

A Report on the project “Gender perspectives on university education and academic disciplines - a pedagogic project for the development of teaching”, supported by the Council for the Renewal of Higher Education in Sweden under the period from 2004 to 2006.

***Methods for Transforming University Teaching and Education:
Explorations of critical feminist pedagogy and university teaching***

Authors:

**Sara Goodman and Diana Mulinari (scientific leader for the project)
Center for Gender Studies
Lund University**

This project has been financed by the Council for the Renewal of Higher Education, and we would like to express our thanks for the support and encouragement that the project has received from the Council and the Council’s staff.

We would also like to express our gratitude to the exciting team of university lecturers and doctoral students who have been a part of this project. In particular, we would like to warmly thank Charlotte Agevall, Anna Jansdotter, Viktorija Kalonaityte and Johan Vaide, for their thoughtful, intellectually challenging and productive contributions. Additionally we would like to thank Slavka Sehovac and Birgit Gisslar-Höglund at the Centre for Gender Studies for their support in making this project practically possible.

Contact address:

**Sara Goodman and Diana Mulinari (scientific leader for the project)
Center for Gender Studies
Lund University
Box 117
221 00 Lund
Sweden**

Webpage: www.genus.lu.se

Abstract

This article describes analyses an action research project on methods of integrating of gender perspectives into university education. This project was carried out at Lund University, and involved both doctoral students and university teachers. The project incorporated doctoral students as part of the project team and they actively participated in the planning of courses on the integration of gender perspectives into learning and teaching at the university. During the project, the project team also explored their own experiences and dilemmas in teaching in relationship to the body of literature regarding feminist pedagogy. The methodology developed in the project, which we refer to as the “Lund Model”, is contextual and intersectional. The concept of intersectionality focuses upon the complex relationships of power and is used to analyze how gender is intertwined and melded other kinds of relations and structures of power and knowledge within the academic world as well as within society.

Keywords: university teaching, gender perspectives, feminist pedagogy, higher education
Intersectionality, intersectional gender studies.

This article is a reflection upon and critical analysis of a project to develop methods for integrating gender perspectives into university education curriculum and will discuss some of the possibilities, paradoxes, problems and pleasures in working with the integration of gender perspectives and gender research into university teaching. We will also discuss the continuing dynamic tension between disciplines and gender research and within gender research. This article is based on work done with in the project *Gender perspectives on university education and academic disciplines - a pedagogic project for the development of teaching*. This project received support the Council for the Renewal of Higher Education under the period from 2004 to 2006.

Rationale for change

In 2003, when the Council for the Renewal of Higher Education announced a call for funding of projects in which would develop pedagogical models for integrating a gender perspective into higher education, a group of academic staff members from the Centre for Gender Studies discussed whether the Centre for Gender Studies should to apply or not. The Center had earlier given a number of courses for doctoral students and university lecturers at Lund University on “Gender in university teaching and learning”. Still, there were a number of issues that made us hesitant. While none of us felt ourselves to be “experts in pedagogy”, we do have long years of teaching Gender Studies, developing a new subject and actively partaking of/ and or participating in the lively debate on critical feminist pedagogies and following the research on teaching and learning, that has accompanied and been central to the development of Gender Studies. Although we understand generally what is meant by “gender perspective” – the term is in many ways has no well structured or commonly accepted definition. Indeed, is it is often very loosely defined and can be used in a variety of ways in different contexts. One can define it quite narrowly as methods of teaching that are gender aware – but this definition is quite thin and limited. When this term is applied to university teaching, we argue for a more robust and forceful use of the term which bridges discussions of pedagogy and method of teaching, along with critical feminist pedagogy and in interaction with the cutting edge of gender research.

Lastly, another issue upon which we reflected, is that the formulation of the goal of integrating a gender perspective at the university level and the state policy level as an equality policy, tends to create certain unclear expectations about the role of the Gender Studies in general and the role Centre for Gender Studies at Lund University specifically as well as generating some unclear expectations

about the professional roles of the lecturers and researchers. This may be particular to the Swedish context in which there have been extensive public debates about gender equality in general as well as a set of limited, at times weak but always much debated reforms directed at higher education in relation to equality and diversity issues. The Centre has two main functions and these are doing critical and independent research and carrying out and further developing education in Gender Studies at the undergraduate, advanced and PhD. levels.¹

Review of relevant literature

In the development of the field of Gender Studies, the discussion of teaching and forms of learning in relation to science critiques and questions of epistemology has been a central intellectual current. So discussions of feminist pedagogies have developed concurrently with the development of the field. The field of Gender Studies² in the Sweden, the Nordic countries, US and in parts of Europe roots in the second wave of the feminism³ The second wave of feminism is the term used to describe the women's movements that arose in the mid-sixties and early seventies in western countries. The U.S. the movements of the 60s and 70s were first referred to as women's liberation. These movements were influenced and inspired by the Black Liberation movement and by the civil rights movement. Additionally the second wave was formed in the context of the student movement and anti- Viet Nam war movement.

