropriated to make race visible where it has traditionally been invisible – often this is white in a predominant white context as most of the EU-countries. The Norwegian Sociologist Anne-Jorunn Berg suggests this strategy as a possible way out of this cul-de-sac.[49] The method of memory work is a double-edged strategy since it works both for the situatedness of the researcher and the researched – it has therefore strong affinity with Feminist stand point

---

[49] Anne-Jorunn Berg, "Silence and Articulation – Whiteness, Racialization and Feminist Memory Work", NORA – Nordic Journal Of Feminist and Gender Reseach, Vol. 16 No. 4 (2008), 213-27.

theories. This concept can be fruitfully adapted to a teaching methodology as Mia Liinason outlines in her chapter in this publication and can be read together with Iris van der Tuin examination from a historical perspective, of standpoint theories within Feminist theories. In this teaching method we locate great potential not only to involve students, but also teachers' memories and teaching activities that can be re-visited and discussed.

Approaching, understanding, teaching Critical Whiteness is not only about deconstructing white privilege. As shown with the metaphor of the alien: while the "other" physically suffers from discrimination by a society based on racial structures, privileged persons – to different degrees – enjoy the advantages of the system. As consequences of our own experiences of teaching, discussing and studying Critical Whiteness that are documented in this chapter, we have formulated the following features of a course on Critical Whiteness Studies with a focus on knowledge transfer:

- Including emotions as part of the inquiry into Critical Whiteness Studies
- Starting with one's personal experience to work on the broadening of one's own interpretative frame and therefore acknowledging one's partial knowledge of society.
- A high degree of interactivity that allows the participation of all the students in the classroom and demands that everyone, including teachers, put themselves into the position of being critically challenged and open to a self-critical perspective.

References

Benedict Anderson. *Die Erfindung der Nation – Zur Karriere eines folgenreichen Konzepts.* Frankfurt/New York: Reihe Campus, 1988.

Berg, Anne-Jorunn. "Silence and Articulation – Whiteness, Racialization and Feminist Memory Work." *NORA – Nordic Journal Of Feminist and Gender Research.* 16:4 (2008): 213–227.

Gray, Breda. "`Whitely scripts` and Irish women's racialized belonging(s) to England". *European Journal for Cultural Studies.* 5: 3 (2002): 257–274.

Gingrich, Andre. "Concepts of Race Vanishing, Movements of Racism Rising? Global Issues in an Austrian Ethnography." *ETHNOS.* 69:2 (2004): 156–176.

Gotsbacher, Emo. "Schimpfklatsch und fremdenfeindliche Normalität. Identitätspolitik im Schatten der inneren Dynamik von Ausländerdiskursen". In *Trennlinien. Imaginationen des Fremden und Konstruktionen des Eigenen*, edited by Berghold, Joe, Robert Menasse and Klaus Ottomeyer, 47–76. Klagenfurt: Drava, 2000.

Griffin, Gabriele and Rosi Braidotti. "Whiteness and European Situatedness". In *Thinking Differently. A Reader in European Women's Studies*, edited by Griffin, Gabriele and Rosi Braidotti, 221–236. London and New York: Zed Books 2002.

Gronold, Daniela. "´Wer denkt an die Opfer?` – Repräsentationen tschetschenischer EinwandererInnen in der österreichischen Mediennation." *MedienJournal.* 32:3 (2008): 31–40.

Hall, Stuart. When was the "Post-Colonial"? Thinking at the Limit. In *Divided Skies, Common Horizons,* edited by Curti, Lidia and Iain Chambers, 242–260. London, 1996.

Hall, Stuart. Kulturelle Identität und Globalisierung. In *Widerspenstige Kulturen*, edited by Hörnig, Karl H. and Rainer Winter, 393–441. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Taschenbuch, 1999.

Hall, Stuart. *Ideologie, Identität, Repräsentation – Ausgewählte Schriften 4.* Hamburg: Argument Verlag, 2004.

Haraway, Donna. *Reinvention of Nature.* New York: Routledge, 1991.

Hervik, Peter. On the new Racism in Europe. *ETHNOS*, 69: 2 (2004): 149-155.

Kilic, Sevgi, Sawitri Saharso and Birgit Sauer, Birgit. "Introduction: The Veil: Debating Citizenship, Gender and Religious Diversity." *Social Politics* 15:4 (2008): 400–440.

Lund Pedersen, Linda. Kønsforskellen og Neutralitet. (eng. Sexual Difference and Neutrality). *Kvinder, Køn og Forskning*, 4 (2008): 38-49.

Marable, Manning. "Whiter Whiteness – The Souls of White Folk". *Souls,* 4:4 (2002): 49.

Morrison, Toni. *Playing in the dark – whiteness and the literary imagination.* New York: Vintage books, 1992.

Räthzel, Nora. "Nationalism and Gender in West Europe: the German case". In, *Crossfires: Nationalism, Racism and Gender in Europe, edited by* Lutz, Helma, Ann Phoenix and Nira Yuval-Davis, 161–189. London: Pluto Press, 1995.

Schultz, Dagmar. "Witnessing Whiteness – ein persönliches Zeugnis". In *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte,* Eggers, Maureen Maisha et al., 514–529. Münster: Unrast Verlag, 2005.

Skeggs, Beverly. *Class, Self, Culture.* London: Routledge, 2004.

Strohstein, Juliane. "Als *weiße* Studierende in einer *weißen* Universität: erste Positionierungen". In *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte,* Eggers, Maureen Maisha et al., 506–513. Münster: Unrast Verlag, 2005.

Todorova, Maria. *Imagining the Balkans.* New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Wollrad, Eske. *Weißsein im Widerspruch.* Königstein and Taunus: Ulrike Helmer Verlag, 2005.

Wollrad, Eske. "Weißsein und Bundesdeutsche Genderstudies". In *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte,* Eggers, Maureen Maisha et al., 416–426. Münster: Unrast Verlag, 2005.

Woodward, Kathryn. *Identity and Difference.* London: Sage Publication, 1997.

"This Is Not Therapy!"
Un/Expected Encounters in Memory Work.
Notes from the Field of Feminist Teaching[1]

Mia Liinason

Abstract

Taking its departure in the experience of conducting memory work together with students, this chapter reflects over the (missing) links in the classroom between the theories that are presented in class and the students' expectations. With the aim of exploring how the expectations from the students influence the learning process when teaching feminism, this chapter focuses particularly on the resistance that was articulated in the classroom, understood as an expression of a more general narrative in feminism that revolved around the past, the location and aim of feminist work. This chapter also discloses how the split between theory (academy) and experience-based work (activism) functions as a restraint on the use of experience-based work in an academic context and how an un-reflected inheritance of second-wave feminist consciousness still guides feminist work in its aim to develop a critical consciousness. Moreover, this chapter suggests that the attainment of consciousness as a method to liberate the subject from oppression functions as a capturing trope in feminism which in and of itself constructs women as innocent victims of oppression who are in the need of empowerment through consciousness-raising. Finally, this chapter underlines the importance of making classroom assumptions explicit in teaching, as well as critically evaluating the history of the theories used in the context of teaching.

Introduction

Last summer, I co-conducted a workshop together with students in memory work as an auto-biographical method that enables critical reflection over social experience. Things that occurred during this workshop kept me thinking about how memory work can/cannot be used in the context of teaching. The experiences from this workshop also kept me pondering over conceptions of 'femi-

---

[1] I would like to give my warmest acknowledgements to the members of the Interdisciplinarities-group in Travelling Concepts, a working group in the Advanced Thematic Network of Women's Studies in Europe, see http://www.athena3.org.

nism' in the classroom. Thus, while I decided to continue to critically evaluate and try out the use of the method in the context of teaching, I also decided to make myself more familiar with feminist pedagogy and the implicit assumptions that exist among feminist teachers and students. How do we position ourselves? How do we understand and relate to each other? And, above all, how this is related to the theories deployed in the classroom?

Clearly, the implicit assumptions that are made in a classroom which is understood as feminist both connect with the location of the subject field in the academic space and also with feminism's past. But those tacit agreements also connect with ideas about the aim of feminism. What possibilities/impossibilities are created through the ideas of feminism in the classroom? What are the expectations from the students and teachers? What kind of knowledge can or cannot, be developed out from those assumptions? Is it possible to traverse, and even transcend notions of feminism in the classroom?

As pointed out by Iris van der Tuin in the first chapter to this volume, the categorisations first-, second- and third-wave feminism, indeed, the mere idea of 'generations' in feminism, have been much criticized by feminists. Interestingly, van der Tuin identifies precisely *this criticism* – generationality as dualist and teleological – as an Oedipal gesture belonging to the second-wave.[2] In her conceptualisation of the third-wave, she presents a generation of feminists who are capable of *thinking through* second-wave feminism, that is, working with rather than against second-wave feminism (an an-Oedipal relationality).[3] As van der Tuin claims, this gesture singles out a cartographical methodology of third-wave feminism that, instead of using a dualist model, works through dis-identification, in which the second-wave generation is both affirmed and traversed.[4] In this chapter, I focus on how pedagogy has been affected by this generation of feminism, and particularly the difficulties that can arise because of implicit assumptions among feminist teachers and students about the past, location and aim of feminism. Through paying attention to the resistance from students to particular exercises in class, in this chapter I analyse a more general narrative within feminism that can function as a constraint to the theories that are deployed in class. I also suggest that it is important to ex-

---

[2] Iris van der Tuin, "Third-wave feminist theory's generational logic: affirmation and anti-representationalism" (2009), see this volume 22.
[3] Ibid, 27.
[4] Ibid, 28.

plicitly address this narrative in order to be able to traverse through and beyond notions of feminism in the classroom. Since the argument in this chapter takes its departure in a workshop where we used memory work, I will start with a short introduction to the methodology of memory work.

Introducing memory work: a method aimed at studying how we become the persons we are

Memory work is a feminist method and methodology introduced by a group of academic feminists in Germany, in the end of the 1970s.[5] The first published volume in English on memory work is entitled *Female Sexualization*, and was the second volume on memory work published by the collective of authors.[6] Memory work, as it is explained by Haug et al., is a visualization of how experience interacts with social context and how it is always embedded in particular situations, relations and structures. The method is based on auto-biographical stories, where the research collective's own personal memories constitute the material to be collectively analysed.

While the poststructuralist critique asserts that there is no experience that is not already discursively constructed, the memory work collective also acknowledges a similar kind of anti-essentialism. This however is not at all focused on the fractions that are characteristic for poststructuralists, but on matter and materiality and is engaged in a study of the effects on women's socialization of colonized discourses, structures and relations.[7] To this group of scholars, any attempt to fix femininity – irrespective if the aim was to lock femininity in, or if it was to rescue femininity – was problematic. Indeed, every "naturalistic and ahistorical conception in which the body appears as the guardian of femininity's ultimate truths" was rejected by this collective of scholars.[8]

---

[5] Frigga Haug et al. *Female sexualization. A Collective Work of Memory*, (London: Verso, 1987), 33-72.

[6] The German title of the book is Frauenformen. Alltagsgeschichten und Entwurf einer Theorie weiblicher Sozialisation, ed. Frigga Haug 1980, and it is published at AS 45, Berlin/W. Recently, Frigga Haug has published a short article titled "Memory work", see *Australian Feminist Studies* (2008), 23:58, 537-541, and published the chapter "Memory work: A detailed rendering of the method for social science research," in the volume *Dissecting the mundane: International perspectives on memory-work*, ed. Adrienne E. Hyle et al., (MD: University Press of America 2008).

[7] Frigga Haug, "Memory Work", in *Female sexualization. A Collective Work of Memory*, ed. Frigga Haug et. al. (London: Verso, 1987), 54.

[8] Erica Carter, "Translators foreword", in *Female sexualization. A Collective Work of Memory* ed. Haug et. al (London: Verso, 1987), 13.

As a method, memory work focuses on the processes of the social world, and the aim of the method is "to make the process itself the object of discussion, how we work our way through and into ideology."[9] Through this process, individuals are formed but the social structures are reconstructed as well.

Experience, they write, "may be seen as the lived practice in the memory of a self-constructed identity. It is structured by expectations, norms and values, in short by the dominant culture".[10] Still, the authors did not regard individuals as being completely the victims of a structure, instead, they emphasized an element of resistance in people's experiences, in "the human capacity for action [which] leads individuals to attempt to live along their own meanings and find self-fulfilment".[11]

In memory work, theory is mixed with and becomes a part of the everyday narrative. In this way, the collective of authors was able to define the context – structurally, relationally, practically – within which their selves became meaningful. In this way, Haug et. al explain, memory work functions as a bridge to span the gap between theory and experience. Here, experiences as such are not understood as foundational for the forming of the self, but experiences are seen as produced in and through a social world.[12] Haug writes:

> Since it is as individuals that we interpret and suffer our lives, our experiences appear unique and thus of no value for scientific analysis. The mass character of social processes is obliterated within the concept of individuality. Yet we believe that the notion of the uniqueness of experience and of the various ways in which it is consciously assessed is a fiction. The number of possibilities for action open to us is radically limited. We live according to a whole series of imperatives: social pressures, natural limitations, the imperative of economic survival, the given conditions of history and culture. Human beings produce their lives collectively.[13]

The memory work collective wanted to avoid the uni-dimensional perception of power and the homogenizing view of women as victims which was present in second-wave feminism at large and, for instance, visible in early standpoint theory. Building on ideas put forward by Marx, Freud and Foucault,

---

[9] Haug, 33, 41.
[10] Ibid. 42.
[11] Ibid. 35, 42.
[12] Carter, 16, Haug, 52.
[13] Haug: 43, 44.

the memory work collective understood women as active "co-producers in the relations and organisations of oppression".[14]

This collective of authors understand autobiographical story telling as representations of the social judgements and prejudices we carry. In that way, these stories also serve as models for an interpretation of the world. Through autobiographical stories, the authors attempt to denaturalize existing value judgements – around femininity, the body, sexualization, etc. – and to study the processes by which we become the persons we are. Through the emphasis on the collective, the distinction between the subject and the object of research is questioned, but the collective enterprise also affects the analysis of the memories.[15] Thus instead of developing a discourse of individualism, the memory-work authors stressed the collective in our experiences and in the forming of ourselves.

Clashes in feminist teaching: Memory work in pedagogic practice

I had recently started to use memory work myself, and had only held one workshop when I decided to use it in class. Yet, before that, I had had the opportunity to be tutored in the method by Joke Esseveld, one of those who introduced it in the Nordic countries and who also had done memory work together with Frigga Haug. I conducted the workshop together with two experienced teachers, even though none of them had done memory work before. We regarded the use of the method as an experimental way to critically reflect over how experiences (or rather, the interpretations of them) are connected with social context. The workshop was given at an international and interdisciplinary intensive program for master students in gender studies. With scheduled sessions from 9-17 every day in ten days, the intensive program really lived up to its name. The memory work workshop took place on day 7 of the course, which meant that we knew each other quite well at that point of time. But the time factor also involved an element of exhaustion in both students and teachers. The interdisciplinary teaching and discussions demanded a high level of attention from students and teachers. However, the language question was an issue too, which increased the feeling of exhaustion during the middle-days of the course. Besides this, the social aspect also had an influ-

---

[14] Carter, 17.
[15] Haug, 36, 48, 49.

ence on the teaching. This was because various kinds of emotions were present during the ten days of the course – from the early days of the course when people were eager to get to know each other, over some days of closer friendship, to a certain level of tiredness in the social relations that occurred on day 7 and 8 of the course.

Partly because of the different levels of knowledge between the students, and partly because of our view of knowledge not as accumulated mass, but as understanding arising through experience and thinking, we wanted the students to reflect on various perspectives of knowledge already at their disposal, to highlight complexities and introduce different theoretical frameworks in order to increase the level of understanding. This meant that the teaching process during the course could be regarded as experimental, and students who were used to lectures on books or theories probably perceived these sessions as a bit confusing at the start.

As a group of co-teachers, we had scheduled the days of the course around different concepts, that in our view are key to gender studies, such as 'politics', 'knowledge', 'interdisciplinarity' and 'sex/gender'. Day 7 of the course was dedicated to 'experience', and during that day we wanted to discuss why experience has been important for feminist theory. The ambition was to show that experiences, are always already interpretations, and as such cultural and historical, but that – despite this – it is necessary to take experiences into account and reflect on them. With the ambition to have the students think critically about experience, ontology and epistemology, we decided that we should start the day with a hands-on exercise in memory work before we gave our lecture.

After a brief introduction to the method, we asked everyone to write a few pages on a concrete memory they had from a particular situation. As one important feature of the method is that everyone shall have a personal memory of the situation, we first tried to find a situation about which every participant would have a concrete memory. We had prepared different suggestions to the group, such as "Going with public transport", "Getting dressed", "Cooking for someone else" and "Entering the university for the first time", but the whole group – all in all we were 26 persons – both teachers and students took part in the exercise – couldn't agree on a common situation. Thus, we decided to split the group into three smaller groups, in order to find a suitable situation to write about. Later on, it turned out that two of the groups had decided to

choose the theme "Cooking for someone else" while the third group chose "Entering the university for the first time". Nevertheless, already during the first phase of the method – when everyone writes down a memory from a concrete situation – some students reacted very strongly against the method. One student started to cry, and left the room. She described her reaction to the teacher who accompanied their group as a mixture of different things. Taking part in the group who wrote about "Cooking for someone else", her feeling of homesickness became too strong. But she was also angry over the method, because, as she said, "This is not therapy!" and at the same time, she explained that she did not have enough trust in this group to be able to take part in this kind of exercise. Another student explained that she became angry because she felt forced to take part in this method, but that she had realized too late that she did not want to participate (so she had stayed in class). During the closing slot, when we discussed the analysis and reflected over the day, a third student felt a need to leave the classroom. During the closing session of the workshop, the classroom was filled with emotions of different kinds – anger, sadness, surprise, curiosity – with the result that many of the students and some of the other teachers in the group, too, felt somewhat sceptical about the method.

At different stages during the day, the students returned to the comparison with therapy. Some were surprised that we wanted to work with this kind of method on an academic course. One student said: "I have been to feminist therapy, and I liked it, but that was in a group outside of the academy". Why did they return to this notion of therapy? And why was it difficult for the students to grasp the difference between a therapeutic method and this research method? On the one hand, it is not difficult to see the similarities between memory work and feminist therapy – both methods work with the same material, that is, our memories and experiences. On the other hand, that is also the only thing that the two modes of procedure have in common. If feminist therapy has a curative function, where the aim is to heal and strengthen the individual against oppressive structures and relations, memory work has other aims: to understand how we work ourselves into the structures. Indeed, memory work is built upon a profound scepticism against the idea of "individuality". The uniqueness of experience – as well as the aspiration for consciousness – is stated as a fiction by the memory work collective who wants to investigate how we construct meaning about our selves in and through a social world. So, why did some of the students return to the notion of therapy

when we wanted them to do memory work? Maybe they didn't listen carefully enough; maybe we didn't explain this as clearly as it could have been explained. But the comparison remains, and I pay it some attention here because I think that it pinpoints an unresolved issue in feminism. Indeed, the misconception of memory work, the spontaneous associations to therapy, and the resistance to working with a therapeutic method, reveals some links to the feminism of the second-wave that can stand in the way for the theories that are deployed in the classroom today and of the ways feminism can be generated.

Why therapy? Feminism's past and locations of feminism

In feminist theory and activism, consciousness has been a central concept, and indeed so during the second-wave feminism. Nevertheless, and as Norma Alarcón writes, the idea of consciousness still shapes the form and content of much feminist work.[16] In the 1970s, Catherine MacKinnon argued that consciousness-raising was "*the* feminist method" through which women are "led to know the world in a different way ".[17] And standpoint theorists, like many feminists of the second-wave, deployed the idea of consciousness without any closer investigation of its history. Theoretically, the base for the idea of consciousness that was developed among feminists was the Marxist idea about class consciousness, a form of consciousness that Erica Sherover-Marcuse smoothly translates into an 'emancipatory consciousness'. She further defines the Marxist emancipatory consciousness as "the forms of subjectivity that tend towards a rupture with the historical system of domination". More specifically, she explains this as "those attitudes, character traits, beliefs and dispositions that are both conducive to and supportive of the sort of radical social transformation that the young Marx characterizes as 'universal human emancipation'".[18] Still, ideas of emancipatory, or class, consciousness are not only restricted to Marx and Marxism, but can also be understood as a more general narrative in the imaginary of modernism. In a reading of Lukács's idea on proletarian consciousness, Rey Chow shows how the move from oppression to self-awakening and liberation that appear in Lukács's writings on consciousness constructs

---

[16] Norma Alarcón, "The Theoretical Subject(s) of This Bridge Called My Back and Anglo-American Feminism", in *The Second Wave. A Reader in Feminist Theory*, ed. Linda Nicholson (London: Routledge, 1997), 289.
[17] Ibid. 293.
[18] Erica Sherover-Marcuse, *Emancipation and Consciousness. Dogmatic and Dialectical Perspectives in the Early Marx*, (London: Basil Blackwell, 1986), 1.

a particular narrative of captivity that Chow describes as a historical and discursive construct characteristic of a post-Enlightenment era. Understood as a metaphor of a general narrative in a "modernist imaginary", Chow thus suggests that the narratives about captivity and liberation need to be "rehistoricized as a modernist invention".[19]

However, the feminist critique of the Marxist ignorance of women's conditions led feminists to produce a notion of a particular 'feminist consciousness'. The feminist consciousness is described as an "anguished consciousness", and, as explained by Sandra Bartky, characterized by victimization. The feminist consciousness involves a divided consciousness which means, according to Bartky, that it involves the knowledge "that I have already sustained injury, that I live exposed to injury, that I have been at worst mutilated, at best diminished in my being". But, Bartky adds, it also contains a "joyous consciousness of one's own power, of the possibility of unprecedented personal growth and the release of energy long suppressed".[20] Those elements – victimization and empowerment – were also the basic constituents in the various consciousness-raising groups, the bitch sessions and rap groups of the second-wave. And even though there is a great variety in the forms and methods used in the different groups, they were all characterized by the idea that all women share a common oppression and that men are the oppressors.[21]

In Chicago in 1968, Kathie Sarachild presented a model for consciousness-raising divided into seven steps: 1) Individual confession (which was explicitly stated as therapeutic); 2) Generalizations out from the individual stories (to gain political insight); 3) Awareness of oppression; 4) Treatment of personal experiences together with the group; 5) Understanding and development of a radical feminist theory; 6) Training in organising other groups; 7) Organisation.[22] As many know, though, the consciousness-raising groups often got stuck in the therapeutic phase, which meant that the discussions

---

[19] Rey Chow, *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (Princeton: Columbia University Press, 2002), 39.

[20] Sandra Lee Bartky, *Femininity and Domination. Studies in the phenomenology of oppression* (New York & London: Routledge, 1990), 14-5.

[21]   Jo Freeman, "The Tyranny of Structurelessness" (paper presentation at the Southern Female Rights Union conference, in Beulah, Mississippi, May, 1970), 2, accessed at 090220.

http://www.uic.edu/orgs/cwluherstory/jofreeman/joreen/tyranny.htm; Göran Ivarsson et al., "Basgrupper inom kvinnorörelsen" unpublished essay Dept of Gender Studies, Göteborg: Göteborg university,, 1980, 12; "We are the feminists that (Wo)men have warned us about", (introductory paper prepared for the Radical Feminist Day Workshop at White Lion Free School, April 8th, 1979).

[22] Göran Ivarsson et al, "Basgrupper inom kvinnorörelsen" (paper at the Department for Gender Studies, Göteborg: Göteborg university, 1980), 15.

in the consciousness-raising groups did not lead to organisation and political action. Besides, the therapeutic element in the groups could function in such a way as to directly hamper political action. Nevertheless, in April 1979, a radical feminist workshop was held at the White Lion Free School. Here, as in many other feminist spaces during this epoch, the notion of consciousness-raising was brought up for discussion. On this occasion, the speakers commented upon the problem that consciousness-raising so easily resulted in what was a merely "confidence-raising exercise".[23] Still the agreement was, nonetheless, that consciousness-raising should continue to be the base for the movement and the speakers emphasized the importance of consciousness-raising groups. They urged that "all members of Women's Liberation should be in an initial CR [consciousness-raising] group and should continue with it as long as they continue to identify with the Women's Liberation Movement."[24] Already during its hey-day, consciousness-raising was thus strongly connected with its therapeutical function, and this was a function that was difficult to exceed.

Indeed, I do believe that the (mis)conceptions that occurred during our intensive program, where the memory work exercise was taken for a therapeutic session, reveals the deep embeddedness of the idea that experience-based work has a therapeutic function that can liberate us from oppression. But even though this might be valid for the way experiences were handled in the consciousness-raising sessions, this must not be true for all experience-based work. The resistance to the method ("This is not therapy!") was a complex resistance, however, as first of all it can be seen, by way of association, as a reconstruction of a connection between experience-based work and therapy.

The division between theory and experience-based work, in return, is a well-known division among academic feminists, in which theoretical work is seen as "abstract and rational and male" and experience is represented as "practical and emotional and female".[25] Here, experience-based work is identified with the working methods of the women's movement in the 1960s and 1970s, i.e. to consciousness-raising. Defenders of this division often mourn the loss of those working methods, and, in a nostalgic vein, express

---

[23] Amanda Sebastien, "Tendencies in the movement. Then and now. (Paper prepared for the Radical Feminist Day Workshop at White Lion Free School, April 8, 1979).

[24] Gail Chester, "I Call Myself a Radical Feminist", (paper prepared for the Radical Feminist Day Workshop at White Lion Free School, April 8, 1979).

[25] Diana Mulinari, "Learning to teach feminism(s)", in *Undervisning i kvinno- och könsforskning i Norden.* (rapport från symposium i Stockholm, Forum för kvinnoforskning, Stockholms universitet, 28-29 September 1998, Stockholm), 42, 46.

their distress over the successful institutionalisation of women's/gender studies into the academy. Detached from activism's political practices and squeezed into academy's abstract theory, as it is described, the institutionalisation of feminism into the academy is said to have shaped the subject field into the form of a proper academic subject. Nancy A. Naples writes that

> the institutionalization of Women's Studies in the academy constrains the development of collective political action that characterized the CR [consciousness raising] groups of the 1970s. With power differentials between teachers and students and among students, and the surveillance of Women's Studies curriculum by bureaucratic bodies within the academy, feminist faculty often find it difficult to incorporate the 'commitment to praxis' in their classrooms.[26]

These accounts of pedagogy in women's/gender studies represent the practice of "academic teaching" as one that builds up hierarchies between the students and the teacher, constructing the teacher as an Expert through mechanisms of authority. On the other hand, feminist pedagogy is understood as an enterprise whose goal it is to develop "a critical consciousness", to empower the students and provide them with "the ability to call into question taken-for-granted ways of understanding their social, political, economic and academic life".[27] Nevertheless, even if described as apocalyptic by Robyn Wiegman, these accounts of feminist pedagogy are really a form of address that equates feminism with the feminist struggle of the 1960s and 1970s, and which results in a re/production of divisions between activism, theory and politics. Wiegman writes:

> Indeed, I want to go so far as to claim […] that any attempt to write movement subjectivity as the field's origin and reproductive goal is not simply wrong headed but counterproductive precisely because it generates *as a disciplinary imperative* a certain understanding of the political (and with it the relation between theory and activism).[28]

The idea of a split between academy and activism does indeed rest upon a dualist understanding of experience-based work versus theory. Accordingly, when the students resisted using memory work, which they apprehended

---

[26] Nancy A. Naples, "Negotiating the Politics of Experiential Learning in Women's Studies: Lessons from the Community Action Project", in *Women's Studies on Its Own*, ed. Robyn Wiegman, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002), 387.

[27] Wiegman, 383.

[28] Robyn Wiegman, "Academic Feminist Against Itself", *NWSA Journal* 14: 2 (2002), 26.

as a therapeutic method, they not only reaffirmed a particular notion of *feminism's past* through associating experience-based work with therapy, they also reacted against the *location* of this exercise. Through their referral of "feminist therapy"/"experience-based work" to a space outside of the academy, the students expressed their expectations that academic feminism would work with theory (which was understood as different from experience-based work). Consequently, since it was conceived as a kind of work that "belongs" to an arena outside of the academy, some of the students refused to take part in an exercise that worked with our own stories as the material.

In effect, when efforts to transgress and travel beyond certain notions of feminism are not explicitly commented upon, it may very well be that, they are mistaken for precisely that which they wish to overcome. In a teaching context, the implications of those implicit notions of feminism's past and of feminism's location, can result not only in missing links but also in problematic misconceptions about the theories that are deployed in class – which also was the case when the students (mis)conceived memory work as a therapeutic method seeking a reconstruction of the subject as the origin, aiming to strengthen the subject against oppressive structures and relations.

Dislocations: the investment in human consciousness

Nevertheless, our efforts to have our students to reflect over their own intertwinedness in the dominant structures – instead of having them reach consciousness and be liberated from those pressing structures – resulted in resistance from our students. In addition to the student's ideas of feminism's past and location, that became disrupted through the introduction of this exercise, I would argue, as also Robyn Wiegman has argued, that this resistance also is connected to notions of a more general investment in human consciousness. But this investment, expressed through a search for the subject-of-consciousness, is not only present in academic feminism – it is also the meaning of the humanities at large and other interpretative sciences.[29] Students and teachers in women's/gender studies have been trained in and themselves taken part in the re/production of this meaning of consciousness at different locations in the academy. In effect, they have been trained to give the achievement of consciousness a value, but they have not been asked to critically historicize the notion of conscious-

---

[29] Wiegman, 22, 28.

ness as built upon Western, individualist norms. In addition, the widespread belief that women's/gender studies will provide students with knowledge about how to liberate the subject from oppressive structures, relations and norms, feed the very idea that it is through the aspiration for consciousness that the journey can start. Nevertheless, there is an implicit agreement between students and teachers to seldom explicitly mention the reaching of consciousness as a goal. On the other hand it is mirrored in the learning practises, through students' personal testimonies of experiences of oppression and teachers' assignments where students are asked to reflect over their own experiences. Consequently, situated in a larger discourse – politically, socially and geographically – where individuation and consciousness is proclaimed as *the* liberating strategy – the students in our intensive program had difficulties with the aim of memory work. Instead of giving them support in working towards a larger individual independence from experiences of oppression, from dominant structures and social pressure, we actually asked them to do the opposite – to investigate and understand the hegemonies at work, and their involvement in them.

Interestingly, Susan Heald, a Canadian feminist scholar, who has been doing memory work in her classes, realized that her students – who were mainly white, middle-class and heterosexual – did not need to be empowered through consciousness-raising. What they needed was " an analysis, a decentering of the 'self' and a recognition of how that 'self' has been formed in opposition to and through the exclusion of an imagined Other.[30] In her apprehension of conscious-ness-raising as one of the working methods *prima facie* of the second-wave femi-nism, Heald marks a distance to the focus on consciousness in Western femi-nism, and urges her students to investigate their own experiences, not to find the sublime figure of Western feminism, the "real" woman, but to explore dominant structures and their own participation in the re/construction of them.

Notably, because of an inability, or unwillingness even, to examine one's own involvement in power structures, social processes and its material effects, the efforts to (re)create woman as a conscious subject has supported a silencing or exclusion of non-Western, lesbian or working class women Susan Heald explains as follows:

---

[30] Susan Heald, "'Just My Opinion'" Women's Studies, Autobiographies and the University", in *Troubling Women's Studies. Pasts, Presents, and Possibilities* ed. Susan Heald et. al (Toronto, Ontario: Sumach Press, 2004),48, cf Haug, 41, 48, 49.

"Empowerment has, however, sometimes, been taken to mean the promotion of equality of opportunity and participation. Similarly, empowerment has been used in other contexts to imply the development of individualism and the skills required for self-assertion and advancement rather than any analysis of the roots of powerlessness and the structures of systemic oppression.[31]

In effect, the articulation of women and men as opposites in the consciousness-raising working groups implies a binary between women and men, which also is upheld and strengthened through this mere articulation. The notion of women as innocent victims of patriarchal structures also homogenizes women and treats them as infallible. But the mere aim of consciousness-raising, to reach liberation from oppression or captivity, takes its departure in the idea of the subject as "Origin, Essence and Cause", like Althusser formulates it[32]. As such, the autonomous, self-conscious subject at the core of the ideals of the Enlightenment was the privilege of men for many years and they also were the subjects of knowledge. Subsequently, although, feminist work made women the subject of knowledge, they only scantily questioned the "inherited view of consciousness".[33]

Curiously, the idea of consciousness-raising was initially also used by memory workers. As described by the memory work collective, they start off from the idea of making the process of socialization conscious, because "this makes clear the process whereby we have absorbed existing social scientific theories, ideologies and everyday opinions".[34] Nevertheless, having done this, they start to question the usefulness of consciousness-raising and decide to distance themselves from the idea of consciousness. Through the explicit urge to find a "less predetermined way of seeing" they describe how they try to combine both the knowledge from everyday life and scholarly, theoretical knowledge, aiming to a "displacement of the problem".[35] Thus, even though they depart from in the idea of consciousness, they do not find any solution to the problem in raising the individual's consciousness. Instead, they turn to the Foucauldian idea of discourses, to investigations into the colonizing effects from "theories, explanations, value judgements" and in explorations of "colonized forms" of perception[36] in order to investigate how individuals work themselves into

---

[31] Heald, 47.
[32] Althusser quoted in Alarcón , 290, Alarcón,, 295.
[33] Ibid, 289.
[34] Haug, 54.
[35] Ibid, 54.
[36] Ibid, 55.

social, cultural and economical structures. Placed within a Marxist framework, the collective of authors points out how the individual is tied up in these structures. Simultaneously, and inspired by Althusser's theorizations of ideology, they emphasize the fact that the individual is not only a victim of the social relations, but an active agent in the forming of these social relations. Haug explains that this results in a situation where women, for instance, can defend the idea of life-long monogamous marriages even though the marriage is loveless and very boring. If one does not want to reject the belief in love and if life-long monogamous marriages are the only accepted form of love in the society in question, the decision to defend the idea of life-long monogamous marriages is understood by Haug et al. as one way to find self-fulfilment.[37] The view of women as victims, which was predominant during second-wave feminism, is criticized by the collective of authors, who instead emphasize a focus on "beings who desire and have a capacity to become something they are not as yet".[38] Herewith, they distance themselves from structuralism's fixation with class, gender and race as different but immutable social and cultural positions and focus instead on the multiple sites that are involved in the production of positions/relations such as class, gender and race.[39] Seeing that a number of dualisms, such as the division of labour between head/hand, the division of mind/body, and the division between theoretical/practical, leads to an incapacity to explain the world, the collective of authors breaks with those dualisms, hoping to "produce articulations of the relations between human beings and the world that overcome the present relations of class, race and sexual domination".[40] In effect, Haug writes, the method results in a "displacement of the problem"[41] and a decentering of the (Westernized) self.

Feminism and the trope of consciousness

During the day of the workshop, we were divided into three small groups when we wrote and analysed our memories. In the group who decided to write about "Entering the university for the first time", the writing phase and analysis developed without any unexpected reactions. In the group, there was a slight

---

[37] Ibid, 35, 42.
[38] Ibid, 25.
[39] On this point, the collective of authors were inspired by Angela McRobbie's work on girl culture, which was understood as a culture of femininity which the girls help to reproduce, Carter, 16, 17.
[40] Haug, 28.
[41] Ibid, 55.

fascination with the strong commonalities between the different memories – even though this was the most heterogeneous group of them all, considered in terms of age, ethnicity, sex and sexuality. Curiously, we noted that no one had mentioned anything about knowledge in their memories of entering the university for the first time, but that all the memories were centred on inclusion/exclusion in a social context. The two groups who wrote about "Cooking for someone else" found that the topic brought about strong emotions, both in the form of spontaneous emotional attachment to the memory itself, and in the form of a curious resistance to the stereotypically gendered actions that the memories/analysis exposed (after all, many of the participants had a deep investment in gender equality). The discussion in one of those groups – the group where one student started to cry – came to focus on how to handle issues of ethics in teaching/research. The participators in all the groups, were fascinated, nonetheless, by the possibility to treat the memories – also their own memories – as objects, and not as personal testimonies of an experience to which anyone 'owned' the 'right' interpretation. Even though some of the students also found this painful, it gave them an insight into the vulnerability of research subjects when collecting and analysing narratives from interviews, for example. When the three small groups reassembled into one large group after a short break, all the groups commented upon the process. Some were fascinated by the exercise because they had learnt a lot, theoretically, methodologically and ethically, while others were critical and found the method too experimental for this kind of group. This was because of the lack of trust between members of the group, because the workshop was mandatory, and because of the expectations attached to an academic course in gender studies. Afterwards, some students reported that they had found the closing session very problematic and that they had problems with listening to the conversation, much less contributing to it.