Central to the establishment of Gender Studies has been a critique of aspects of the academic system in Western countries, which has historically tended to largely exclude women as knowers and creators of knowledge and to exclude research questions that addressed social inequalities between women and men. The second wave implicitly refers to the earlier women's movements for women's rights in the second half of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century. A number of critical debates in Gender Studies, debates that have roots in women's movements and that have influenced feminist theorising and practice around pedagogy are as follows: the science critique in Gender Studies and its relation to social change; conceptions of power and hierarchy, knowledge and experience in feminist thinking; black feminism; the ethics of caring and its critics; theorizing

¹ Currently, Gender Studies is a major at Lund University and students can take degrees in Gender Studies at the Bachelor, Master's and PhD. Levels.

² We use the term Gender Studies to refer the broad field which may also be called women's studies or feminist studies. This field includes masculinity studies, gay and lesbian studies and queer studies and the term gender studies is used as a broad "umbrella" for the field rather than a discursive statement regarding which term should be used for these fields.

³ The term second wave does not entirely fit all of the women's movements in Europe. For an extended discussion of different national women's movements and their relations to gender studies see Rosi Braidotti and Gabriele Griffins's anthology (2002), *Thinking differently : a reader in European women's studies*.

differences; postmodernist attempts to develop feminist theory; global feminisms; gay, lesbian and queer feminisms and finally intersectional perspectives.

Berenice Malka Fisher gives an excellent overview of a number of issues in feminist pedagogies. She has been involved in the teaching of gender issues and Women's Studies for the last twenty-five years.⁴ She argues in her recent book *No angel in the classroom: teaching through feminist discourse* (2001) for the need of feminist discourse⁵ in the teaching of Women's Studies. She compares the roots of Women's Studies in the feminist movements of the 1970's with other social movements and their need to articulate a vision of social change. For example the well know educational theoretician and practitioner, John Dewey was a reformer whose ideas were inspired by the social movement of his time, the "U. S. progressive reform movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries" (Fisher 2001 p. 27). Similarly, the political theorist Antonio Gramsci developed a theory of education based upon the idea that educating the working class and the poor would give them the intellectual and social means to create changes towards a more equitable economic system. (Gramsci 1971). Like many other university teachers in Women's Studies, Fisher also references to the emancipatory educational theories and practices of Paulo Freire, the Brazilian adult educator and social critique, best known for his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Freire sought to use the experiences of oppressed groups as a source of knowledge in their own educational process. He suggested that teachers and students be co-investigators. (Freire 1985). These ideas developed out of his engagement with movements for social justice. The ideas of students and teachers as co-investigators, co-learners or participants in collaborative are widely spread within current discussions of teaching and learning within universities, although not always with reference to movements for social equality.⁶ The premise of creating a learning environment that is based upon respect for students' knowledge and upon a process of education which can contribute to greater social justice and equality has been fundamental within feminist pedagogies and within the development of Gender Studies as a field.

Patti Lather notes that the complexity in attempting to teach for empowerment and social change. She argues that there is a fine line between empowering and telling students what to think – it is teaching with a message. Furthermore, Lather found that her own Gender / Women's Studies students did not want to understand that they were oppressed as women. At the same time, Lather wants to deconstruct

⁴ Berenice Malka Fisher works in educational philosophy at New York University and thus has often had classes of 30 students or under with whom to work. This is relevant in understanding her teaching situation.

⁵ Malka Fisher uses discourse here to mean discourse, that is "formal and orderly and usually extended expression of thought on a subject" (Merriam Online Dictionary 2005).

⁶ See for example Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press and Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to Teaching in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.

the category of women. Lather surprisingly doesn't problematize other classroom conflicts around class, sexuality, race and identity. This is taken up in a more convincing way by Fisher.

Fisher argues that her position in teaching Gender/Women's Studies within the university systems is influenced by the second wave feminist movement. Her background is common for the first generation of Women's Studies practitioners. Discussions of pedagogy in Gender Studies are often characterized by the tensions of working in a university system and striving for emancipatory social change.⁷ This has also meant challenging our own practice and a critical reflection on the limits of democratic relations in the university. One of the important limits is structural – that is the differing positions of teachers and students in terms of power and resources. This is an important relationship to examine in teaching. Furthermore, as Malka Fisher points out that our positions in the academy are quite different. Her own teaching praxis is based a university with a small teaching load and small class size, which permits her to expand the boundaries of her feminist teaching. On one hand feminist teachers try to develop innovative teaching and learning forms on the other hand, on the other hand there is other a serious lack of resources and time. A heavy teaching load means that at times one doesn't know all of ones' students, much less have time to discuss and problematize personal experiences in relation to course literature. The teaching in Gender / Women's studies often creates a need in students to reflect upon themselves and upon their society in a dialogue with the teacher.