At the end of the day, the mix of emotions, confusion, anger, surprise and curiosity in the group was thought-provoking – especially considering that the theoretical point of departure of the method (that we work ourselves into social structures) really is everyday-knowledge for most of the students (that is, Master students in gender studies). This is particularly curious when thinking of how much emotions and personal narratives 'regular' lectures about gender usually raise. On such occasions, students are often very keen to share their own narratives of gendered experiences, to support or challenge the teacher's argument.[42]

---

[42] Mulinari, 43.

In this workshop, though, the students reacted with resistance to the sharing of personal experiences. Why did this happen? In the short introduction to the method before we divided into groups and started to write, we described how memory work marks a distance from the subject's aspiration for consciousness of oppression. Instead of aspiring to liberate the subject from subordination, we underlined, this method give us an opportunity to investigate how we create ourselves through social structures, but also to understand our participation in the creation of those social structures.

Considering how some of the reactions against the method, as described in earlier sections of this chapter, did construct a particular relation to feminism's past (theory versus experience-based work), where ideas of the "right" location of a certain kind of feminism were developed (the academy or outside of the academy), it is clear that some of the students found it difficult to accept the way this method wanted to blur the boundaries between experience-based work, theory, academy and the world outside the academy. In addition, when the mere *aim with feminism* is understood as a liberation of women from oppression, I can imagine that the ideas of memory work are even more difficult to grasp. In that case, the reaching of self-consciousness – or, more correctly, to learn its methods – will be understood as the aim with the feminism that is deployed in the classroom. In effect, such a perspective gives the reaching of consciousness in feminism status as a safe trajectory, even if it is not the "right" one. But if this trajectory is mistaken for feminism, a deviation from the beaten track would involve a fear that feminism will loose track of its aim.

While much of the theorizing on the reaching of consciousness in feminist theory refers back to Catharine MacKinnon, who stated that consciousness raising was *the* feminist method, as earlier mentioned, I here want to address two more recent readings of MacKinnon's theory of consciousness. Through this, I aim to give the debate around the notion of consciousness in feminist theory a contextual frame but also to inquire how consciousness has been understood in those two rejoinders to MacKinnon's theory, and also in what ways those understandings can contribute to an understanding of the reactions from the students at the course.

In "Eccentric Subjects: Feminist Theory and Historical Consciousness", Teresa de Lauretis comments upon MacKinnon's version of radical feminism. Here she understands "consciousness as product and the form of feminist

91

practice".[43] She explains MacKinnon's thoughts about consciousness raising in the following words: "MacKinnon's suggestion that feminist consciousness can grasp the personal, subjective effects of class or race relations, as it knows the personal yet collective effects of gender relations, is one I find more hopeful [than Althusser's understanding of the link between ideology and consciousness] as well as more accurate and consonant with my own view of the position of the feminist subject vis-a-vis the ideology of gender".[44] Still, she argues, MacKinnon's emphasis on heterosexuality and its connections to male power locks the theory of consciousness inside this very structure. Thus, de Lauretis suggests: "I propose that a point of view, or an eccentric discursive position outside the male (hetero)sexual monopoly of gender/knowledge … is necessary to feminism at this point in history".[45] Consequently, she suggests that we turn to the idea of "political consciousness" which she understands as a much less pure position and as such ideologically intertwined with the oppressive orders and actions. This form of consciousness, de Lauretis continues, "is neither unified nor singly divided between positions of masculinity and femininity, but multiply organized across positions on several axes of difference and across discourses and practices that may be, and often are, mutually contradictory".[46] de Lauretis concludes with the argument that consciousness can only exist historically "in the here and now, as the consciousness of a 'something else'" – as an excessive critical position that travels across boundaries between "sociosexual identities and communities, between bodies and discourses".[47]

While critiquing MacKinnon for locking the theory of consciousness within a heterosexual framework, de Lauretis chooses to retain the idea of the subject as the origin, through a creation of an eccentric subject. Here, de Lauretis' further develops her ideas that are built upon assumptions of a subject that is "conscious about something else" and thus understood as existing before the encounter with the boundaries that the same subject is travelling between or across. Even though she acknowledges a certain element of "impurity" in this form of consciousness (through the intermingledness between consciousness and oppressive orders) the eccentric subject who is expected to reach this consciousness is nonetheless conceived as something that

---

[43] Teresa de Lauretis, "Eccentric Subjects: Feminist Theory and Historical Consciousness", in *Feminist Studies*, vol. 16, issue 1 (1990), 120.
[44] Ibid, 121.
[45] Ibid, 123.
[46] Ibid, 130.
[47] Ibid, 133, 134.

precedes the encounter, and not as constituted through the encounters with the "identities", communities", "bodies" and "discourses" that she is referring to. Logically, it is this non-normative subject that de Lauretis urges me to reach consciousness about.

In her *Cyborg manifesto,* also Donna Haraway presents a reading of MacKinnon's theory of consciousness. Here, Haraway describes MacKinnon's feminism as an authoritarian version of radical feminism. Indeed, she explains it as "a caricature of the appropriating, incorporating, totalizing tendencies of Western theories of identity grounding action".[48] To Haraway, MacKinnon understands men's sexual exploitation of women as the cause for the structure of sex and sexuality. But the implications of this, Haraway continues, is that MacKinnon builds her ontology upon a non-being, where someone else's desire – not the self's labour – forms the origin of "woman". This "teleological logic" in MacKinnon's theory, Haraway adds, results in an apocalyptic theory of experience, where difference is erased or policed.[49]

Through a construction of a subject that is not categorized as masculine or feminine, homosexual or heterosexual on beforehand, de Lauretis as well wanted to avoid this ignorance of difference in MacKinnon's theory. But while de Lauretis kept hold of the (eccentric) subject as origin in her idea of the "political consciousness", Haraway understands the subject as constituted through the labour of the self. Instead of understanding the reaching for consciousness as a search for the discovery of a subject's "true" history aside, beyond or in opposition to, the propaganda from the ruling regime, Haraway further develops the Marxist view of *praxis*, in which the subject is understood as constituted through its encounters with the social world and where consciousness is described as "an achievement".[50]

While Haraway then is critiquing all possible ideas of origin and innocence in her Cyborg Manifesto, where she understands the attainment of consciousness as a painful realization of one's own participation in oppressive structures and practices, both MacKinnon and de Lauretis re/construct a narrative of consciousness which functions as a capturing trope in feminism. This is a trope that in itself reproduces a fiction of the innocent subject, who

---

48 Donna Haraway, "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century," in *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (Routledge: New York, 1991), 159, http://www.stanford.edu/dept/HPS/Haraway/CyborgManifesto.html (accessed February 20, 2009)
49 Ibid, 150.
50 Ibid.

has been exposed to subjection by oppressive structures in the production of which she herself has not taken part. In MacKinnon's version, this narrative offers a spirit of unity among women, through the establishment of a common ground in feminism and activated by an awareness of (internalized) oppression. This could also be phrased as: women are subordinated by heteropatriarchy. In de Lauretis' engagement with MacKinnon's theory, the idea of political consciousness offers a common goal in feminism, in which the aspiration for knowledge of a subject, travelling across a range of possible oppressive relations, can be reached through consciousness. Both versions thus reproduce the same trope, where subjects – culturally, historically and socially – are constructed as victims of injustice and oppression. In effect, this trope creates a narrative of an original (partially) innocent subject, who encounters oppression and needs to attain consciousness of those oppressive structures/relations/practices, in order to be liberated. Thinking through the deep embeddedness in feminist theory of consciousness as a method for liberating the (innocent) subject from oppression, makes it thus possible to understand the resistance towards memory work as an expression of an apocalyptic anxiety over a fear that a deviation from the well-worn path of Western, heterosexual feminism would result in a loss of those constituencies that makes feminism feminist.

Concluding note: teaching through feminism

In this chapter, while thinking through these experiences from a workshop with students on memory work, I have also shown how implicit assumptions about feminism's past, location and aim may stand in the way for the theories that are deployed in class. In order for feminism to regenerate itself, it is thus important to establish possibilities to deploy new theories in the classroom, theories that can work through and traverse the ideas of feminism that the students are more familiar with. Thus, I want underline the importance of making assumptions, like these I have outlined in this chapter, explicitly in the context of teaching. In addition, it is also important to be careful with how exercises, lectures and theories are presented and developed, and to critically evaluate the context and history of the concepts used.

Bibliography

Alarcón, Norma. "The Theoretical Subject(s) of This Bridge Called My Back and Anglo-American Feminism", in *The Second Wave. A Reader in Feminist Theory*, ed. Linda Nicholson (London: Routledge, 1997), 288-299.

Bartky, Sandra Lee. *Femininity and Domination. Studies in the phenomenology of oppression* (New York & London: Routledge, 1990).

Carter, Erica. "Translators foreword", in *Female sexualization. A Collective Work of Memory* ed. Frigga Haug et. al (London: Verso, 1987), 11-20.

Chester, Gail. "I Call Myself a Radical Feminist", (paper prepared for the Radical Feminist Day Workshop at White Lion Free School, April 8, 1979).

Chester, Gail. "We are the feminists that (Wo)men have warned us about", (introductory paper prepared for the Radical Feminist Day Workshop at White Lion Free School April 8th 1979).

Chow, Rey. *The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (Princeton: Columbia University Press, 2002).

Freeman, Jo. "The Tyranny of Structurelessness" (paper presentation at the Southern Female Rights Union conference, in Beulah, Mississippi, May, 1970), http://www.uic.edu/orgs/cwluherstory/jofreeman/joreen/tyranny.htm (accessed February 20, 2009)

Haug, Frigga. "Memory Work", in *Female sexualization. A Collective Work of Memory*, ed. Frigga Haug et. al. (London: Verso, 1987), 33-72.

Haraway, Donna. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century," in Simians, *Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York: Routledge, 1991), 149-181, http://www.stanford.edu/dept/HPS/Haraway/CyborgManifesto.html (accessed February 20, 2009).

Heald, Susan. "'Just My Opinion'" Women's Studies, Autobiographies and the University", in *Troubling Women's Studies. Pasts, Presents, and Possibilities* ed. Susan Heald et. al (Toronto, Ontario: Sumach Press, 2004), 43-90.

Ivarsson, Göran et. al. "Basgrupper inom kvinnorörelsen" (unpublished essay Dept of Gender Studies, Göteborg: Göteborg university, 1980),

Lauretis, Teresa, de. "Eccentric Subjects: Feminist Theory and Historical Consciousness", *Feminist Studies*, Spring 1990 vol. 16, issue 1: 115-140.

Mulinari, Diana. "Learning to teach feminism(s)", in *Undervisning i kvinno- och könsforskning i Norden* (rapport från symposium i Stockholm, Forum för kvinnoforskning, Stockholm: Stockholms universitet, 28-29 September 1998).

Naples, Nancy A. "Negotiating the Politics of Experiential Learning in Women's Studies: Lessons from the Community Action Project", in *Women's Studies on Its Own*, ed. Robyn Wiegman, (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002), 383-415.

Sebastien, Amanda. "Tendencies in the movement. Then and now" (paper prepared for the Radical Feminist Day Workshop at White Lion Free School, April 8 1979).

Sherover-Marcuse, Erica. "Emancipation and Consciousness. Dogmatic and Dialectical Perspectives in the Early Marx (London: Basil Blackwell, 1986).

Wiegman, Robyn. "Academic Feminist Against Itself", *NWSA Journal*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (2002): 18-37.

Techno-Mindfulness and Critical Pedagogic Praxis in Third Wave Feminist Classroom Spaces

Jennifer Lynne Musto

Abstract

This chapter doubles as a snapshot reflection piece and practical primer in thinking about third wave feminist utilization and negotiation of media and technology in university classroom spaces. It locates the techno-cultural terrain in which third wave feminist instructors find themselves and considers how information and communication technologies (ICT) both enhance and delimit third wave feminist teaching practice. This chapter additionally questions how third wave feminists can teach gender utilizing ICTs in ways that challenge rather than privilege students' roles as consuming subjects, and explores generational distinctions between third and second wave feminists' engagement and pedagogical treatment of technology. Finally, this chapter proffers experiential reflections, open-ended questions, and working suggestions for how third wave feminists might bring innovative and creative pedagogic practices into the instructive fold of teaching gender.

Introduction

Against the backdrop of the institutionalization of Women's and Gender Studies departments in recent years, third wave feminists have, like their second wave mentors grappled with translating the interdisciplinary leanings of the field into a sustained and cross-institutionally intelligible pedagogic practice.[1] Here third wave feminists, many of whom have been trained in post-graduate Women's and Gender Studies programs, have entered the ranks of the academy as graduate-level instructors and junior level faculty and have begun to take stock of the kinds of analytic and technological tools that are required to craft a decidedly third wave pedagogic practice. Questioning what counts as "third wave" pedagogy and how it fits within an academic landscape saturated by and reliant upon technology is a tenuous feat at best, particularly in

---

[1] Enikö Demény, Clare Hemmings, Ulla Holm, Päivi Korvajärvi, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, and Veronica Vesterling. Practicising Interdisciplinarity in Gender Studies. Travelling Concepts in Feminist Pedagogy: European Perspectives (York, England: Raw Nerve Press 2006): 66.

a historical moment when technological innovation is rapidly changing and when the inclusion of information and communication technologies (ICT) in the classroom tends to precede opportunities to critically reflect upon their educational efficacy. As a result of the increased presence and utilization of in-class technologies and media ranging from "smart classrooms," to PowerPoint presentations, You Tube, blogs, Wiki, and other e-learning and virtual learning environments, it behooves third wave academic feminists to reflect upon the critical purchase and potentia of this hybrid bricolage of information and communication technologies and to consider what a technologically innovative, analytically rigorous third wave feminist practice might in fact entail.[2]

This chapter doubles as a snapshot reflection piece and practical primer in thinking about third wave feminist utilization and negotiation of media and technology in university classroom spaces. The critical intervention of this chapter is multiple: first, it locates the techno-cultural terrain in which third wave feminist instructors find themselves, with a particular emphasis on the kinds of discursive and practical tools that are necessary to negotiate the increased traffic and consumption of media in Women's and Gender Studies classrooms. I additionally seek to build upon Kirkup and Rommes' pressing question of "how self-identified feminists think about pedagogical practices and how technologies help or hinder them in their ideas" by drawing upon my own experiences as a feminist instructor and exploring what, if any, generational distinctions exist between third and second wave feminists' engagement and pedagogical treatment of technology.[3] Finally, this chapter concludes by offering working suggestions for how third wave feminists might creatively incorporate technology into their pedagogic toolkits.

Situating Third Wave Techno-Positionalities and Practices

Before delving into the particulars of how third wave feminists integrate media and technology into their pedagogic repertoires, it seems fitting to situate my own positionality and investment to questions related to technology,

---

[2] The term smart classroom refers to media consoles, which are installed in classroom spaces and outfitted with televisions, VCR and DVD players, LCD projectors, audio speakers, and/or desktop computers with Internet capability. The express purpose of smart classrooms is to facilitate the instructor/student interface by integrating technological tools with course related content.

[3] Gill Kirkup and Els Rommes. "The Co-evolution of feminist pedagogy and learning technologies." (Paper presented at the 3rd Christina Conference on Women's Studies and the 4th European Gender & ICT Symposium, Helsinki, Finland, March 8-12, 2007).

pedagogy, and teaching gender.[4] The ideas for this chapter have been forged in the productive cracks that exist between my Women's and Gender Studies doctoral training on the one hand and my experiences teaching undergraduate and graduate students in the U.S. and the Netherlands on the other. Despite a rigorous interdisciplinary, transnational, and multi-institutional doctoral training in Women's and Gender Studies, I have been generally struck by the lack of sustained attention to pedagogy in general and dialogue about the possibilities and limitations of technology in the classroom in particular. While the latter observation will be taken up later in the chapter, the former point requires some nuance. I do not mean to suggest that all PhD Women's and Gender Studies Departments in which third wave feminist scholars are trained are inattentive to pedagogy per se. Indeed, as a third wave feminist trained mostly in a U.S. context, I am poignantly aware of the fact that U.S. training paradigms for Women's and Gender Studies students are noticeably different and in some ways less streamlined than European models, particularly in respect to the latter's more efficacious mainstreaming of goals, curriculum, and competencies between and across European educational and institutional spaces. Here ATHENA3 and its predecessor projects have provided much in the way of mapping the contours of the field of European Women's and Gender Studies and in identifying key themes and sites of structured cooperation.

Nevertheless, I have found that both in my experiences as a Ph.D. candidate at UCLA and also as a visiting scholar and instructor to the Graduate Gender Programme at Utrecht University in the Netherlands, teaching praxis like service, activism, and ICT competency tend to receive far less institutionalized space, support, and attention, not to mention course and workshop offerings, than for example, professional development efforts focused on research and publication.[5]

---

[4] It seems fitting to point out that my location as an itinerate American PhD candidate who has visited Utrecht University's Gender Studies Programme as an exchange student and instructor on several occasions has required creative negotiation in reconciling my U.S. based training and institutionalization in Women's Studies in a European academic feminist landscape vested to forging its own political and intellectual project separate and different from American styled feminism(s). This has prompted me to question how I might collaboratively engage in and maintain affinity with European feminist knowledge production without hegemonically asserting U.S. based paradigms. For an important discussion of European feminisms, see Gabriele Griffin and Rosi Braidotti, *Thinking Differently: A Reader in European Women's Studies* (London: Zed Books, 2002); Gabriele Griffin, *Doing Women's Studies: Employment Opportunities, Personal Impacts, and Social Consequences* (London: Zed Books, 2005).