Women and gender have been central, almost foundational categories in Gender Studies. Although theorizing in Gender Studies has always pointed to the historical and social specificity of the meaning of being a women or a man, woman of colour theorist have continually problematized the insufficient attention to experiences of women of colour and lesbian women have problematized the omission of lesbian experiences.⁸ The focus of the criticism from women of colour has been the inarticulation or silencing of their experiences and the inadequate theorizing of different forms of domination. The Comhahee River collective published an early statement in the 1970s. Within sociology Maxine Baca Zinn has developed her argument for a more inclusive analysis within Gender Studies since the middle of the 70's and has highlighted the structural situation and experiences of Mexican women in the U.S. Central theorists for black feminism include Audrey Lorde, Patricia Hill Collins and Bell Hooks. Particularly bell hooks has focused upon the marginalization of black women within feminist studies in her work *From the margins to the center* and *Ain't I a Women*. The concept of experience and the use of experience remains explicitly or implicitly in Gender Studies teaching. In a discussion of teaching practices, Bell Hooks notes that: "Feminist and critical pedagogy are two alternative

⁷ All practioners of gender studies would not agree with this formulation. Some would argue that gender studies is not a socially critical subject but rather one subject like all others. However, most practitioners would recognize these tensions, even if the tensions are resolved differently.

⁸ I place this critique before the discussion of poststructuralism/ postmodernism since these critiques were rasied before and parallel to introduction of poststructuralism into women's studies.

paradigms for teaching which have really emphasized the issue of coming to voice. The focus emerged as central, precisely because it is so evident that race, sex and class privilege empower some students more than others, granting “authority to some voices more than others.” (Hooks 1994: 185). Paulina de los Reyes and Diana Mulinari are Swedish researchers who have established research in the areas of gender, “race” and racism and have figured centrally have been central in developing the discussion of intersectionality in a Swedish feminist context. In 2005, their book on intersectionality was published. In their analysis gender, class and “race” they emphasize structures, practices and individual actions. The connection between curriculum, gender and nation building projects and between privileged forms of white (hetero) sexual femininity implied a different reading of the analytical category of woman (Lather 1991.)

Question(s)

Our research plan suggested focusing on aspects of integrating gender into teaching and learning which included:

- 1) Organisational and institutional discussions – the organization of the discipline is introduced together with a discussion of the gender division of labour within the field. Historical and organisational analyses are explored regarding women’s inclusion/ exclusion from the field. Investigations of useful concepts and theories.
- 2) Gender perspectives as a critique of science and a discussion of research policy. Why have concepts and research relating to gender been included or not included in the field? Has women’s work been referred to or has it gradually been erased? Have men been problematized as a sex/gender or do only women appear to be bearers of sex?
- 3) Intersections of gender, class and ethnicity in university teaching, learning and research.
- 4) Gender perspectives as introducing new research and theories which address previous “blind spots” in science regarding gender.
- 5) The deconstruction of representations and dualities regarding men and women, male and female, masculinities and femininities in scientific texts. How are women and men portrayed?
- 6) Analyses of power relations within the academy and with in development of science. How has male numeric dominance been transformed into a representation of men as more scientific rational, etc.
- 7) How do gender relations “work” in the class room teaching and how are male and female teachers’ authority viewed.

Importance of the project to you and why

For the purpose of this project we defined integration of gender perspectives as implying reflection on both teaching forms as well as course subjects and contents. It necessitates a critical reflection upon questions and traditions within different academic fields and a willingness to address new questions and incorporate new research into teaching and learning. The theoretical and analytical development of the concept of gender to include studies of men and diversity means that gender research can contribute to supporting ethnic and social diversity within the academic worlds. While Gender Studies is a fairly new field as a research area, it is nonetheless both empirically and theoretically well developed. And it is thus possible to integrate gender perspectives in learning and teaching into different academic disciplines since there exists a substantial body of research and theoretical literature. In our opinion, it is vitally important that the forefront of Swedish and international research in gender is included in the discussion of a gender perspective and that the complex understandings of inter-relationships between gender, class, ethnicity, disability and sexualities, not be reduced or simplified to a discussion of binary perspectives.

Method

The methodology developed in the project, which we refer to as the “*Lund Model*”, is contextual and intersectional. The concept of intersectionality⁹ focuses upon the complex relationships and structures of power and is used to analyze how gender is intertwined and melded other kinds of relations and structures of power and knowledge within the academic world as well as within society. It includes moving between different levels of analysis from individual identities, to organisations and to societies and culture.