[5] Gill Kirkup has argued that the cultivation of feminist pedagogy has been difficult to sustain alongside other rapid changes taking place in European higher education, namely increased demands on "performance-based and outcome-based learning and computer-supported education." See Gill Kirkup, "Developing Practices for Online Feminist Pedagogy," in *The Making of European Women's Studies*, eds. Rosi Braidotti and Annabel van Baren (Utrecht: Athena, 2005): 27.

As earlier noted, there are certainly notable exceptions to this, particularly as evidenced by thematic working groups such as ATHENA3's ICT in Women's Studies whose efforts are noteworthy in promoting feminist research and technological/e-learning best practices within and outside the classroom. Yet I would argue that despite the significant efforts on the part of ATHENA3's ICT working group, third wave feminists' pedagogic and ICT training remains a patch-work of practices, pieced together through their experiences teaching alongside senior level faculty as apprentice instructors and via informal, albeit productive conversations with graduate and junior level faculty colleagues about how best to cultivate an interdisciplinary, feminist classroom space that utilizes technology in creative and innovative ways. So while thematically bounded working groups like ATHENA3's ICT in Women's Studies prove invaluable in strategizing how to incorporate ICTs into feminist classrooms spaces and in transferring knowledge across national and institutional borders, there appears to be an additional need to institutionalize such insights into the advanced degree training and professional development of third wave feminist scholars at their respective institutions during and after their postgraduate studies.

In addition to creating more formalized sites for third wave feminists to discuss and exchange ideas about pedagogy, there is likewise a need to map how they are teaching gender and using ICT in the classroom and whether such efforts efficaciously bridge exigent gaps between curricular content and pedagogic practice. Here Gill Kirkup's observation is noteworthy. She states: "It is sad but true that feminist pedagogy, Women's Studies and Gender Studies has produced radical and influential content, but their pedagogic practices have become restrictive and unadventurous, particularly with respect to media use."[6] Chief among my interests is gauging whether third wave feminists have continued the "restrictive and unadventurous" pedagogic practices that Kirkup alludes to or whether they, like members of ATHENA3's ICT working group, are instead re-vamping and successfully merging theoretical content with innovative technology and media use in feminist classrooms.

Deconstructing and productively harnessing the tensions between curriculum and pedagogy seems of particular importance for third wave feminists, specifically those disciplined and institutionalized in Women's and Gender Studies programs since they have inherited thirty plus years of politicized, transformative, and discipline-bending intellectual work alongside university settings increasingly

---

[6] Gill Kirkup, 27-28.

besieged by neoliberal values where heightened technological mediation of the classroom can and often does fall under the auspices of cutting instruction costs. Although most third wave feminists remain keenly aware of their historical location enmeshed in the throes of a techno-cultural landscape characterized by "informatic domination," densely knit webs of human/non-human relations and power, and the hyper-mediation and visual domination of social space, relations, and meaning, they are tasked in similar though decidedly distinct ways from their second wave mentors with negotiating how to translate such analytic insights into their pedagogic and classroom practices while remaining relevant to students' lives and fluent in utilizing existing and new classroom technologies.[7] Here third wave feminists are challenged to build upon the treasure-trove of excellent feminist research on pedagogy by asking whether historically identified feminist pedagogical aims – to empower students, to bridge gaps between student experience and feminist knowledge production, to function as the academic or at the very least, the archival arm of the women's and feminist movements – are tenable despite or perhaps in light of technology.[8] Can third wave feminists teach with and produce our own ICT content in ways that challenge rather than privilege our students' all-too common role as passive, consuming subjects? We may further consider what kind of media and technology support and/or delimit our classroom goals and in what ways new media and technology have redefined the ways we interact with students and vice versa. These questions are certainly not exhaustive; rather, they are meant to serve as a productive launch pad in thinking about how and under what circumstances third wave feminists strive to teach gender with and alongside these burgeoning technologies and media. What remains to be seen, however, are how we use them and whether they fulfil our underlying pedagogic goals, however shifting, non-unitary, and provisional such goals may be.

Though there are many new e-learning and virtual learning environments, a few techno-media sites/programs stand out and have helped to reconstitute student-instructor interactions. They include: Microsoft PowerPoint presentations, You Tube, blogs, Wiki, social networking sites like Facebook, and virtual learning environments like Moodle. While PowerPoint presentations are not

---

[7] Rosi Braidotti, *Transpositions* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006); 48, 57; Donna Haraway, *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium. FemaleMan©_Meets_OncoMouse™.* (London and New York: Routledge, 1997):174.

[8] For a useful discussion of these topics, see Nancy A. Naples and Karen Bohar, *Teaching Feminist Activism: Strategies from the Field* (New York and London: Routledge, 2002); Robyn Wiegman, *Women's Studies On Its Own: A Next Wave Reader in Institutional Change* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002).

new per se, they like Internet-based media such as You Tube clips and blogs have become ubiquitous fixtures of university classroom spaces. And although individual feminist instructors may choose to opt-out of utilizing any or all of these programs/media/technologies, I would wager that undergraduate and post-graduate students have and will continue to bring them into the classroom by way of compulsory in-class presentations. My point here is merely to articulate the obvious: that technology and media are here and will likely remain for the duration of third wave feminists' tenure as university instructors. The consequences of not responding and/or questioning how such technologies/media transform our teaching are multiple. For example, there is a risk that our students will be unable to see, literally and symbolically, the saliency of course concepts as they relate and can be applied to their lives, particularly since technology and media remain potent sites of identity formation and meaning making. If gender continues to be taught mostly by way of textually constituted, person-to-person platforms, there is an added risk that other virtual, technologically mediated environments will remain outside the scope of gendered analysis or conversely that third wave academic feminists will cater to a specific group of students, namely those students interested in pursuing advanced research degrees in Women's and Gender Studies rather than distance and life-long learners or professionals interested in taking courses on gender. Another consequence may arise at the institutional level, where Women's and Gender Studies Departments and programs may miss an important opportunity to demonstrate to university administrators that in addition to teaching students' much-needed critical thinking skills, Women's and Gender Studies instructors likewise enhance students' technological competency, and media literacy, skills which prove invaluable in a competitive, globalized work environment. While these challenges are pressing for second and third wave feminists alike, it is my contention that if appointed as professors, third wavers will likely be evaluated on their capacity to both teach gender effectively and to create and sustain an interactive, technologically mediated learning environment. Put another way, third wave feminists will be charged with teaching gender and creating original ICT content for their courses vis-à-vis more rigorous standards than their second wave mentors. How and to what extent such evaluative measures will determine third wave feminist career trajectories and advancements remains to be seen, though the need to continuously reinvent our classroom practices and upgrade our ICT toolkits seem essential to third wave pedagogic practice and teaching success.

For my part, I have utilized various ICT technologies in my teaching practice, most notably via virtual learning environments like Moodle, which allows instructors to set upon and facilitate discussion boards, chat groups, live chats, on-line quizzes, Wiki modules, and to publish a course-specific, student-generated glossary of key terms and concepts. I have likewise observed third wave feminist colleagues who have creatively curated the learning environments in which teach by incorporating self-produced and directed short-videos on course themes, weaving self-designed DVD collages of relevant moving and still images alongside lectures, and producing course blogs, websites, and podcasts.[9] Students have also brought their technological leanings, insights and skills into the classroom. Here I have simultaneously embraced my students' showcasing of their impressively assembled interactive PowerPoint presentations, their sharing of recent "viral" You Tube clips and reflective blog entries, and their invitations to be friends on social networking sites like Facebook while remaining ambivalent about the overall educational or emancipatory effects of these media. On the one hand, I have come to think of such media and technology as having the potential to connect with students within and outside the temporally bounded confines of the classroom via the screens that have become such an integral and intimate part of their lives and identities and encouraged their making of critically meaningful linkages between theoretical content and images, texts, and non-human interfaces. On the other hand, I have also witnessed numerous students' short-lived attention spans and at times, their anomic responses to lectures and student presentations organized around "prefabricated bite-sized chunks" of PowerPoint slides, their usage and reference of YouTube clips as a way to side-step rather than critically engage with course concepts, and their distaste of all things Moodle and its underlying requirement for active participation outside the bounds of the physical classroom.[10] At the fore of my anxieties is the sinking suspicion that rather than fostering students' critical thinking and active learning, such mediums can instead encourage their detached consumption of gender vis-à-vis neatly-packaged slides, video clips, and informatic sound-bites. Another potential side effect is turning the classroom into an edutainment space,

---

[9] For an illustrative example of how one third wave feminist is creating original media content for the purposes of teaching, see a description of Loran Marsan's work at: http://www.csw.ucla.edu/Newsletter/Nov07/Nov07_marsan.pdf.
[10] Cecile Crutzen, "Questioning Gender in E-Learning and its Relation to Computer Science: Spaces for Design, Working, and Learning," in *The Making of European Women's Studies*, eds. Rosi Braidotti and Annabel van Baren (Utrecht: Athena, 2005): 40.

where technological and media accoutrements of the classroom stamp out opportunities for students' embodied engagement with course concepts. I am speaking here of a kind of implicit calculus that can operate in the face of such a diversified spread of techno-media offerings where theoretical content is only relevant when bolstered by "showing" an illustrative You Tube clip, music video, and/or advertisement. The pedagogical formula (theoretical concept + media/You Tube/PowerPoint = critical thinking) is what I am seeking to rework, particularly when such scopophilic tendencies give primacy to the visual/visualization while simultaneously rendering texts/textuality and in-class inter-activity and accountability immaterial. Effectively teaching gender vis-à-vis technology would promote the assemblage of texts, media, and ICTs in complementary ways that synthesize rather than isolate theoretical content from technological skills, yet the balancing act proves difficult, particularly without more formalized venues for third wave feminist to share and compare best practices.

Moreover, the strategy I gleaned as an apprentice graduate student instructor, namely to teach critical thinking skills and encourage students to "apply" it to their media and technological consumption emerges as short-sided at best and irrelevant at worse, particularly when students place greater critical purchase and unproblematized "belief" in visual representations over and above academic texts, and when reality becomes *really real* because students saw it first on You Tube. Here Braidotti's observations about visualizing regimes are instructive. She notes, "Our era has turned visualization into the ultimate form of control. This marks not only the final stage of the commodification of the scopic but also the triumph of vision over all the other senses."[11] If indeed our times are marked by such sophisticated and pervasive visualizing regimes, is seems reasonable to want to strategically manage the very media and technology, at least in the confines of the classroom, that exacerbate such problematic "vision-centered" modes of being and knowing. To this end, I have felt the need to incorporate a "techno-mindfulness" clause into my syllabi which seeks to instruct students about my expectations as to how they may and may not use technology and media in the course, and that despite our reliance upon e-learning tools, such tools should not diminish nor obstruct our critical engagement with course concepts and ideas.

---

[11] Rosi Braidotti, *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002): 246.

Techno-Digital Divide Between Second and Third Wave Feminists

I would now like to explore in greater depth what, if any differences exist between second and third wave feminists with respect to technology and pedagogic practice. Just as scholars and cultural theorists speak of an asymmetrical "digital divide" that exists between individuals from disparate socioeconomic backgrounds, most notably between those located in the Global North and South as well as individuals occupying the marginal "third world within" developed nations, so too does there appear to be generational distinctions between second and third wave feminist instructors' pedagogic use and production of in-class media and technology. Such differences seem more historically and culturally contingent than emblematic of innate or inevitable differences, and are likely the fairly straightforward result of the extensive exposure and experience that third wave feminists have had in comparison to their second wave feminist mentors. As a young person growing up in the American Midwest in the 1980s, computers were a commonplace feature in every classroom to which I was assigned. Whatever lessons I did not learn in the myriad typing and computer application classes I was required to take as part of my public school education were supplemented by after-school marathon video and computer game playing sessions and later by my widespread utilization of a host of information and communication technologies. My sense is that my experience, while privileged in having access to technology, underscores the standard fare of techno-media consumption and "consumption regimes"[12] that many third wave feminists coming of age in Western, late capitalist, post-industrial societies have been spoon-fed and reared on.

Yet I have been curious about the fact that third wave feminists' techno-media skills, however enmeshed within consumer culture they have been and continue to be, have not been institutionally harnessed and culled to constitute a stock component of third wave academic feminist training. Here I would like to reiterate a point I made earlier in the chapter in that it is not the content of feminist theory that forecloses a dynamic reading and practice of techno-feminist pedagogies but rather what often amounts to a lack of time, resources, and/or institutional/departmental support to transpose such important feminist theoretical insights into classroom practices. So, although third wave feminists like their second wave mentors seem to share a general intellectual proclivity

---

[12] Peter Miller and Nikolas Rose, *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social, and Personal Life* (Cambrige: Polity Press, 2008) 101.

to avoid binaristic traps, rejecting on the one hand a non-innocent nostalgic return to some bygone, fictionalized pre-technological moment while refusing to swallow whole market-driven, teleological tropes of technology's inevitable ability to deliver and equitably mete out social justice, we appear to depart most notably from second wave instructors in the unspoken, though requisite necessity to be able to translate such knowledge into pedagogic practice in twenty-first century classroom spaces.[13] Put another way, the choices that were second wave feminists to make, "to blog or not to blog," to remain, for a portion of their careers anyway, outside the purview and surveillance of students' Google searches, to refrain from keeping tabs on the most recent viral incarnation to come out of You Tube, or to ignore incipient techno-media flavors of the month, no longer seems feasible for third wave feminist instructors, particularly if integrating students' intellectual learning with their personal experiences remains at the fore of the third wave intellectual and activist project. If consciousness is, as Braidotti observes, "about co-synchronicity: shared time zones, shared memories, and share-able time-lines of projects," then third wave feminist pedagogic practice requires that we think between and across our as well as our students' techno-mediated, multiple screen locations in finding mindfully intelligible, meaningfully synchronized means of affinity and modes of knowledge transfer. This may mean, for example, asking questions we may not be typically accustomed to asking our students. Practical questions such as learning more about and excavating in greater depth the websites our students regularly visit, asking how they search, gather, disseminate and make sense of the visual and informatic content they are daily exposed to, and investigating what their techno-media consumer habits consist of, and how they negotiate in-vivo, corporeal interactions with fellow students and instructors juxtaposed to more distanced e-learning environments.

These questions, along with others, may assist third wave feminists in strategizing how best to bring media and technology into the dynamic realm of teaching gender in a European landscape. Such questions also set the stage for envisaging ways in which second and third wave feminists might collaborate in cross-generational discussions and research about how to teach gender while utilizing new media and technology. If, for example, e-learning "provides new possibilities for challenging the de facto hierarchy of students and teachers,"

---

13 Nina Lykke and Rosi Braidotti, "Postface," in *Between Monsters, Goddesses, and Cyborgs: Feminist Confrontations with Science, Medicine, and Cyberspace,* eds. Nina Lykke and Rosi Braidotti (London: Zed Books, 1996); Donna Haraway; Rosi Braidotti, *Transpositions.*

perhaps organizing workshops wherein third wave feminists demonstratively showcase their techno-practices to second wave mentors, may likewise shift and reroute the methods by which knowledge about teaching and technology are transferred[14]

Implications for Teaching

In this short chapter, I have endeavored to flesh out some looming questions and personal reflections regarding third wave feminists' navigation and integration of technology and media into their feminist classrooms. From this third wave feminist's perspective, it does not seem feasible or productive to definitively strike all things technological or media oriented from the pedagogic record of teaching gender, though an equal mix of mindfulness and creativity are certainly welcome. Here Braidotti's prescriptive diagnosis is useful. She finds, "The merger of the human with the technological, or the machine-like, not unlike the symbiotic relationship between the animal and its habitat, results in a new compound, a new kind of unity…it marks the highlight of radical immi-nence – an ethics of interdependence."[15] Braidotti's notion of the new-found unity wrought by human/non-human interface bears resemblance to the kind of techno-mindfulness I am suggesting, whereby mindfulness acts as a sort of connective tissue linking the technological with the corporeal with the express, though non-deterministic purpose of enmeshing students, instructors, and machines alike in a more creative, techno-mediated classroom space. Mindful pedagogic practice might entail a re-constituting of what we talk about with students when we talk about media and technology and a conscious re-orienta-tion and re-imagining about how to engage with technologies and media that have otherwise been shored up outside the bounds of the feminist classroom for the purposes of de-politicized consumption. In conclusion, third wave feminist instructors have an exciting opportunity to think about how to syncretically enfold technology and media into their pedagogic toolboxes and reinvent the tools requisite for teaching gender in a European landscape.

---

[14] Enikö Demény, Clare Hemmings, Ulla Holm, Päivi Korvajärvi, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, and Veronica Vest-erling; Mervi Heikkinen, Suvi Pihkala, and Vappu Sunnari. "Constructing a pedagogical approach for an e-learning programme on gender and sexual violence" (paper presented at conference From Violence to Caring: Gendered and Sexualised Violence as Challenge on the Life-Span, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland, December 4-5, 2008).
[15] Rosi Braidotti, *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming,* 225-226.

References

Braidotti, Rosi. *Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002.

Braidotti, Rosi. *Transpositions*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006.

Crutzen, Cecile. "Questioning Gender in E-Learning and its Relation to Computer Science: Spaces for Design, Working, and Learning," in *The Making of European Women's Studies*, edited by Rosi Braidotti and Annabel van Baren, 40-60. Utrecht: Athena, 2005.

Demény, Enikö, Clare Hemmings, Ulla Holm, Päivi Korvajärvi, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, and Veronica Vesterling. *Practicising Interdisciplinarity in Gender Studies. Travelling Concepts in Feminist Pedagogy: European Perspectives*. York, England: Raw Nerve Press, 2006.

Griffin, Gabriele. *Doing Women's Studies: Employment Opportunities, Personal Impacts, and Social Consequences*. London: Zed Books, 2005.

Griffin, Gabriele and Rosi Braidotti. *Thinking Differently: A Reader in European Women's Studies*. London: Zed Books, 2002.

Haraway, Donna. *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium. FemaleMan©_Meets_OncoMouse™*. London and New York: Routledge, 1997.

Heikkinen, Mervi, Suvi Pihkala, and Vappu Sunnari. "Constructing a Pedagogical Approach for an e-learning Programme on Gender and Sexual Violence." Paper presented at conference From Violence to Caring: Gendered and Sexualised Violence as Challenge on the Life-Span, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland, December 4-5, 2008.