The concrete method for this project included the development and planning of the four team taught courses by the project group of lecturers and doctoral students. These courses targeted doctoral students from all the Social Sciences and Humanities but which were even open to lecturers. On the average eight to ten doctoral students and eight to ten lecturers participated. The three-day courses that was planned and organised (and evaluated) by the developmental group (including the doctoral students) provided an arena (that according to the participants was missing in their own institutions) where gender issues could be critically grasped and where possible models to expand (or to open) the institutions for a gender perspective developed.

⁹ See Crenshaw 1995.

Including Doctoral Students

The process of including doctoral students in the planning and evaluation of the courses along with the discussion of literature and application of theoretical and research-based articles contributed to the strong success of the doctoral students' teaching and learning experiences. In our view it engendered a creative and dynamic learning community between the senior project members and the doctoral student members. In this community, the doctoral students made many important contributions which strengthened the course planning process. Additionally, the doctoral students emphasised that they had use for a forum to discuss, critically reflect upon their experiences. In their evaluative reflections on the project, they argue that this discussion along with the discussion of theory and research, contributed to their understanding of gender with in the context of their respective disciplines and teaching.

Innovation (what and how)

The *Lund Model* includes *four significant innovations*.

1. Firstly, a significant innovation of the *Lund Model* is its *explicit contextual and intersectional approach* to developing courses on the integration of gender perspectives for university teachers and doctoral students.
2. A second important innovation, is the *strong emphasis in the project upon including the forefront of gender research* both interdisciplinary research and more disciplinary based research.
3. Thirdly there is an *explicit intent to include research and scholarship that is relevant to different teaching contexts in combination with critical reflection on more concrete teaching methods* and to combine this with both science critiques and exploration of teaching methods is unique.
4. A further innovative future is the emphasis upon *embodiment and teaching and the development of gender case studies*.

Additionally more concretely there are a number of innovative aspects in the concrete project organisation that are discussed below. These include:

- doctoral student participation in planning, organizing and evaluation of course
- the exploration of new and alternative pedagogical forms and intersectional perspectives within gender pedagogy
- critical reflections on the public/private dichotomy and embodied teaching
- development of gender case studies for use in the courses.

The courses that was planned and organised (and evaluated) by the developmental group (including the doctoral students) and thus gave the doctoral students in the development group experience in operationalizing and planning a course in the development of teaching, an experience in connecting research on scholarship with course development. These courses provided an arena (that according to the participants was missing in their own institutions) where gender issues could be critically grasped and where possible models to expand (or to open) the institutions for a gender perspective developed.

One of the exciting challenges for this project has been the heterogeneity of the research team; the fact that the research team is composed by teachers with extremely different experiences of how a gender perspective is embodied within their own disciplines and institutions forced the group to understand the need of developing models of gender pedagogy that are highly contextual and grounded in the disciplines and the institutions previous history and culture. Secondly there is a generational shift; the doctoral students provide both a theoretical and empirical understanding of gender that illustrates the shift that has taken place in the discipline between a focus on gender as the central analytical tool in gender studies towards a focus on gender as both one of the several axes of power relations and as a social relation that is constitutive and highly shapes other social relations. Their understanding of gender challenges (up to a given point) earlier studies within gender research based on a narrowed focused on women and men and demands new and alternative pedagogical forms in order to mediate what the research group has defined as an intersectional perspective within gender pedagogy.

While it could be argue that the strength of the project lies in the heterogeneity of its numerous members, it would also be suggested that in the context institutions that demand their presence, it has been more difficult for some members to prioritise the project as they would have wished. Furthermore there have been diminishing teaching opportunities for doctoral students due to budget cuts in undergraduate education at Lund University. This is a problem beyond the project's control but it has contributed to less opportunity for the doctoral students to work on their own teaching.

Another central experience has been the critical reflection on the public/private dichotomy. Within the project team, we focused some efforts on analyse the embodied experience of being a feminist student/teacher within what continuous to be a highly patriarchal institution with tremendous impediments to include new ways of thinking and doing research. The exploration of personal narratives or teaching autobiographies, gave a richness of the discussion grounded on these reflections. And this has contributed to our understanding of the centrality of focusing on the concept of bodies when discussing teaching. A collection of these narratives, theoretically inspired in memory work has been an important task for the project during year two and three. Elements of these narratives are reflected in the gender cases that were developed for teaching.

One of the more challenging ideas in this project is the importance given to the participation of doctoral students through the entire research project. In this context one of our achievements has been the construction and consolidation of a doctoral student group. While doctoral students belong to different disciplines and faculties, all of them are highly engaged in gender aspects of their respective fields. The first year the doctoral student group and the leading group (Diana Mulinari and Sara Goodman) met roughly once a month. These meetings have had a similar agenda. The first two hours have been dedicated to theoretical debates on gender and pedagogy. Discussion has been based on several texts that are at the core of feminist pedagogy. The second part of the meeting has had at its focus our efforts to operationalise this theoretical discussion in the everyday practice of teaching within the University. Discussions have been based in both the content and form of courses aiming to integrate a gender perspective to traditional models of university teaching and researching and in the personal experience of the doctoral students and the leading group as feminist / gender teachers in the academy.