Kirkup, Gill. "Developing Practices for Online Feminist Pedagogy," in *The Making of European Women's Studies,* edited by Rosi Braidotti and Annabel van Baren, 26-40. Utrecht: Athena, 2005.

Kirkup, Gil and Els Rommes. "The Co-evolution of feminist pedagogy and learning technologies." Paper presented at the 3rd Christina Conference on Women's Studies and the 4th European Gender & ICT Symposium, Helsinki, Finland, March 8-12, 2007.

Lykke, Nina and Rosi Braidotti, "Postface," in *Between Monsters, Goddesses, and Cyborgs: Feminist Confrontations with Science, Medicine, and Cyberspace*, edited by Nina Lykke and Rosi Braidotti, 242-249. London: Zed Books, 1996.

Marsan, Loran. "Thinking From Women's Lives: Sandra Harding, Standpoint & Science," in *UCLA CSW Newsletter*, (November 2007), http://www.csw.ucla.edu/Newsletter/Nov07/Nov07_marsan.pdf (Accessed January 1, 2009).

Miller, Peter and Nikolas Rose. *Governing the Present: Administering Economic, Social, and Personal Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008.

Naples, Nancy A. and Karen Bohar. *Teaching Feminist Activism: Strategies from the Field*. New York and London: Routledge, 2002.

Wiegman, Robyn. *Women's Studies On Its Own: A Next Wave Reader in Institutional Change*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2002.

Teaching Gender Outside Academia: Training Economic, Social and Political Actors on Gender Equality in France

Soline Blanchard and Milka Metso

Abstract

This chapter focuses on adult training and feminist teaching outside the Higher Education sector. Through the authors' personal experience it relates the process of creating a feminist training and consulting business in a free market context. The paper highlights the difficulties *of positioning oneself* simultaneously *within and outside academia,* i.e. being PhD candidate and entrepreneur teaching non-academic adult individuals. The authors also illustrate the dilemma of combining knowledge transmission, feminism and business making and raise such questions as: Why is one willing to engage in adult training and teaching gender outside the academia? How can we adapt pedagogical methods, learned within academia, to the public of economic, social and political actors? How can we maintain critical thinking while transforming feminist knowledge into professional know-how to sell? And finally, how is one to combine one's own political engagement for social change and the market needs?

The overall aim of this article is not just to share a lived experience of feminist business creation but also to provide "tips" and "hints" for other young (or less young) feminist researchers who might be interested in teaching gender outside academia. The paper thus takes a very practical stance on the issue and suggests one possible methodology for putting up such an activity, obviously closely linked to the authors' personal experiences and to the French context. The authors also discuss the specificities of teaching gender to an adult, non-academic public and its concrete implications for training. They draw on the differences between the initial and lifelong training and their pedagogical approaches and highlight the adaptations required both in terms of content as well as in terms of practical modalities. Finally, they share some of the pedagogical strategies they have adopted in order to translate feminist knowledge into a comprehensible discourse for the professionals working outside higher education sector.

Introduction

In 2007, with two other associates, we created 'Valta Göra' a non-governmental organization providing training, research and consultancy in gender equality for French private and public organizations.[1] We chose 'Valta Göra' from the Finnish '*valta*' (power) and the Swedish '*göra*' (to do), because the word by word translation 'the power to do/change' echoed our desire to contribute to social change moving towards a gender fair society. In this article we will start from personal experiences and perform a bottom-up analysis of teaching gender outside academia.

Why is one willing to engage in teaching gender outside the academy? How can one transfer academic knowledge into professional know-how without losing the essence of feminist critical knowledge? How can one cope with the question of internal coherence whilst standing at the crossroads of 'market' needs and one's own personal motivations for social change? These were some of the problems we had to face when setting up our project. Although we still lack several responses, we claim that pragmatism is, at least for the moment, the best answer we found.

This pragmatism, founded on strong political feminist engagement, is probably one way, or at least our way of defining the today's feminism. However, we would like to argue that, for us, this pragmatism is *not* a specific characteristic of the Third Wave – or any other of the feminist waves either – at least as long as the fieldwork activism and practices (including the *feminist* gender consulting) are concerned. Moreover, the theoretical and very relevant question of the specific nature of the Third Wave feminism within the field of Women's/Gender studies does not make that much sense when we speak about our personal feminist practices that take place outside academia. From the consultants' perspective, we therefore argue that what counts is the translation of feminist knowledge (partly produced within the field of Women's/Gender studies) into practical know-how for people standing outside this field.

For us, this practice is a continuing part of the collective feminist project from The First to The Third Wave although it might have taken different forms from one historical period to another. Furthermore, we agree with Micheline

---

[1] 'Valta Göra' is a joint venture of four people (www.valtagora.org). We all had common higher educational background and we had become friends during our training years. However, this paper is written only by two associates who are still working within academia. In this text the word 'we' refers mainly to the whole group, except for the parts discussing the difficulties of positioning oneself within and outside academia. The word 'both' refers to authors.

Dumont who argues that other historical narratives of the feminist movements are possible. According to this author there are several ways of schematizing feminist evolution. She refers to Karen Offen who prefers to talk about "geology, successive beds themselves formed by contrasting layers."[2] Dumont states that Offen's geological image allows us to think about "eruptions, cracks, ebbs and flows, diverging and converging movements." It might thus be misleading to use a chronological perspective to analyse feminist movements and think about their heritages only in terms of 'pre' and 'post' and/or evoke different waves. We position ourselves within this continuing tradition, independent of waves.

Starting up a 'Feminist' Business

Who Framed Feminists into Business?

Starting up one's own business is not an obvious career choice for feminist academics. Our list of motivations was long but not really original, compared to other female entrepreneurs.[3] However, one more specific motivation may be highlighted: we defined our business project as a political and militant engagement and one of our purposes was to participate actively in social and political change. We were eager to get our gender equality expertise recognized outside the academy and promote a type of knowledge and skills which are often ignored and overlooked in France.

Our objective was also to propose a feminist alternative to the increasing service offerings emanating from what we called 'the opportunist structures.' As gender equality has become a potentially expanding market, some more traditional consulting firms improvise as experts on the matter without any particular training on gender issues. The underlying danger here is that some of these self-declared experts teach stereotypical representations of women and men, and thus do not question the origins and logics of gender inequality. Our aim was both to defend and disseminate our feminist convictions and to curb practices which we found counterproductive for the promotion of real gender equality i.e. practices that maintain the idea of compulsory complementary between sexes and their respective roles and 'natural' qualities.[4]

[2] Micheline Dumont, "Réfléchir sur le féminisme du troisième millénaire," in *Dialogues sur la troisième vague féministe*, ed. Maria Nengeh Mensah (Montréal, Les Editions du remue-ménage, 2005), 59–73.
[3] François Hurel and Perrine Danmanville, "Les femmes et la création d'entreprise," APCE Collection Focus (2001).
[4] For an illustration see Irène Jonas and Djaouida Séhili, "De l'inégalité à la différence. L'argumentation naturaliste dans la féminisation des entreprises." *Sociologies Pratiques* 14 (2007): 119 –131.

WoMen at work

In all, it took us almost a year before we managed to define the project and its practical details collectively. During all this time our project benefited from several resources we had at our disposal: the academic research on female entrepreneurship realised by one of the partners was used as a reflexive mirror for our own creation; the initial MBA background of one partner was used to give the project a business perspective; the technical training on entrepreneurship offered by the national unemployment agency (*ANPE*) was followed by another and benefited the project as whole. We also used our respective networks to get advice on management, commercial strategy and communication.

The particular character of our project, as well as our personal trajectories, ethics and convictions led us to opt for an egalitarian partnership, i.e. we all have the same status as founding associates. We all work in turns as the privileged interface with clients and suppliers and share the responsibility of contracting and managing projects. However, working independently and as equals does not mean that our partnership is reduced to a group of individuals working side by side. On the contrary, and as we said before, our objective was to create a collective working process. Here, we faced several difficulties: the geographical distance between us,[5] our different specializations and working methods and the variety of lifestyles with different professional timetables.

In order to overcome these difficulties, we decided to create a 'fifth associate', the corporate body itself. Valta Göra is an umbrella structure for our diverse activities. We all support this structure financially and share the administrative responsibilities within it. In addition, all the pedagogical tools we create under the name of Valta Göra belong to this collective structure.

Besides our common organization, we also define our strategy collectively and work at least in pairs, and whenever it is possible we extend the teamwork to the three or four of us. In order to keep contact with each other, we report continually on our respective team activities, and meet on a bi-monthly basis.

However, the most important element of our cooperation is mutual respect. This was an essential part of the creation process and it allowed us to start our joint venture with solid groundings. In fact, before our project we had never actually worked together and, thus, we needed to get to know each other better both professionally and personally. This meant that we accepted

---

[5] None of us is currently living in the same city and the geographical distance between us ranges from seventy to almost seven hundred kilometers!

both our own difficulties and those of the others, as well as our different life-styles and forms of commitment to the collective project. This could have not been possible without full and entire mutual respect and trust. We also placed professionalism, intellectual honesty and personal development at the heart of our working principles.

Borrowing Master's Tools

In order to define what our contribution would be more precisely, we used such 'traditional' managerial tools as a business plan (including a market study, communication strategy and a financial plan) and an evaluation of competencies. We started with a mapping exercise to gauge our personal and professional strengths and weaknesses and then discussed and evaluated them collectively. This exercise enabled us to define subject areas and services which we could propose immediately and those we were willing to develop in the future.

At the beginning of Valta Göra, both of the authors were specialized in gender equality at work, while the two other associates had developed an expertise in the prevention of gender violence and in non-sexist education. Thus, we were able to cover different fields of gender equality which gave us a significant asset in relation to the competition.[6] We also decided to share our specific skills and knowledge among and as a result become, at least partly, interchangeable.

Our next step was to define the commercial strategy and to construct the catalogue of services with valid prices. In addition, we made a choice concerning our potential customers and decided not to reject any client on the basis of their political position for example. Instead, we decided to take the client's real desire to change existing gender inequalities as our first criteria for collaboration.

The French regulations offered several options regarding to the legal status of our structure.[7] We created a non-profit organization bringing together four self-employed consultants. This choice had several advantages: it was easy and quick to set up, it related to our not fully business-oriented activity and it guaranteed each partner the freedom to leave the structure whenever she wanted to, temporarily or definitively, without harming the collective project.

---

[6] The French Women's Rights Office identifies five main areas for their actions: professional equality, individual rights and dignity, education, access to responsibilities and men/masculinity.

[7] For information see www.apce.com.

Facing Uncertainties and Self-questioning: What it Takes to Try it Out

Recent research focusing on female entrepreneurship points out several difficulties specific for these women's situation.[8] Our experience covers some of them, but we also managed to avoid some of the usual pitfalls mainly because of the very specific nature of our activity and of our professional and personal profiles. However, we also faced some other difficulties, precisely for these same reasons.

Being Female Entrepreneurs… just like the Others?

If we start with the more common or general barriers women meet while starting off in business, we definitely had to cope (and still do) with the tricky question of balancing work and private life. At the beginning of our joint venture only one out of the four associates had children and thus the daily organization of our work remained quite fluent. As feminists, we were aware of these difficulties and conscious of the double/triple working day of female business creators. However, our feminist engagement also allowed us to emancipate ourselves from the stereotypical roles and gender arrangements within the couple and we were able to negotiate the equal sharing of household responsibilities with our partners.

Our problems in terms of organization and time restrictions were more linked to our dual activity, as we all had a full or part-time employment in addition to our training and consulting business. In consequence, we had to manage not only our quite different personal working timetables and rhythms, but also the potential overlapping and conflicts of interests between our own business and our respective jobs, located as they are within the same or quite similar activity sectors.

So far we have managed to keep the project going and even to expand our activities, but it has not been without difficulties and sacrifices. We often work on weekends and evenings, obviously at the expenses of our personal and family time. We still face problems in anticipating the amount of work and we have not yet been able to work serenely without constant pressure and hurry. For the moment, we all continue to work outside Valta Göra. However, we are more and more aware that quite soon we will have to make choices concerning our professional activities and/or to find other ways of coping with our growing business (sub-contracting, recruiting other associates).

---

[8] Fiducial, *L'Observatoire Fiducial de l'entrepreneuriat au féminin* (Paris: Fiducial, 2006).

Keeping up a dual activity is obviously linked to another aspect that we share with other female entrepreneurs, namely the lack of funding. To overcome the financial barrier, we chose the low risk option of self-funding supported by our paid employment. It is important to highlight that this alternative was feasible because our activity requires only a small investment in money. Indeed, what we really invested in our partnership was a lot of time and energy and a huge amount of intellectual effort.

Like so many female business initiators, we were confronted with the dilemma of self-doubt. In our case this insecurity covered a wide range of issues: from questioning our professional capacities to offering quality services within an unknown environment (such as private enterprises); over doubting our credibility; to fearing the loss of our feminist convictions.

These apprehensions and fears also determined the legal status of our project, as we decided to create a non-profit organization rather than a proper consulting firm. In the French context, this solution contains lower financial risks and, consequently, it implies fewer obligations in terms of the duration and profitability of the activity. In sum, when we finally took the decisive step, we did it with almost no risks. In that case, why did it take us more than one year before we really dared to 'take the plunge'?

The Two Faces of Janus: Being a PhD Candidate *and* Business Creator

Probably because we were tackling one more (major) problem, arising from our particular situation as young French academics; that of locating and positioning our-selves simultaneously inside and outside academia. Indeed, we were both PhD candidates, still in training within the university and also already full professionals (although beginners) in training people outside the academy. Why did we then find this problematic? For three main reasons: the first one is linked to the French university system and to its training objectives; the second is connected to academia's relations with the private market and companies; the third is the result of these two previous points, visible in terms of various resistances.

The French PhD training is very much focused on careers *within* the higher education sector and research and it does not really prepare people for jobs outside academia. Although quite a lot of self-employed consultants have a university background, there is not much information available within the

Doctorate degree's curricula for setting up such an activity. While the two other partners had benefited from vocational training focusing on gender equality (Professional Masters degree) and had former professional experience on the field, we, as PhD candidates, were lacking both professional experience outside the university and practical knowledge of gender equality.

Thus, our theoretical knowledge did not correspond, as such, to the market needs and we needed to find ways to translate our knowledge and language into practical, and therefore useful, information for professionals outside academia. This turned out to be a quite difficult exercise, not only because we were not really aware of what the gender training and consulting market might turn out to be, but also because we were seriously lacking a methodology for a commercial approach and strategy, as well as skills in team work (possibly another heritage of our university training as individual researchers).

Since the French university system mainly trains people for academia, its relations with the private business sector and enterprises are quite distant and loose. Moreover, the French academic community is reluctant to sacrifice its autonomy and tends to reject any external influence on its research and teaching practices.[9] There is a general fear that political influence or market forces might 'corrupt' scientific research endeavour and this belief has represented a significant barrier to the development of more cooperation between the universities and firms.[10] Thus, academic university-based staff are generally quite unwilling to design courses to meet the requirements of private enterprises[11] while distrust of the universities' alleged leftist and overly theoretical orientation has led many employers to channel the requests of expertise towards their own consulting organizations.[12]

Thus, when we started to canvass potential clients we had to cope with some serious handicaps: we were a non-mixed team of young, female consultants, working simultaneously in a feminist, university based research team. This implied that we needed to overcome employers' and policy decision-makers' resistance, sometimes mistrust, and convince them that we were not

---

[9] Nicky Le Feuvre and Milka Metso, *Disciplinary Barriers between the Social Sciences and Humanities. National Report on France* (Report for European project STREP "Research Integration: Changing Knowledge and Disciplinary Boundaries Through Integrative Research Methods in the Social Sciences and Humanities," University of Toulouse II-Le Mirail, 2005).

[10] Goldstein in Le Feuvre and Metso, 47.

[11] John van der Graaff and Dorotea Furth, "France," in *Academic Power. Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education*, ed. John van der Graaff (London: Praeger Publishers, 1978), 49–66.

[12] For more information on the organization of the French HE sector see Le Feuvre and Metso.

too theoretical and 'radical'. Furthermore, our double location within and outside university also produced some opposition from our academic colleagues and we needed to explain and reaffirm our professional project as feminist consultants. Our colleagues' cautions partly reflected our own apprehensions concerning the difficult balance between our feminist beliefs and the market's demands for 'non feminist' and 'positively toned' actions.

Obviously, our double position within and outside the university brought some advantages as well. Through our academic jobs and feminist studies' networks we were able to access both the recent knowledge production on gender equality and the relevant work opportunities and offers. In addition, we had the possibility to share the difficulties we faced while disseminating feminist knowledge inside and outside the academy with our colleagues. We also benefited from the good reputation of our feminist research group Simone-SAGESSE and we were able to transform some of our academic relations into business contacts. Indeed, we did quite a lot of networking while wearing our academic 'suit'. This again led to some ethical concerns about issues like: Is it suitable to market our-selves as consultants while we are giving a conference paper? Is it acceptable to wear several hats when working?

The Specificity of Teaching Gender

Still another difficulty can be added to the three previous ones and it concerns the essence of feminist teaching. A recent French publication focusing on feminist knowledge and its transmission highlights several specific difficulties concerning the teaching within this field.[13] In France, the institutionalisation of feminist studies is quite new and the field is still lacking legitimacy, within and outside academia. For this same reason, the practical tools for teaching like manuals, readers and guide books are scare.

Furthermore, the very subject of feminist teaching, gender power relations, is not neutral. It touches the very intimate (sometimes stereotypical) convictions of trainees and provokes quite heated debates and strong reactions of resistance. Taking into account this affective dimension of feminist teaching is a central issue for its knowledge transmission also outside academia.

---

[13] Soline Blanchard, Jules Falquet and Dominique Fougeyrollas (ed.), "Transmission : Savoirs Féministes et Pratiques Pédagogiques, Actes des journées d'études CEDREF-EFiGiES des 27 et 28 mai 2005," *Les Cahiers du CEDREF* 42 (2006).

In addition, many feminist academics have questioned and challenged the 'traditional' pedagogical practices by inventing other non hierarchical ways of transmitting knowledge. These questions remain also relevant for feminist teaching outside the university. Do we have a different and a more equal way of dealing with authority? Or do we, on the contrary, produce very traditional class relations as a way of counterbalancing the lack of legitimacy of our knowledge? One of our aims was to be free to develop and create innovative teaching methods and pedagogical tools, but we were not sure that this would be possible outside academia and within a market driven teaching context.

Many Questions and Few Answers: Ethical Dilemma of Combining Teaching, Business and Feminism

As a response to these difficulties and enquiries, we spent a lot of time collectively defining the political frame of our activities and finding suitable strategies that would allow us both to sign contracts and also to respect our convictions. In reality, the combination of teaching-making business-feminism turned out to be a quite difficult puzzle to solve.

A first series of questions concerns the clients; Do we want to work with everyone? What does it mean, in terms of independency, to work with/for institutional feminist bodies and private enterprises?

A second series of interrogations relates to possible missions; What types of mission are acceptable for feminists? Since we are prepared to consider propositions from a large panel of players, as long as their motivations for social change seem real, do we also accept to work with any theoretical frame and material conditions whatsoever?

Last and maybe the most difficult series of questions concern money. The question of money is taboo in France and even more so among the French feminists. We needed thus to question our own relation both to money and to feminist knowledge. Is it suitable to sell such wisdom and if so, at what price? Overall, is it fitting to speak about money, academic knowledge and feminism at the same time?

In sum, we had to address the problem of business-teaching-feminism as an ethical dilemma. This then led to still more questions. How to make sure that our business activity does not turn feminism into a market commodity? How to preserve the radicalism of our standpoint and avoid the compromises and other pitfalls inherent in pleasing the client? Finally, we had to find a way

(or rather ways) of dealing with the radical and with business thinking at the same time.

Our whole creation process has been articulated around these constant hesitations, which has resulted in our drifting between our attachment to academic feminism and its values and our desire to disseminate this same knowledge to a wider public and, accordingly, to transform it into an active tool for social change.

Finally, we became exhausted from all this wavering and simply decided to trust ourselves and our intellectual honesty and to make the best out of our particular position inside and outside academia. We also decided not to abandon our feminist perspective. Thus, instead of trying to accommodate our values with the market demands, we chose to concentrate our efforts on a suitable pedagogy, capable of translating academic feminist knowledge into professional practices for policy makers and private companies.

In this sense, our preoccupations and perspectives find an echo in the work carried out within the ATHENA network under the strand 3A 'Strengthening the Societal Impact of Women Studies.' This group aims to strengthen the ties between the three kinds of professions, feminists, researchers, and policy makers who have mostly become professionalized each within their separate fields. It also works toward innovative "tools to provide the necessary training for new professionals in all domains."[14] At our very personal level we wanted to participate to this collective effort of constructing bridges over professional borders.

Combining a Critical and Pragmatic Approach on Gender Equality

Our understanding of gender (in)equality, which is also shaping our training and consulting activities, is based on a common and shared theoretical framework of masculine domination. According to Danièle Kergoat, a French sociologist, the unequality of the treatment of men and women results from a social gender system based on the dual principle of division and hierarchy between the sexes.[15] In this perspective, men/masculinity are clearly different from women/femininity and both of these categories have their specific roles

---

[14] For further details: www.athena3.org.
[15] Danièle Kergoat. "Division sexuelle du travail et rapports sociaux de sexe," in *Dictionnaire critique du féminisme*, ed. Helena Hirata et al. (Paris: PUF, 2004), 35–44.

and duties which are seen as complementary.[16] Furthermore, this bi-categorisation forms a social hierarchy where men/masculinity are valued over women/femininity.[17] The gender system operates simultaneously at several levels of social reality: it defines the sexual division of labour and power; determines the social representations of both categories of sex and shapes the individuals' subjective gender identities and, therefore, frames their social destinies.[18] In sum, the concept of a gender system allows us to analyze the unequal power relationships existing between the categories of men and women (and within these categories, as well).

Resistance to Critical, Structural Approach on Gender Equality

Taken in its 'rough' form our discourse is not very easy to access or to sell. Many of our less feminist business rivals have adopted a more 'psychological' discourse focusing on individual coaching (for promoting equality in work life) or on couple mediation (for fighting against gender violence) and some have turned towards performance discourse i.e. the economic growth generated by mixed working teams. Certainly these discourses are more appealing to the employers and policy makers than the structural, systemic approach to masculine domination! Especially in the French context, where open resistance and hostility to the idea of gender equality still occurs and where such issues as gender violence, inequality and discrimination continue to be considered as (more or less) taboo.

Thus, our discourse namely challenging the status quo of gender relations and pointing to the fact that resolving the prevailing gender inequalities is the task of *both* sexes, sometimes provokes quite heated debates and discussions. To give just one example of such resistance; we hear frequently that the gender violence that takes place within the couple or family is a private matter and thus should be settled within the private sphere. During one of our first training sessions an older man even declared that a husband should be able to 'correct' his wife if needed and he could see no problem to that. At that moment we were a bit taken aback by what he said and did not know how to react properly, but his reaction, added to many other similar forms of resistance, encouraged

---

[16] N. Le Feuvre, "Penser la dynamique du genre" (Habilitation thesis, University of Toulouse II-Le Mirail, 2003).

[17] Pierre Bourdieu, "La domination masculine," *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 84 (1990): 2–32.

[18] Le Feuvre.

us to improve our communication skills and, most important, to find a set of predefined responses to these repeated oppositions.

This example also points to the fact that gender equality is often understood as a private, personal issue in the French context – as in many other ones. As mentioned before, everyone is affected by these sometimes quite difficult questions and can reflect upon them on a very subjective and intimate level. It is not surprising then that, during the training sessions, some individuals reject our more structural perspective on gender inequality, especially if it is the first time they have ever heard such a discourse.

Implication for Teaching: Translating Feminist Theory into Pragmatic Pedagogy

Our definition of pedagogy can be summed up as an organized situation of knowledge transmission. Although initial and lifelong training have many aspects in common, their pedagogical approaches are quite different and their content as well as practical modalities vary significantly. We have been able to experience these differences with our dual teaching practice within and outside academia.[19]

Teaching a group of undergraduate students is quite different from teaching adults. First of all, the university students are, mostly, younger than we are. In France, they are used to sitting and listening to the teacher, even for couple of hours, and hardly ever speak up during the courses. Indeed, the class-room situation is a very hierarchically structured and the transmission of knowledge is rather unidirectional, from professor to the pupils. The students are also used to theoretical discourse and academic subjects. Furthermore, we teach them several courses and follow the group over a long period of time (from one semester to a year).

In contrast, when we teach adults we are usually the youngest people in the room. For the large majority of the trainees the university with its learning techniques belongs to a remote past (if they ever studied there) and our training is quite often seen as a 'merry break' from work life routines. The exchanges with the trainer are quite different as well. We are much more frequently and spontaneously questioned and there is no hierarchical relation between the participants. In most of the cases, we only see the trainees once and they have very specific demands concerning the content of the teaching. They want practical

---

[19] Both of us have several years teaching experience with under-graduate students at the university.

answers adapted to their own professional situations and not well turned general theoretical phrases. Thus, the adult training requires much more time and efforts in the construction of suitable content, each time adapted to the specific public, whereas the university curricula can remain quite the same from one student group to another.

It is needless to say, that our adult public of economic, social and political players is rarely interested in academic feminist debates or in knowing whether this idea or that idea pops out from the First, Second or Third wave of feminism. Consequently, while teaching outside the academia, our concern is not that so much to know whether our feminist teaching is a Second or Third wave activity, than it is to see if our pedagogical practices are adapted to our public and permit the transmission of knowledge.

However, this does not mean that our feminist teaching with adults is completely disconnected from the debates taking place within the academia or within the wider social context. We need constantly to take into account the evolution of ideas around gender issues and to introduce new theoretical elements into our training content. The debate around intersectionality currently taking place both within Women's/Gender studies and outside of it (mainly in the field of Diversity Management) is a good example of such knowledge development.

Feminist tool kit for training

We have developed several strategies in order to transfer the feminist ideas into an understandable discourse for the professionals we are training.

We draw from the strategy we experienced once before and start by saying that we do not ask the trainees to be or become feminists, but simply to wear gender eyeglasses for a moment, that is to look at the surrounding social reality from the gender perspective by taking into account the comparative situation of men and women, of girls and boys.[20] While saying this, we obviously think, and hope, that once someone has put those lenses on their nose they can never take them off again and, consequently, once they have seen reality from the gender perspective it is impossible to pretend that the inequalities between men and women do not exist.

[20] In 2006, we had the opportunity to attend a Labour Union training session given by Annie Junter, a senior lecturer and researcher specialized in gender equality at work located at the University of Rennes 2. During this training session she used the method described in this paragraph.

Then we turn towards the 'magic of numbers' and use statistical data to draw a clear, irrefutable and credible picture of the prevailing gender inequalities. We also often use mathematical reasoning and logic to explain the nature and origins of gender inequalities. This is quite an efficient strategy since mathematics are still regarded as an expression of (almost incontestable) scientific truth in the French context. In addition, we sometimes 'borrow' the language and the concepts of our trainees. For example, while training private enterprises to the gender equality in work we use the managerial vocabulary as a means of facilitating the reception of the feminist message.

Furthermore, we have accepted some compromises, at the surface level, with our feminist positions. We have learned that the strategy of 'small steps' is often more effective at the beginning than that of straight talk. We generally do not use such words as 'masculine domination' or 'patriarchy' and we adopt the attitude of neutral kindness and sympathy towards our public. In other words, we put aside our feminist militant garment in favour of the consultant's suit. This has not always been an easy task to perform and it still remains our major source of frustration and dissatisfaction. In fact, this 'role game' is probably the main difficulty we need to confront in the exercise of our training and consulting activity. However, we are eager to continue our construction of feminist pedagogy that takes into account even the intimate resistances of the partakers.

If a trainee opposes our discourse we never reject his/her hostile view outright. Instead we take up the argument and try to develop it collectively with the whole group: What do the others think about it? Do they agree or disagree and why? What counts is not our personal opinion on the issues, but the debate that it evokes and the discussion that follows from it. However, for us, humour remains one of the most powerful tools for passing the message on and we also use play as a pedagogical technique whenever possible. We have also learned the importance of communication strategies. Studies in communication have pointed out that the public absorbs most of the content of a discourse through its non-verbal and visual presentation. This includes our appearance and behaviour as consultants (remember we are in France!). This side of our activity was quite new and unexpected for some of us and we spent a lot of time on constructing a common visual design for our training documents – and on mutual coaching for appropriate dressing!

As the form of the message counts almost as much as its substance, we have found it very helpful to use metaphors, anecdotes and real life examples to clarify the core issues. The cross cutting references between different types of discrimination are also often quite eloquent and help people to understand – and accept – the mechanisms producing gender inequality.

Our last 'secret weapon' is exoticism. One of us has a Finnish background and an easily noticeable accent. Her position, as an outsider to the French society, allows us not only to access Finnish data and practices in the field of gender training and consulting but also to use these examples as an introduction and as a mirror to the French context. Indeed, we have noticed that it is sometimes easier to approach the gender equality within the French society by introducing examples from other national contexts. For some trainees, the fact that we are not talking about the immediate surrounding social reality seems to facilitate the reception of the message. Furthermore, with her Finnish accent she can also ask falsely naïve questions during the collective discussions and in this way we are able to take the debate further on by questioning taken for granted values, for example.

Our strategies and attitudes may vary significantly from one intervention to another. Indeed, to train people who have hardly heard about gender equality and need to be convinced about its usefulness is quite different from working with feminist activists who want to reflect on their ongoing practices and refresh their theoretical knowledge. Yet our strategies have one shared objective. They all aim to facilitate the understanding and acceptance of gender equality as a fundamental value which should be transformed into everyday activity and, thus, become an integrated part of professional practices.

Conclusion

We have now marched along the slippery road of feminist business creation for one and a half year. Looking back, we would say that it has been quite a difficult but extremely interesting and rich joint adventure. We have obviously committed many errors and there have been some disappointments, but to date the overall evaluation of our project is positive.

We have been able to attain one of our main starting objectives which was to transform the intellectual, academic skills into professional know-how. Due to our collective reflection, based on mutual esteem and trust, we have

also been able to find a (partly) satisfying response to a key question: how to establish a complex and delicate balance between market needs and our own personal aspirations for feminist social change. However, we also recognize that maintaining this internal coherence – whilst further developing our activity – requires our constant vigilance and we continue to reflect on our business choices from the critical feminist perspective.

We continue to develop innovative pedagogical methods as well. We are constantly seeking new ways of translating our updated theoretical knowledge into professional practices for trainees. To date, we are focusing on performance and scenic arts that we might use as pedagogical tools in the near future. In this perspective, we have initiated new partnerships with persons coming from quite different disciplinary and theoretical backgrounds. This makes cooperation and the collective construction of transmission methods a very challenging, but also extremely stimulating, task.

Many of our other questions still remain without answers: How to solve the dilemma of double professional burden? How to improve our internal working methods? How to construct a successful commercial strategy and assure the durability of our action despite of changing public policies?

With experience from previous activities and lessons from past errors, we hope to find elements of answers to these questions and to be able to continue our joint adventure of disseminating feminist knowledge within *and* outside the academic circles.

References

Blanchard, Soline, Jules Falquet and Dominique Fougeyrollas, ed. "Transmission : Savoirs Féministes et Pratiques Pédagogiques, Actes des journées d'études CEDREF-EFiGiES des 27 et 28 mai 2005." *Les Cahiers du CEDREF* 42 (2006).

Bourdieu, Pierre. "La domination masculine". *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales* 84 (1990): 2–32.

Dumont, Micheline. "Réfléchir sur le féminisme du troisième millénaire." In *Dialogues sur la troisième vague féministe*, edited by Maria Nengeh Mensah, 59–73. Montréal: Les Editions du remue-ménage, 2005.

Fiducial. *L'Observatoire Fiducial de l'entrepreneuriat au féminin*. Paris: Fiducial, 2006.

van der Graaff, John, and Dorotea Furth. "France". In *Academic Power. Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education*, edited by John van der Graaff, 49–66. London: Praeger Publishers, 1978.

Hurel, François, and Perrine Danmanville. "Les femmes et la création d'entreprise." *APCE Collection Focus* (2001).

Jonas, Irène, and Djaouida Séhili. "De l'inégalité à la différence. L'argumentation naturaliste dans la féminisation des entreprises." *Sociologies Pratiques* 14 (2007): 119–131.

Kergoat, Danièle. "Division sexuelle du travail et rapports sociaux de sexe." In *Dictionnaire critique du féminisme*, edited by Helena Hirata et al., 35–44. Paris: PUF, 2004.

Le Feuvre, N. "Penser la dynamique du genre." Habilitation thesis, University of Toulouse II-Le Mirail, 2003.

Le Feuvre, Nicky, and Milka Metso. *Disciplinary Barriers between the Social Sciences and Humanities. National Report on France*. Report for European project STREP "Research Integration: Changing Knowledge and Disciplinary Boundaries Through Integrative Research Methods in the Social Sciences and Humanities": University of Toulouse II-Le Mirail, 2005.

"School and Teaching from a Gender Perspective
– Gender Sensitive Didactics"
Review and Evaluation of a Continuing Education Workshop
for Austrian Grammar School Teachers[1]

Solveig (Sol) Haring and Anita Mörth

Abstract

The authors present the concept of gender-sensitive training in the context of continuing education for teachers in Austrian grammar schools. They developed and conducted a workshop for Austrian teachers in January 2008. The purpose of this article is to present and evaluate the schedule and concept of the workshop, the methods used, the teaching aims, and the learning outcomes. The theoretical background of the workshop draws on Butlerian gender de-constructivism. The gender-sensitive didactics in this article refer to concepts put forth by Austrian and German authors.

The theoretical input of the workshop was structured according to framework conditions, content and methods. The methods used in the workshop focus on training self reflection, sharing experiences, and practicing exercises with the general aim of extending the participants' experience of limits as well as their "behavioral repertoires". In particular, the workshop aimed to help participants recognize how constructed gender is while opening their eyes to new and alternative subject positions. In the light of the authors' prior professional experiences as well as their experiences during the workshop, active participation in the exercises is considered crucial for successful and lasting learning experiences. A series of tools were used in the "gender factory" to help participants work on their own clichés and the restrictions conveyed by society; they participated in teamwork situations, gender role-changing, role-playing, and a method used to identify gender hierarchies through an exercise called the "cemetery bag", in which the content of a bag helps participants visualize how we construct identities. Another crucial part of the workshop included testing exercises that could be used by the participants in their classrooms.

---

[1] This article is being published in German as: Sol Haring and Anita Mörth, "Was heißt Gender in der Schule?," in *Gender Mainstreaming und Schule*. Anstöße für Theorie und Praxis der Geschlechterforschung, eds. Malwine Seemann and Michaela Kuhnhenne, (Oldenburg: BIS Verlag, 2009), 105–125.

As the learning outcomes demonstrate, this model of integrating theoretical knowledge with experienced-based learning scenarios appears to be quite successful.

Introduction

In our chapter, we seek to document and evaluate the continuing education method for teacher training we developed and subsequently tested in a workshop in January 2008. This workshop on gender-sensitive education took place in the context of voluntary continuing education programs for grammar school teachers in Austria. In the course of this article, we evaluate the concept and description of the workshop, the written and oral feedback from the participants, their reflections regarding us as leaders of the workshop. It is important for us to work out which contextual contributions and methods used within the workshop were important for the participants, which discussions were particularly fruitful and which were less effective.

As authors our interest lies within the evaluation of this continuing education program, so that the concept of gender-sensitive teaching can be further developed by teachers as they apply this method in their schools.

The aim of the workshop was to impart some basic, theoretical background knowledge of gender-sensitive didactics and to give more life to this theoretical information through reflection, testing, and practice. The focus was on visualizing alternative identities, presenting methods for dealing with the topic of "gender" in classrooms, and testing the methods. The goal was for teachers to use the experience to reflect on their own self-perception and to recognize their own prejudices and categorizations.

This article is an attempt to reflect on the theoretical ideas that were put into practice at the workshop as well as the results of this way of teaching theory. Furthermore, we seek to provide readers of this text with our results for testing, adjusting and amending the theories based on our experiences.