Procedures

The issue of integration is related to theories of science, epistemology and development of scientific fields. It is not only an issue of including women in university teaching or literature written by women in course literature lists, but also a deeper scientific question that implies more radical change in the content of courses. Academic research has historically been male dominated in terms of the actual actors in the field. This dominance has influenced the development of science by influencing the kinds of questions and problems but also in terms that have been considered scientifically important or at the scientific cutting edge. The selection of problems which have been considered scientifically important has tended to exclude problems which have been central to women's lives and experiences.

The methodology that we refer to as the "*Lund Model*", is contextual and intersectional. This means that the integration of gender perspectives is always in relation to a particular academic context or field of studying. The concept of intersectionality focuses upon the complex relationships of power and is used to analyze how gender is intertwined and melded other kinds of relations and structures of power and knowledge within the academic world as well as within society.

The project was not offering a ready made package that could be used in any context; rather we have argued for is the active involvement of doctoral students and lecturers in a critical reflection about the contents and forms of teaching in their subjects. We choose not to separate the content of teaching from the form of teaching and did not wish to provide a check- list.¹⁰

¹⁰ This does not mean that check lists have no place or use for reflections on teaching.

Within the project we worked on two fronts. Most, importantly we formed a team of lecturers and doctoral students, who had the task of exploring critical feminist pedagogies and gender perspectives together. And then the team used this knowledge and common reflections in the development and teaching of courses in “University Pedagogy – Integrating Gender Perspectives in University Teaching and Learning”. These courses were given in cooperation with the Faculty of Social Sciences and the Faculty of the Humanities at Lund University. The courses could be used by the lecturers and doctoral students to partially fill the Lund University requirements for university pedagogy.¹¹

Results

The purpose of the project has been to further develop a pedagogical model – the now called “Lund Model”. This aspect of the project has been in many ways quite successful. Both the project members and the course participants have been very positive to this methodology for integrating a gender perspective. The project has resulted in a further development of the model, a number of courses and a number of publications. The methodology will continued to be use in the university pedagogy courses on “Gender Perspectives”, which are now being given regularly at the Faculty of Social Sciences, Lund University. Our work has been presented in Sweden and internationally and has been received with interest. So in one sense this effort has been quite successful. However, since we argue for a particular model that includes context and intersectionality, an awareness of generation and embodiment and attention to gender research and theory in relationship to disciplines along with a focus on forms of teaching, we do not necessarily expect the model to be applied in its entirety in different university settings. It requires a commitment to developing knowledge of gender research that is both disciplinary and interdisciplinary. This is a one sense a reasonable expectation, if the goal is to integrate gender perspectives in university teaching.

Discussion

The *Lund Model* is however, also a demanding model. It requires time, effort and learning from doctoral students and university teachers. A time and effort that both our project team and most of the course participants have chosen to give. Nonetheless, in a period in which teaching loads are increasing, resources are diminishing and doctoral students feel increasing pressure to perform and focus, asking university teachers and doctoral students to do more work and to explore new fields of knowledge, is not without contradictions. While it is outside the scope of this project, if this kind of model is to be most fruitful, we would strongly argue that both doctoral students and university

¹¹ Individual teachers can choose a variety of university pedagogy courses and are not required to take ours in particular. So it was one option among many.

teachers need more time and resources for reading, research and development of teaching. *A gender perspective also requires knowledge, interest and time: and time has become such a very scarce resource for university teachers in Sweden.*

References

- Crenshaw, K. (1995) : Mapping the Margins, in *Critical Race Theory*, The New Press, New York, 357-83.
- De los Reyes, Paulina och Diana Mulinari (2005), *Intersektionalitet : kritiska reflektioner över (o)jämlighetens*. Malmö : Liber.
- Fisher, Berenice Malka (2001), *No angel in the classroom : teaching through feminist discourse*, Lanham, Md. : Rowman & Littlefield.
- Freire, Paulo (1985) *The politics of education : culture, power, and liberation* introduction by Henry A. Giroux ; translated by Donaldo Macedo, London : Macmillan.
- Gilroy, P. (1997) 'Diaspora and the Detours of Identity', in K. Woodward (ed.), *Identity and Difference*. London: Sage.
- Gramsci, Antonio (1971) *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*, ed. and transl. by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, London : Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hall, S. 1990. 'Cultural Identity and Diaspora' in J. Rutherford (ed.), *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Hooks, Bell (1984) *Feminist theory from margin to center*, Boston, Mass:South End Press.
See for example Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press and Ramsden, P. (1992). *Learning to Teaching in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Lorde, Audre (1984) *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*, New York: The Crossing Press.
- Merriam Online Dictionary, <http://www.webster.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va=discourse>, © 2005 Merriam-Webster, Incorporated, read 2005-02-11.)
- Mulinari, Diana and Kerstin Sandell (1999) "Exploring the Notion of Experience in Feminist Thought", *Acta Sociologia*, Vol. 42, nr. 4, pp 287-298.
- Rakow , Lana F. (2001) "Teaching Against the Text" *Feminist Media Studies*, Volume 1, Number 3 / November 1, 2001, pp. 381 – 383.
- Smith, Dorothy E. (1990) *The conceptual practices of power : a feminist sociology of knowledge*, Boston : Northeastern University Press.
- Zinn, Maxine Baca. 1982. "Mexican-American women in the social sciences." *Signs* 8:259-272.

Appendix 1:

The following is a documentation of course material developed by member of the project group. The project group developed five "cases" based upon a critical analysis of our own reflections on teaching experiences in dialogue with discussions of critical feminist pedagogies.

Genusperspektiv i undervisning

Case: När olikheter möts.

Jag skulle i anslutning till mina personliga reflektioner här ovan, vilja fortsätta diskussionen om representationer. Låt oss föreställa oss följande scenario:

En grupp studenter har samlats för seminarium kring temat kultur och kulturella förklaringar. Diskussionen flyter på och studenterna verkar finna ämnet intressant och levande. I diskussionen hänvisar man i stor utsträckning till egna erfarenheter, om hur vi svenskar är, hur vi turkar är, hur kvinnor är, hur män är osv. Men vad kan vi säga utifrån våra erfarenheter och vad vill vi ha sagt med berättelser baserade på den egna erfarenheten?

Om en kvinnlig student från Turkiet berättar att männen i hennes hemland inte accepterar att flickor/kvinnor har utomäktenskapliga förbindelser och att dessa män är beredda att slå och döda sina döttrar för att upprätthålla familjens heder.

Om en ung kvinnlig student från Sverige genom att referera till egna erfarenheter, berättar att kvinnor har en helt annan förmåga att ta hand om barn, än vad män har. Hennes man vaknar t.ex. aldrig när barnet gråter om natten, medan hon vaknar så fort bebisen vänder på sig i sängen.

Att representera en hel grupp människor, att göra sig till "språkrör" kan vara problematiskt. Det kan också vara problematiskt att låta erfarenhetskonceptet ligga till grund för legitimeringen av att agera "språkrör". Med begreppet språkrör åsyftas i denna diskussion, en person som antingen själv tar på sig en hel grupps eller befolknings röst. En person som utger sig för att kunna tala inte bara för sig själv, utan även för andra, om det görs med hänvisning till kön, etnicitet, religion, klass eller någon annan identifikationsfaktor kan däremot variera.

Hur kan vi i samtal använda oss av egna erfarenheter, utan att göra erfarenheter till en "sanning" (något som vi kan generalisera utifrån) och utan att kränka den person som delger oss andra av sina egna erfarenheter? Hur skapar vi både det goda samtalet och det kritiskt vetenskapliga samtalet? Hur skall vi som lärare agera i situationer där:

- 1) Den egna erfarenheten – används för att göra grova generaliseringar?

- 2) När kritik av den egna erfarenheten, görs på ett sätt som uppenbart kränker den andra personen?
- 3) Frågan är dock om ”språkrörsfrågan” alltid är negativ eller om det också finns en styrka i att agera språkrör, i att använda sina egna erfarenheter? (Hur hade kvinnorörelsen eller kampen för svartas rättigheter eller kampen för sexuellt likaberättigande sett ut om vi fråntar människor rätten att tala i termer av representationer, om ingen tillåts agera språkrör?)

Charlotte Agevall, case för projektet ” Gender Perspectives on University Education and Academic Disciplines. A Pedagogic Project for the Development of Teaching”, Centrum för genusvetenskap, Lunds universitet, November 2005. ©

Genusperspektiv i undervisning

Diskussionsunderlag,

Case: Några reflektioner om representationer i en undervisningskontext

När jag började läsa på universitet för 10 år sedan, minns jag att jag blev besviken över att det bara fanns manliga lärare. Det var först på b-kursen som jag för första gången fick en kvinnlig lärare. Mitt behov av en förebild som jag kunde identifiera mig med var stort och jag var både spänd och nyfiken inför föreläsningen som den kvinnliga läraren skulle hålla. I takt med att kursen gick, blev jag mer och mer besviken över att de förväntningar som jag riktade mot läraren inte uppfylldes. Men vad var jag egentligen besviken över? Dels upplevde jag inte att läraren motsvarade mina förväntningar beträffande innehållet i föreläsningarna och dels så var jag besviken över att hon inte hade något genusperspektiv eller intresse av att lyfta fram genusfrågor.