In the first section below, we place our workshop within the context of continuing education of Austrian grammar school teachers. Section two contains a description of the concept and the schedule of the workshop. Section three describes what the participants could learn. Here we present the content we aimed to impart, namely: gender-sensitive teaching and its aspects concerning access and framework conditions, curriculum, and teaching methods. In section four, we describe how the participants could learn

through reflection, by dismantling clichés and body language, by sharing their experiences, in the "gender factory", and by practicing exercises that could be used in their own classrooms.

In the concluding section, we outline the participants' learning outcomes as they were presented at the end of the workshop.

Background

The Austrian school system is organized hierarchically: the head of school, heads of departments, academic coordinators (for each subject area), *KustodInnen* (responsible for the provision of appropriate teaching resources for the respective subject), administrators, and *KlassenvorstaendInnen* (similar to homeroom teachers; however, in Austria, teachers in this position are responsible for an entire class and may have more administrative duties than the average homeroom teacher in the American system). Various teachers take on the additional responsibilities of these positions. Team meetings and coordination meetings are convened to plan daily school and teaching life as well as the continuing education of teachers. Teachers are encouraged to take active part in activities within their schools, make use of their continuing education days, attend seminars and workshops, share their newly gained knowledge with their colleagues, and to implement it in their teaching (see: www.schule.at).

In Austria, the Ministry for Education, Science and Culture (*Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur*, abbreviated as "bmbwk") organizes continuing education for grammar school teachers. Specialized programs were previously offered by "Pedagogic Academies" (*Pädagogische Institute and Pädagogische Akademien*).[2] Over the last ten years, these institutions have been continually reorganized and the training and continuing education of teachers is currently offered by "Pedagogic Universities" (the former Pedagogic Academies). This means that all the training for teachers working in compulsory education takes place at the university level. The basis for this development is set by the new Academies Study Act (*Akademien-Studiengesetz*) of 1999.

---

[2] bmbwk – Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, ed., *Bildungsentwicklung in Österreich* (Wien: 2004), 59. http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/11759/bildungsentw_de.pdf (last accessed: 4 September 2009); link to the Federal Ministry: http://www.bmukk.gv.at/schulen/lehr/index.xml (last accessed: 4 September 2009).

Within the organizational structure for personnel at particular schools, teachers can participate in continuing education workshops offered by the Pedagogic Universities or avail themselves of the school's internal continuing education opportunities (SCHILF – Schulinterne LehrerInnenfortbildung) in order to participate in workshops, initiate workshops that are not otherwise offered, or invite experts to conduct training sessions at the school.[3]

The workshop

After Anita Mörth's article appeared in the publication "geschlecht + didaktik",[4] we were invited by Erika Mikula of the Pedagogic University Carinthia (*Pädagogische Hochschule des Bundes in Kärnten*) to develop and lead a three-day seminar, organized by her institution.

The target group for the workshop included Austrian grammar school teachers who were invited to participate in this continuing education training exercise. Eleven women and four men from different Austrian provinces came; they ranged in age from thirty-two to fifty-five years old. All the participants were highly motivated and interested; some already had certain knowledge of the topic. The aim was to acquaint the teachers with the concept of gender-sensitive teaching which, according to Gindl, Hefler and Hellmer,[5] means that one must

- Respond to the needs of all participants,
- Ensure that all participants can benefit equally from the learning situation,
- Create learning situations that do not discount gender and that allow all the participants to develop their gender competences.

---

[3] bmbwk – Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, ed., *Unterrichtsprinzip Erziehung zur Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern. Informationen und Anregungen zur Umsetzung ab der 5. Schulstufe* (Wien: 2003), 26. http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/10634/PDFzuPubID76.pdf (last accessed: 4 September 2009).

[4] Anita Mörth, Barbara Hey and Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, eds., *geschlecht + didaktik* (Graz: Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 2006). http://www.uni-graz.at/kffwww/geschlecht_didaktik/ (last accessed: 4 September 2009).

[5] Michaela Gindl, Günter Hefler and Silvia Hellmer (IFF-Fakultät für Interdisziplinäre Forschung und Fortbildung Arbeitsbereich Wissenschaft und Arbeitswelt), *Leitfaden für gendersensible Didaktik, Teil 1: Grundlagen der Gendersensibilität in der Lehre* (Vienna: MA 57 – Frauenabteilung der Stadt Wien, 2007), 9. http://www.gender.schule.at/index.php?basiskat=10478&typ=&kthid=10499&K3=&land=&text=&anzahl=69 (last accessed: 4 September 2009).

Table: Schedule Reference: Workshop schedule

	Monday, 21 January 2008	Tuesday, 22 January 2008	Wednesday, 23 January 2008
9.00 – 10.30	Welcome and kick off	Teaching and learning gender sensitively? Sharing experiences	Seminar souvenirs – Things you can take along into your teaching practice
11.00 – 12.30	Gender factory – We are doing gender	Theoretical input: Status quo of gender-sensitive teaching	
14.00 – 15.30	Self reflection	My own teaching practice – Recognizing potentials for change	
16.00 – 17.30	Theoretical input: History of gender-sensitive didactics	My own teaching practice – Role playing and group work	
19.30 – 21.00	Body work: Gender hierarchies	Presentation: results of group work	

Possible outcomes for participants

In this section we discuss the knowledge of gender-sensitive teaching we tried to impart to the participants.

Gender-sensitive didactics aim to enable both girls and boys to reach learning objectives equally well. This means that learning aids and opportunities that meet the different needs equally and that are adequate for all learners should be used.[6]

---

[6] Gindl, Hefler and Hellmer, 8.

Gender-sensitive didactics can be put into action step by step at the following levels:

1. Dealing with gender – access and framework conditions
2. Content
3. Teaching material
4. Methods – gender-sensitive learning scenarios

In the process, one can fall back on the available general didactic tools. When the focus is on learners – as individuals – and their needs, gender cannot be ignored in any case.

Dealing with gender – access and framework conditions

In order to encourage gender sensitivity in students, it is helpful to arrange framework conditions that are gender-fair and to impart access and approaches that enable a critical reflection of reality. This allows for reflection and an analysis of commonly accepted standards, standardizing mechanisms and exclusion mechanisms. Such reflection stimulates critical thinking, challenges (alleged) knowledge and truths, and permits the scrutiny of truths that are normally considered universally valid. Such a framework and conditions ensure a space where everyone – especially minorities – can have one's say.

Furthermore, if one's own identity is challenged, the ensuing reflection over one's position within society and within one's social milieu reveals how deeply entrenched one is in the predominant power dynamic. This, in turn, permits us to reflect on our own ideas of clichés and internalized standards, categories of boundaries and discriminations. It also permits us to recognize how we participate – as part of the complex power dynamic – in making ourselves gendered individuals. As a consequence, one's own positions and conceptions of the norm can be reassessed.

If in discussions the teacher is able to show his/her multilevel, contradictory identities, it will be possible for students to recognize their own internalized stereotypes and thus alternative self-concepts can be encouraged.

It is important to give careful thought to the style and content of such discussions in order to avoid reinforcing the very stereotypes being critiqued and dismantled.[7]

Content

In terms of content, conscious consideration of the gender dimension has proven to be supportive of gender-sensitive teaching. Similarly, breaking through the traditional canon in a certain subject opens an extended view of the achievements of women, which is otherwise hardly visible.

Accordingly, the choice of content could thus be arranged so that:
* female authors are considered,
* the perspectives of both men and women are discussed
* the power dynamic between men and women is openly referenced.[8]

In addition to the intentional integration of gender issues into teaching content, it is also important to allow sufficient time for the often-crucial process of confrontation and reflection. Due to what are normally deeply ingrained opinions regarding "men" and "women", students need time to adopt and get used to new statements about gender and the power dynamic.[9]

We felt it was important to show participants at the workshop that it is possible and meaningful to include the gender dimension in all subject areas – even in such fields that seem quite far removed from the gender topic. In mathematics, for example, it is possible to integrate biographical stories about female researchers or concepts from the feminist critique of science. In literature classes, it is useful to ask students how many female authors they know and how these authors' life experiences differ from those of their male peers. In history, the differences in laws and social frameworks governing the lives of men and women within various historical contexts can be an important topic for discussion.[10]

---

[7] Anita Mörth, „Handlungsvorschläge für einen nicht-binären Umgang mit Geschlecht," in *geschlecht + didaktik*, eds. Anita Mörth, Barbara Hey and Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz (Graz: Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 2006), 85ff.
[8] Gindl, Hefler and Hellmer, 15.
[9] Ibid, 11.
[10] bmbwk, *Unterrichtsprinzip Erziehung zur Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern. Informationen und Anregungen zur Umsetzung ab der 5. Schulstufe*, 84ff.

A further dimension is knowledge about actual gender research. Findings in this field can lead to new views and learning experiences that dispel existing convictions. The following actions could be helpful within this context:

- Deliberately plan for content from the gender perspective in teaching materials.
- Deal head on with the reasons for including gender and the fear of teaching the "wrong" stuff (e.g. discuss the plan openly with colleagues before the class takes place).
- Choose gender-related input that is relevant to the general objective of your class and take into account the possibility of returning to such content later.
- When selecting inputs prefer "surprising" examples to general statement.[11]

"When the gender question is consistently discussed on a 'general' level, the danger arises that although the group may arrive at a passable 'common sense' impression of the gender topic, there are no [individual] possibilities for learning."[12]

---

[11] see Gindl, Hefler and Hellmer, 16.
[12] Gindl, Hefler and Hellmer, 16. Translation by authors: "Wenn wiederholt auf einer ‚allgemeinen' Ebene über Genderfragen diskutiert wird, dann besteht die Gefahr, dass zwar eine halbwegs passable Abbildung eines ‚Common Sense' zum Genderthema zustande kommt, aber keine [individuellen] Lernmöglichkeiten eröffnet werden."

It is important that content concerning gender is selectively prepared and firmly embedded in the actual course of instruction. The following examples show possible approaches to the gender topic:

- Make the topic accessible by talking about general knowledge and understanding of gender as well as other differences.
- Discuss everyday situations in which gender affiliations and other differences are put into question and/or are ambiguous.
- Discuss everyday situations that reveal hierarchies.
- Read and discuss scientific and other texts on the topic of gender and other differences.
- Read texts and watch films, then conduct a discussion of the gender roles represented therein.
- Watch and discuss films that convey gender transgressive content.
- Conduct projects and exercises about gender and other differences, e.g. analyze music videos[13]

---

[13] Mörth, 89. Translation by authors: "Zugänglichmachen des Themas durch Sprechen über das eigene Alltagswissen und Alltagsverständnis von Geschlecht [und anderer Differenzen];

Thematisieren und Diskutieren von Alltags¬situationen, in denen Geschlechtszugehörigkeiten [und andere Differenzen] in Frage gestellt werden und/oder uneindeutig sind;

Diskussion von Alltagssituationen, in denen Macht*un*verhältnisse wahrgenommen werden;

Lesen und Diskutieren von wissenschaftlichen Texten und Texten anderer Gattungen zum Thema Geschlecht [und anderer Differenzen];

Lesen von Texten und Ansehen von Filmen mit anschließender Diskussion über die dort präsentierten Geschlechter-rollen;

Ansehen und Diskussion von Filmen, die geschlechtertransgressive Inhalte transportieren;

empirische Projekte und Übungen zum Thema Geschlecht [und anderer Differenzen] – wie z. B. die Analyse von Musikvideos."

Teaching materials

Since language is a substantial aspect of the production of our reality, gender-sensitive didactics are based on the usage of a gender-fair or gender-neutral language in all written documents as well as in spoken language. The following paragraphs refer to the German language.

Consideration of just two "rules" in the German language already leads to a changed and more gender-fair language.

- Make gender visible by using the gender specific term or both gender forms, e.g.: *die Lehrerin* (female teacher), *der Lehrer* (male teacher), *die Schülerin* (female student), *der Schüler* (male student), *die SchülerInnen* (female and male students) etc.
- Neutralize gender, e.g. *die Person* (the person), *der Elternteil* (neutral form for parent), *das Personal* (neutral term for personnel), "*alle, die Teil nehmen*" ("all those who participate"). Avoid clichés and stereotypes, e.g. sayings such as: "be man enough for", use *Reinigungskraft* (a non derogatory term for cleaning term with a derogatory connotation in German), use "team" or "group" instead of "*Mannschaft*" (a term that contains the word *Mann*), etc.[14]

In addition to gender-fair language, the following moves should be considered when producing and revising teaching materials:

- Integrate the gender perspective (e.g. point out when women are not addressed and discuss it)
- Address female and male learners (and not only boys by using the male plural form of students "*die Schüler*")
- Avoid gender stereotypes
- Offers identification for girls and for boys
- Make use of examples that reflect male and female life situations
- Avoid constructing hierarchies
- Consider cultural backgrounds (e.g. when choosing colors and symbols).

---

[14] DUK – Donau-Universität Krems, ed., *Leitfaden für gendergerechtes Formulieren.* (Krems an der Donau) http://www.donau-uni.ac.at/gender (last accessed: 4 September 2009), 5ff.

Methods – gender-sensitive learning scenarios

One of the goals of gender-sensitive didactics is to create a situation that allows all individuals to participate equally. This requires that didactical methods are in tune with the needs of all participants. A learner-centered approach with a special focus on equal opportunities for both genders can succeed in dealing with the various needs concerning

- Kinds of work
- Explanatory models
- Communication behavior

An important condition is that of creating an atmosphere which makes it possible to address the (often) delicate topics of gender and gendered identities. Try to create a relaxed working atmosphere, an atmosphere where participants feel that it is acceptable to act fearlessly. Do this by supporting existing alternative subject positions, making space for all expressions, ideas and topics, stressing the positive aspect of variety.[15] Students should be encouraged to refer actively to each other's contributions,[16] teachers should notice existing needs within the group and address these issues constructively. In order to create such a working and learning atmosphere, it is particularly the task of teachers to:

- Consider their own needs and refer to them if necessary[17]
- Introduce clear feedback rules
- Purposefully guide and reflect on the distribution of roles and group building processes
- Offer different perspectives and ways of access
- Draw connections between the discussions about gender and the classroom situation.

Rules for the group create more clarity concerning both sides' needs and their relationship to one another. They also help support better communication at school on a daily basis to the benefit of all the members of the group. Examples of such rules include following the principle of treating each other with respect, keeping to rules for how to give feedback, rules for handling delays

---

[15] Mörth, 89.

[16] Michaela Gindl and Günter Hefler, „Gendersensible Didaktik in universitärer Lehre und Weiterbildung für Erwachsene," in *geschlecht + didaktik*, eds. Anita Mörth, Barbara Hey and Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz (Graz: Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 2006), 108.

[17] Gindl and Hefler, 108.

and absences, both short term and permanent, as well as rules for how to deal with postponing appointments, etc.[18]

The aim of equal participation of all participants can be considered successful if immediate solutions can be found for needs, irritations, or disappointments as they arise, and thus prevent them from hindering the lesson or exercise. When prompt attention is paid to the causes of "disturbances" and "disappointments" and when participants are encouraged to articulate their individual needs immediately, it is possible to quickly discover the cause of the interruption in the learning process and to find an immediate solution. These cases concern specific problems which teachers should not ignore without comment. Most such problems can often be solved merely by acknowledging them. In many cases, requests articulated by an individual also concern other members of the group.[19]

Integrating the personal life experiences of women and men, and in particular of the participating male and female students, increases mutual tolerance, understanding and variety. The variation of learning forms creates space for reflection over one's own life experience. From the point of view of gender-sensitive didactics, it is relevant to include individual life experiences. Anyone who manages to integrate personal life contexts into a learning situation is much more present as a person than someone who limits to mere content transfer. Individual exchanges give people more appreciation for and interest in each other. What is more, considering individual perspectives helps to make clear the impact of gender-specific socialization on life experiences.[20]

Possible gains and insights for the participants

In this section, we describe the methods used for the workshop in January 2008. Since the topics of gender and gender differences concern personal issues and concepts, we focused on reflection, exchange, and personal experiences to bring the topic closer to the participants and to enable a lasting learning experience.

---

[18] Ibid, 23.
[19] Ibid, 28.
[20] Ibid, 29.

Reflection and exchange of experiences

As the workshop leaders we opened the first session with an exchange of experiences in order to clarify the expectations people brought to the workshop.

"We do not want discussions of principles"

Several participants, all of them women and all around thirty years old, challenged the group by rejecting "discussions of principles". But a discussion on "why is gender sensitive training necessary" and "are men and women the same or different" is unavoidable in this context, especially because the topic of gender-sensitive didactics can be very subjective for each teacher. Gender-sensitive teaching is a very sensitive topic that concerns the individual, the teacher-learner-context, the "gendered" conference hall, and the classroom community. Prejudice and unspoken general existential theories about what constitutes gender and what characteristics are apparently attributed to nature, exist in all places or situations and need to be examined.

To practice discussing such issues and sharing personal, gender-specific experiences with each other were central to the workshop so that the teachers could later carry out similar practices with their students.

Gender factory

With the "Gender factory" exercise, we incorporate three exercises: the "cliché cloakroom", one we developed particularly for this seminar, the "cemetery bag", which originated from age-sensitive work,[21] and an exercise on gender hierarchies inspired by the "drag king scene". The common thread running through all these exercises consists of the intention to upset typical understandings of what constitutes gender and the expectations associated with these assumptions. The purpose is to promote reflection on gender roles; thus gender-specific ascribed characteristics are extracted from a naturalized understanding and placed in a socially constructed context.

Prejudices are often very subtle and well hidden – through our own justifications and by those conveyed by society.

---

[21] Solveig Haring, Altern ist (k)eine Kunst. Biographische Bildungsprozesse älterwerdender Künstlerinnen (Saarbrücken: VDM, 2007).

The cliché cloakroom

Sometimes it would be helpful if we could leave our clichés at the cloakroom, as this would facilitate serious continuation of our work. In this exercise, we strove to abandon our clichés symbolically by working as if on an assembly line designed to produce as many clichés as possible; an assembly belt that conveyed attributes such as: "what men are like" and "what women are like". Each attribute was written on a piece of paper. The participants worked in teams of three and four. The seminar leaders timed the rate of production; it was almost a competition. After approximately fifteen minutes, all the clichés were finally left at the cloakroom – that is, the sheets of paper were pinned to a wall in a visual representation of all the attributes for "typically male" and "typically female" that we could find.