Det sistnämnda finner jag intressant. Att läraren inte hade ett genusperspektiv eller intresse av att ta upp frågor som hade med kön att göra, var något som jag förväntade mig av den kvinnliga läraren, men som jag inte kan erinra mig om att jag förväntade mig av de manliga lärarna. Den kvinnliga läraren fick i mina ögon representera något utöver att vara lärare, hon skulle i mina ögon, även vara en person, en kvinna som jag kunde identifiera mig med och som likt en medsyster skulle lyfta fram genusperspektivet i undervisningen och göra genusperspektivet lika centralt som alla andra perspektiv vi fick lära oss om.

Men varför denna naiva inställning, varför denna i högsta grad könsrelaterade förväntning på en kvinnlig lärare? Jag riktar ju inte bara specifika förväntningar mot henne som kvinnlig lärare utan sätter också någon slags tilltro till att hon i egenskap av kvinna skall känna sig solidarisk med och besitta kunskap i det genusvetenskapliga fältet.

- Hur möter vi studenters förväntningar?
- Förväntar sig studenterna idag att undervisningen genomsyras av ett genusperspektiv?
- Är det viktigt att integrera ett genusperspektiv i undervisningen?

Charlotte Agevall, case för projektet ” Gender Perspectives on University Education and Academic Disciplines. A Pedagogic Project for the Development of Teaching”, Centrum för genusvetenskap, Lunds universitet, November 2005. ©

Genusperspektiv i undervisning

Diskussionsunderlag

Case: Att leda en diskussion / etik och lärande

När genusforskning/feministisk forskning diskuteras av kursdeltagare står ofta de teoretiska frågeställningarna i relation till högst personliga uppfattningar, vilket kan vara en utmaning för undervisningen såväl som för skapandet av en fungerande lärande gemenskap. Läraren ansvarar å ena sidan för att bidra till studenternas lärande och å andra sidan för etiska överväganden i undervisningssituationen. För läraren ligger alltså utmaningen i att förmedla forskningsämne och teoretiska innehåll och att samtidigt hantera studenternas reaktioner i klassrummet.

Sexualitetsdiskussion – sexualitet som teoretisk och personlig fråga

Kursen är på nivå 1-20 och det finns 50 kursdeltagare. I diskussionsgrupper finns 16-17 personer per grupp. På den här dagen diskuterar vi hur sexualitet har teoretiserats inom samhällsvetenskapen. Studenterna har precis läst Robert Connells bok *Masculinities* och har fått i uppgift att med hjälp av bokens första avsnitt diskutera sexualitet utifrån ett historiskt perspektiv.

En av studenterna är en mycket aktiv anhängare av Svenska Kyrkan och står för en konservativ tolkning av sexualitet. Hon är illa berörd av Connells diskussion kring sexualitet och har svårt för att betrakta sexualitet som ett föränderligt socialt fenomen, eller som socialt konstruerat, och ser hellre sexuella praktiker i termer av naturliga och onaturliga. Hon har flera gånger gett uttryck för att hon känner sig utanför gruppen, eftersom hon ser sig själv som olik de övriga studenterna. Några av studenterna har tagit detta på allvar och försökt få henne att känna sig mer inkluderad. Andra har försökt att distansera sig från diskussionerna där hennes perspektiv ofta har hamnat i fokus.

Under den här specifika diskussionen gör studenten uttalanden som kan betraktas som homofobiska. Flera av de andra studenterna poängterar detta. Diskussionen hamnar längre och längre bort ifrån läsmaterialet och läraren ser ett återkommande mönster i den här gruppen. Läraren vill arbeta mer med texten, särskilt de kapitlen som handlar om Freud och om hur sexualitet och maskulinitet historiskt sett har behandlats inom samhällsvetenskapen. Flera av studenterna är inte välbekanta med de teorier som Connell hänvisar till i avsnittet och behöver därför tiden för att diskutera dessa.

Samtidigt vill läraren rikta uppmärksamhet mot vad det är som händer mellan studenterna och hon inser att det är hennes ansvar som lärare att hålla en hög etisk nivå på kursen. Vid tidigare tillfällen har flera studenter framfört klagomål till läraren angående att de, särskilt på den här kursen, hade förväntat sig en miljö fri från homofobiska uttalanden. Läraren håller med studenterna men har svårt för att föra diskussionen framåt. Läraren har tidigare haft ett enskilt samtal med studenten i fråga, men studenten har svårt för att förstå var gränsen går mellan att argumentera för hennes personliga ståndpunkt och att ge kommentarer som är homofobiska.

Vilka möjliga strategier kan läraren använda i den här situationen? Vad skulle du ge för förslag till läraren om hon var din kollega? På vilka olika sätt kan läraren föra diskussionen framåt?

Sara Goodman, case för projektet ” Gender Perspectives on University Education and Academic Disciplines. A Pedagogic Project for the Development of Teaching”, Centrum för genusvetenskap, Lunds universitet, November 2005. ©

Genusperspektiv i undervisning
Diskussionsunderlag, februari 2007
Case: argumentation och motstånd

Ibland kan det visa sig vara oerhört svårt att introducera genusperspektiv främst dess relevans ifrågasätts på olika sätt.

På en kandidatkurs om organisationssociologi är ett lektionstillfälle ämnat åt att diskutera artiklar om genus och olika inriktningar inom feministisk teori. Gruppen består av drygt 15 personer, som har visat sig vara mycket aktiva och välförberedda.

Diskussionen kommer igång och snart handlar om genus i allmänhet och inte bara artikel i fråga. Flera deltagare tycker att det vore intressant att se de fenomen som beskrivs i artikeln ur ett allmänmänskligt perspektiv. Även om det finns män och kvinnor, så är alla de beteenden som synliggörs i artikeln och kan observeras i livet individuella, hävdar en av dem. En annan student tycker att det är det finns faror i att läsa in genus i allting, för då glömmes man att individer kanske har helt andra identiteter som är primära för dem. Det är därför det är så positivt med postmodernistiskt influerade teorier, hävdar studenten, där ser man tydligt hur problematiskt det är att reducera människor till män och kvinnor. När läraren påpekar att det empiriska materialet i artikeln visar tydligt hur genus konstrueras, tycker samma kursdeltagare att artikeln inte är så övertygande. Visserligen ser man spår av något som kan tolkas som genus, men hur kan forskaren vara säker på genus är det viktiga i det här fallet? Folk kanske pratar på det sättet, men hur påverkar det organisationen? Och varför är genus problematiskt? Det är ju positivt och förväntat att kvinnliga sekreterare som beskrivs i fallet ska vara mindre passiva och förvärva tekniska kunskaper, hävdar studenten. Och är inte det minst lika synd om de manliga konsulterna, som i sin tur måste utföra flera sysslor?

Flera studenter verkar hålla med. Det kanske inte är en fråga som är relevant för oss, menar en av dem, utan snarare för andra ämnen, psykologi som kan besvara varför folk väljer vissa yrken, eller lingvistik som intresserar sig för språkbruk, men organisationer – det tror vi inte.

Hur kan läraren arbeta för att visa genusperspektivets relevans för ämnet?

Viktorija Kalonaityte, case för projektet ” Gender Perspectives on University Education and Academic Disciplines. A Pedagogic Project for the Development of Teaching”, Centrum för genusvetenskap, Lunds universitet, November 2005. ©

Genusperspektiv i undervisning
Diskussionsunderlag
Case: Gruppdynamik

Gruppdiskussioner är ett vanligt inslag i undervisningen, och sker ofta i lektionsgrupper. Det som är minst lika vanligt förekommande är att studenterna deltar olika mycket i sådana diskussioner. Interaktionen mellan studenterna under diskussionens gång kan påverka huruvida alla eller enbart ett fåtal deltar i diskussionen aktivt.

På denna kurs följs föreläsningar av ett seminarium, där instuderingsmaterial i kompendiet ska diskuteras i grupp. Seminarierna är obligatoriska och sker i grupper av drygt trettio personer. Inför det första seminariet ger läraren studenterna några frågor att förbereda, för att förebygga risken med lågt diskussionsdeltagande.

När seminariet börjar frågar läraren om alla har läst och förberett frågorna, och då verkar alla i gruppen nicka instämmande. Men så fort frågorna ska diskuteras, är det enbart några som räcker upp handen. De mest aktiva är två killar i 20-års ålder som ganska fort hamnar i en debatt sinsemellan. Det är också en av dessa killar som kommenterar andras inlägg utan att räkna upp handen. Samtidigt sitter drygt halva gruppen, de flesta tjejer i 20-års ålder, tysta under hela första timmen av seminariet. Inför pausen uppmanar läraren de som hittills inte har sagt något att engagera sig i diskussionen, och under andra timmen räcker en av de tysta studenterna upp handen. Studenten är närmare 40, med asiatiskt utseende, och i sitt inlägg använder hon sig av egen arbetslivserfarenhet för att stärka sina argument. Under tiden som hon talar, och i sin iver lyckas få fel ordföljd i en och annan mening, börjar studenterna längst bak småprata med varandra. När läraren visar att hon har sett detta, tystnar dem. Lärarens nästa fråga är om någon vill fortsätta på samma tema som 40-åringen, men ingen räcker upp handen, utom den ena aktiva killen. Hans första kommentar är att han inte riktigt vet vad hon sa, men...

Vilka aspekter av gruppdynamiken ovan är problematiska, varför? Hur kan läraren jobba med gruppdynamiken?

Viktorija Kalonaityte, case för projektet ” Gender Perspectives on University Education and Academic Disciplines. A Pedagogic Project for the Development of Teaching”, Centrum för genusvetenskap, Lunds universitet, November 2005. ©