The cemetery bag

The cemetery bag[22] can be conducted with various different group sizes. The exercise is all about a bag and its contents. In this case, we used a practical, collapsible brown bag with a flower pattern. It contains cemetery candles, matches, one umbrella, handkerchiefs, and a perfectly-folded plastic bag. The brown bag, still closed, is placed in the center of the room. The participants are asked to imagine who could be the owner of this bag. All assumptions must be justified by the object (this kind of coding is the basis of the qualitative analysis method "Grounded Theory"[23]). A virtual owner soon develops: old, widowed, in mourning, Catholic, bent, pragmatic, on the way to the cemetery to light a candle, armed against rain or prepared for possible shopping, and more. In our experience, the virtual person whose identity is defined by the bag and its contents splits the participants into two camps: One group is wrapped up in the available connotations; they created a person and fulfilled the task. The other group remained sceptical and wanted to at least try to fabricate a man, a young woman, etc.

At this point, the cemetery bag is a symbol for captivity: we are caught in two-gender-think, in dualistic constructs. In the end, the participants should be encouraged to try to see the attributes separated from their objects. They must look behind the object in order to recognize that deeply-anchored, seemingly natural connections are actually socially constructed. At the close of the exercise, we recommend discussing the participants' general attitudes towards

---

[22] Haring, 125.
[23] Ibid, 125ff.

gender, the dualistic gender concept, and typically male and typically female characteristics. This discussion requires careful moderation (by the seminar leaders) to make sure that everyone has his or her say within this often unpopular discussion. Basically, the frontline between the feminists and non-feminists has to be softened or the discussion will not delve as deeply as it should.

Body work "gender hierarchies"
Can roles be switched at all? This unit serves as a starting point for perception experiments and role-playing. The exercise demonstrates how difficult it is to dissolve hierarchies. A reflection on gender is playfully introduced by setting the scene; meanwhile, the tried and tested method can be taken right into the classroom.

It is well known, nowadays, that drag queens are men who portray themselves as women. Drag kings, women who dress up as men, have also become better known. Delving beyond the masquerade, "drag-kinging" can provide those who desire a physical gender transformation with the possibility to try out their concepts of identity before more irrevocable steps are taken.[24] _In this organizationally complex exercise, participants switch roles for two hours. As workshop leaders, we converted the seminar room to a performance room during the evening dinner break. We hung nicely pressed men's suits, shirts, ties and hats in different sizes on the pin walls and flipcharts. We placed wigs, dresses, tops, skirts and eyeglasses on the tables. The make-up corner is also equipped with charcoal, lipstick, and eye make-up as well as Mastix skin glue, short-cut artificial hair, glue-on beards, and beard adhesive. There are as many outfits as there are participants, only as many dresses as there are men and as many suits and shirts as there are women.

We explained to the participants beforehand that participating in this exercise is voluntary and asked those who did not want to join to come anyway, but as the audience. We announced the exercise as something special and prepared the participants for a surprise. The exercise began as we expected: very hesitantly. Especially the transformation, the changing, the make-up – all this is important, it is an experience. While the more insecure participants decided for a suit or a wig after all, we started to help those already changed – immediately performing as macho or as femme fatal – to do their make up. The "Men" got genuine hair beards; first the courageous ones tried side burns

---

[24] Judith Jack Halberstam, *Female Masculinity* (Durham/London: Duke University Press, 2003).

and goatees, later almost all wanted a full beard, a three-day beard, designer stubble or a moustache. After a photo session, all the participants were asked to arrange themselves in a circle. The "men" were asked to greet each other, to play the macho, to play the wimp. In the subsequent short scenes, the participants were asked to play situations that contained gender hierarchies and to try to arrive at a positive conclusion. For example: in an office at the computer, the email does not work; a man enters and takes the mouse away from the woman and plays the expert. Or a mixed gender couple in the DIY store: the woman asks for something, the salesman answers but speaks only to the man. Or a man chats up a woman at a bar, etc. The solutions are all similar: the oppressed figures – women – try to free themselves from the situation.

The participants enjoyed the role-playing. It was often difficult for them to remain serious in their assumed roles. The scenes often became ridiculous. But also this exaggeration, parody, can be a tool for reflection, as Judith Butler has shown.[25] The exercise "body hierarchies" ended with much applause and little discussion, which seemed suitable to us. Discussions concerning this exercise would take place on the following day.

Practicing exercises

The following exercises on "body language orchestration" were taken from the book "Gender made consciously" ("*Geschlecht bewusst gemacht*") by Gitta Mühlen Achs (1998).[26] The participants received a list of exercises and were asked to try them out in small groups and to reflect on them. The participants were encouraged to use the exercises they found most useful and fun in their classrooms with their students.

Holding hands

In this exercise, two people should each take one another's hand and find out whose hand is on top and who got his/her way; how it feels to hold the other person's hand or to have his/her hand held; and to reflect on their associations.[27]

---

[25] Judith Butler, *Das Unbehagen der Geschlechter* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991).

[26] Gitta Mühlen Achs, *Geschlecht bewußt gemacht. Körpersprachliche Inszenierungen. Ein Bilder- und Arbeitsbuch* (Munich: Frauenoffensive, 1998), 131–141.

[27] Gesine Spieß, "Voll gesellschaftsfähig! – mit einer gendersensiblen Lehre," in *geschlecht + didaktik*, eds. Anita Mörth, Barbara Hey and Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz (Graz: Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 2006), 183f.

Participants who tested this exercise reported that there is a certain way of holding hands so that each person feels it is "right" and natural. The opposite way feels awkward and strange. Not all women felt it was natural to have their hands held. All participants confirmed that they put their hands on top when holding kids' hands. The exercise gave participants the corporal sensation of taking control or of being taken control of. Furthermore, the participants found out that they lead or are led depending on with whom they hold hands.

Standing one's ground
In the next exercise, the participants are asked to stand opposite each other in pairs and to try out different body attitudes when reacting variously to criticism by a superior.[28] They then shared with each other what they experienced in the various arrangements.

In this exercise, the participants were also surprised at what a large difference the varying bodily attitudes constitute. The stable attitude was regarded as the attitude, in which a person could best hold his or her ground. The nonchalant stance was regarded as too flippant and did not correspond to the reproach. While in the meek pose, participants found they could not stand up to criticism at all. By practicing this exercise, the participants were forced to reflect on their own body language and develop new ways of presenting themselves.

What the participants could take home with them

At the end of this section we show the results of the workshop in terms of what the participants have worked out. This results-oriented insight into gender-sensitive teaching is to the teachers' advantage, since personal experience is often underestimated as a basis for new knowledge production. The essential starting point for the work and reflection accomplished at the workshop was found primarily in teaching experiences, both good and bad. These experiences were interwoven with theoretical input, exercises and discussions throughout the workshop.

---

[28] Spieß, 183f.

Presentations from the working groups

Each group was asked to work on a poster in a solution-orientated way and to document their newly-gained "behavioral repertoire". This exercise is intended to document the following:

- Two to three exercises that participants will integrate into their everyday teaching,
- Theoretical knowledge (and new terminology) participants will remember, and
- How participants will implement their new findings into the structure of their schools (e.g. as a report at a team meeting, as a working group, etc.).

Clippings from posters

Group 1 wants t o enable girls and boys to have new experiences and to "walk in someone else's shoes". They want to discover common interests and soften dividing lines. The exercises they want to try with their students include analyzing advertisements and role-playing.

Group 2 focused on working on possibilities for schools and teachers to implement gender as a topic in the school structure. There are various possibilities to make the topic visible, such as: a "Pedagogy Day" at school conferences, parent-teacher meetings, the school's internal continuing education program for teachers (SCHILF – *Schulinterne LehrerInnen Fortbildung*), introducing a "gender representative", etc. A special school community committee (*Schulgemeinschaftsausschuss* – SGA) decides on general matters as well as planning new topics and events. There is space for presenting new topics in different ways, depending on the school. In addition, the employee representative meeting (*Personalvertretungssitzung* – PV) can be a suitable forum for a discussion on the topic of gender-sensitive teaching or for a report of the workshop. As the participants in this workshop know the decision-making structure in their schools best, it is they who can best way to position the topic.

Group No. 3 reflected on their own questions. The manner and method of questioning can influence the number of possible answers and thus the learner's room for maneuver.

In the plenary group, we discussed strategies that were developed over the course of the workshop in response to each experience presented and noted them on a poster. In addition, the participants also shared possible strategies for various classroom situations with each other.

The aim of the workshop was to influence the individual teachers' "behavioral repertoire". For example, one participant recounted that only boys apply to be the form captain, even if the majority of students in the class are girls. The strategy developed: challenge the girls.

Some situations show that it is important to normalize typical gender differences. For example, if girls use a circular saw, teachers should not point out that it is unusual or very hard for girls to use such a machine, but they should ask them to work with it as they would request any normal task. Another example: if boys ask to use a sewing machine, they should be encouraged to do so and the fact that this is a machine usually used by girls should not be discussed. The participants regarded it as very important to ignore certain differences in everyday school life.

That said, sometimes gender-sensitive teaching requires us to discuss certain differences. If, for example, the boys sitting in the front row cooperate very officiously and never take their eyes off the female teacher, the teacher should first go behind the boys to where the girls are sitting and address the girls. As a second step, if the teacher feels the tension emanating from the boys is of a sexual nature, the teacher can discuss it with the class through exercises on gender differences, sameness, desire and respecting others. This presupposes that teachers deal with such situations head on and do not get diverted by the emotions at play. Female participants in particular reported situations in which they felt uneasy as a female teacher. We called one of those stories "penises on the blackboard" and through role-play tried out different reactions to boys' drawings on the blackboard. One possible reaction is to mirror the boys' action by drawing big vaginas next to the penises and instigating a discussion of sexuality; another possibility is to complete the drawing or in biology to draw a correct sketch; scold (yes, this should be allowed), and show one's own feelings (e.g. by saying "Stop; I do not want to see such drawings; This makes me uneasy; Do not do this again; etc). Even if the situations are different in real school life, role-playing strengthens teachers' self-confidence and motivates them.

Conclusion

Teachers' self-reflection is a crucial aspect of successful a gender-sensitive didactics that considers individuals and always incorporates gender issues into the learning process. Reflective self-perception and reflection about one's own presumptions on gender and gendered identities are significant requirements. When teachers work to dispel their own stereotypes, they enhance their gender competence, which is a good starting point for imparting gender-relevant content and including gender in all aspects of teaching situations.

Testing and practicing the exercises that they will later use in the classroom allows teachers to select the best exercise for a given situation and to facilitate its use effectively.

The integration of teachers' experiences into the workshop and the exchange among the participants was substantial. As a result, the spectrum of topics was extended. What is more, by recognizing that others have similar experiences, participants strengthened and amended their own "behavioral repertoire".

References

bmbwk – Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, ed. *Unterrichtsprinzip Erziehung zur Gleichstellung von Frauen und Männern. Informationen und Anregungen zur Umsetzung ab der 5. Schulstufe*. Wien: 2003. http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/10634/PDFzuPubID76.pdf (last accessed: 4 September 2009).

bmbwk – Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur, ed. *Bildungsentwicklung in Österreich*. Wien: 2004. http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/11759/bildungsentw_de.pdf (last accessed: 4 September 2009); link to the Federal Ministry: http://www.bmukk.gv.at/schulen/lehr/index.xml (last accessed: 4 September 2009).

Butler, Judith. *Das Unbehagen der Geschlechter*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991.

DUK – Donau-Universität Krems, ed. *Leitfaden für gendergerechtes Formulieren*. Krems an der Donau. http://www.donau-uni.ac.at/gender (last accessed: 4 September 2009).

Gindl, Michaela and Günter Hefler. „Gendersensible Didaktik in universitärer Lehre und Weiterbildung für Erwachsene." In *geschlecht + didaktik*, edited by Anita Mörth, Barbara Hey and Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 94–127. Graz: Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 2006.

Gindl, Michaela, Günter Hefler and Silvia Hellmer (IFF-Fakultät für Interdisziplinäre Forschung und Fortbildung Arbeitsbereich Wissenschaft und Arbeitswelt). *Leitfaden für gendersensible Didaktik, Teil 1: Grundlagen der Gendersensibilität in der Lehre*. Vienna: MA 57 – Frauenabteilung der Stadt Wien, 2007. http://www.gender.schule.at/index.php?basiskat=10478&typ=&kthid=10499&K3=&land=&text=&anzahl=69 (last accessed: 4 September 2009).

Halberstam, Judith Jack. *Female Masculinity*. Durham/London: Duke University Press, 2003.

Haring, Solveig. *Altern ist (k)eine Kunst. Biographische Bildungsprozesse älterwerdender Künstlerinnen*. Saarbrücken: VDM, 2007.

Haring, Sol and Anita Mörth. "Was heißt Gender in der Schule?" In *Gender Mainstreaming und Schule. Anstöße für Theorie und Praxis der Geschlechterforschung*, edited by Malwine Seemann and Michaela Kuhnhenne, 105–125. Oldenburg: BIS Verlag, 2009.

Mörth, Anita, Barbara Hey and Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, eds. *geschlecht + didaktik*. Graz: Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 2006. http://www.uni-graz.at/kffwww/geschlecht_didaktik/ (last accessed: 4 September 2009).

Mörth, Anita. „Handlungsvorschläge für einen nicht-binären Umgang mit Geschlecht." In *geschlecht + didaktik*, edited by Anita Mörth, Barbara Hey and Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 78–92. Graz: Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 2006.

Mühlen Achs, Gitta. *Geschlecht bewußt gemacht. Körpersprachliche Inszenierungen. Ein Bilder- und Arbeitsbuch.* Munich: Frauenoffensive, 1998.

Spieß, Gesine. "Voll gesellschaftsfähig! – mit einer gendersensiblen Lehre." In *geschlecht + didaktik* edited by Anita Mörth, Barbara Hey and Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 128–183. Graz: Koordinationsstelle für Geschlechterstudien, Frauenforschung und Frauenförderung der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, 2006.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

Angeliki Alvanoudi is a PhD student at the Department of Linguistics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece. Her areas of interest are issues of representation and construction of gender through language, the relationship between language, culture and cognition and issues of interdisciplinarity in Womens'/Gender Studies.

Soline Blanchard, PhD Candidate, University of Toulouse II-Le Mirail / Associate of Valta Göra, France. Her areas of interest are the feminization of the professions, the public policies on gender equality and their regulation within working organizations.

Daniela Gronold received a doctoral degree in Media and Communication Studies and is based at the University of Klagenfurt in the Center for Peace Research and Peace Education. Her academic interests focus on gendered and nationalised identities, racism and public representation, Critical Whiteness Studies and Postcolonial Studies.

Solveig (Sol) Haring, PhD, MPhil, research fellow at the University of Graz, Institute of Education, Life Long Learning. In her interdisciplinary research she focusses on aging, gender and multi-media.

Brigitte Hipfl is a professor at the Department of Media and Communication Studies at the University of Klagenfurt, Austria. Her areas of interest are media and identity, gender and identity, subjectivity and cultural studies.

Mia Liinason is a PhD-student and junior teacher at the Centre for Gender Studies, Lund University, Sweden. Her main research interest is feminist epistemologies and methodologies and she works in the field of trans/national gender studies, which includes issues of sexualities, gender, class and ethnicity.

Linda Lund Pedersen holds a Master degree in Philosophy from the department of Media, Cognition and Communication, University of Copenhagen. Her areas of interest are Psychoanalysis, Sexual difference theories, Travelling Concepts, Feminist theories/Epistemologies/Methodologies, Postcolonial theories and Critical Whitesness Studies.

Milka Metso, PhD Candidate, University of Toulouse II – Le Mirail and Abo Akademi (Finland) / Associate of Valta Göra, France. Her research interests are inequalities in professional life, gendered career patterns, family/employment interface and women's employment in Europe.

Anita Mörth, Mag.ᵃ phil., is a Education scientist. She works at the Berlin University for Professional Studies since 2009. Her current research topics are Gender sensitive Teaching and Training and Organizing Life Long Learning within Higher Education.

Jennifer Lynne Musto is a PhD candidate in the Women's Studies Department at the University of California, Los Angeles and a visiting scholar/instructor in Utrecht University's Graduate Gender Programme. Her research interests include, sex worker, and immigrant rights, structural violence, social movements, transnational feminism(s), European feminism(s), carceral feminism(s), and human rights.

Iris van der Tuin is Assistant Professor in Gender Studies at the Department of Media and Culture Studies at Utrecht University, the Netherlands. Her areas of interest are New Feminist Epistemologies (Esp. New Materialism), Third-Wave Feminism and Philosophy of Science.

Teaching with the Third Wave

How to deal with gender, women, gender roles, feminism and gender equality in teaching practices? The ATHENA thematic network brings together specialists in women's and gender studies, feminist research, women's rights, gender equality and diversity. In the book series 'Teaching with Gender' the partners in this network have collected articles on a wide range of teaching practices in the field of gender. The books in this series address challenges and possibilities of teaching about women and gender in a wide range of educational contexts. The authors discuss pedagogical, theoretical and political dimensions of learning and teaching on women and gender. The books in this series contain teaching material, reflections on feminist pedagogies, practical discussions about the development of gender-sensitive curricula in specific fields. All books address the crucial aspects of education in Europe today: increasing international mobility, growing importance of interdisciplinarity and the many practices of life-long learning and training that take place outside the traditional programmes of higher education. These books will be indispensable tools for educators who take serious the challenge of teaching with gender. (for titles see inside cover)

"Teaching with the Third Wave – New Feminists' Explorations of Teaching and Institutional Contexts" is a collection of the work of young feminist scholars united in their interest in a Third Wave perspective of teaching which continues feminists' struggles for equality and female empowerment. The volume presents reflections on the transfer of feminist knowledge inside and outside university structures under current conditions by respecting the work of earlier generations of feminists. Being part of the European feminist network ATHENA, the contributors map a cartography of emerging questions in regards to teaching methodologies, teaching experiences and challenges for teaching under increasingly globalized and neo-liberal circumstances as well as neo-conservative and right-wing tendencies from the perspective of different Western locations, theoretical backgrounds, political and personal situatednesses. Thus, the volume is of interest for all (feminist) readers who are involved in furthering feminist teaching in present conditions.