This is the accepted version of a paper presented at Congress of the Nordic Educational Research Association (NERA): Marketisation and Differentiation in Education at the University of Gothenburg.

Citation for the original published paper:

Kraus, A. (2015)
‘Gender as a Tacit Dimension of Pedagogy.
In:  (pp. 1-5).

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:
http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:lnu:diva-43602
“Gender” as a “Tacit Dimension” of Pedagogy

Firstly, “gender” signifies a range of characteristics pertaining to, and differentiating between masculinity and femininity, thus “[...] gender is a concept that is widely used and perceived in many quarters to mean ‘women’s issues’.” (FAWE 2005, p.1) and it refers to socially determined roles and relations between males and females - and “other genders”. Secondly, it serves as a category to describe phenomena of social life. Then it is a socio-cultural construct based on societal norms and values that define the roles men and women - and other “genders” - should play in society (ibid.). Thirdly, “gender” is an analytical tool helping us to understand the constitution of certain practices and appreciated knowledge domains at hand. - I will follow up the understanding of “gender” as an analytical “tool”.

It goes back to Donna Haraway’s “Cyborg Manifesto” (1991, 165); here we read: “[...] mind, body, and tool are on very intimate terms. The ‘multinational’ material organization of the production and reproduction of daily life and the symbolic organization of the production and reproduction of culture and imagination seem equally implicated. The boundary-maintaining images of base and superstructure, public and private, or material and ideal never seemed more feeble.” To be private means having an idea of what it is to be public, and the other way round. The experience of meaning-making in the interdependency of the public and the private does not only serve the consciousness of what it means to be constituted as a body. It can also be useful for changing society. “Gender” then serves as an analytical tool to work out the concepts of labor, individuation and other discursive power-lines in a society.

To follow up this approach within pedagogy means to go against the tradition of theoretical pedagogy to read social reality as if it were a text (cp. “linguistic turn”); that is to say, as if it were ruled by completeness, closeness, unambiguity and linearity. (Cp. Wulf 2007) On the basis of this preconception, important pedagogical concepts such as “competence”, “effort”, “learning” etc., and also “gender” are put into the logic scheme of a text, respectively pedagogical phenomena are supposed to exactly fit to the description of them, often reduced to (a kind of) “text” on norms and normativity and personal, social and political-economic demands; in this way they get standardized and, optimistically, rules for an effective practical pedagogy are formulated. Pedagogy is thus led by a high esteem for the personality and the autonomy of a teacher and an adolescent. Looking at postmodern approaches it is obvious that it is overstressing it. Francois Lyotard (1984) proclaimed the “end of master narratives“, such
as “emancipation”, “autonomy”, “societal progress” etc. By this he describes a paradigm shift from modernity to post-modernity. Instead of the outstanding human ideals and the normative frames characterizing “modernity” the concept of “post-modernity” stresses the materiality of the body, experience and history, lines it out and investigates it scientifically. Then, the multimodal utterances and self-interpretations of the acting persons, the contingency of social and cultural phenomena, the discoursivity of all kinds of individual, social and cultural orders as well as the stage-character of phenomena is focused. Thus, we can speak of a “tacit turn” in the Educational Sciences and in the field of theoretical pedagogy (cp. Bergstedt, Herbert, Kraus & Wulf 2012).

Gender should thus not serve as a grand narrative, but as an interpretative process as well as a continuous social ascription (cp. Butler, Barad, Haraway and many others). In this contribution, the concept of “gender” will be situated within the “tacit turn”.

The tacit side of pedagogical practices has already in the 1970s been discussed as a “hidden curriculum” (Jackson 1968) and within the “social systems” approach to teaching in the 1990s. Actually the tacit dimensions of pedagogy become also a central topic in ethnographical, phenomenological and poststructuralist analyses of educational processes that follow up the post-modern paradigm shift.¹ In the discursive fields opened up by these and other scientific approaches the central topics of the tacit dimensions of pedagogy (like e.g. “gender”) are not any more interpreted ontologically resp. as mere categories to describe phenomena of the social life or the characteristics of human beings as it is true for rationalist approaches. Moreover, the central concepts of the tacit dimensions of pedagogy are regarded as analytical tools helping us to understand the constitution of certain educational practices and dominant knowledge domains at hand. Then, they serve as analytical tools. “Gender” is used to describe discourses causing certain power relations, especially with the aim to resignify and to change them. Besides that, there is a whole spectrum of applications of the term, up to the point of bringing the body into the discussion on knowledge acquisition (cp. Lund 2013).

The hypothesis of this contribution is that especially the following three theoretical frameworks for empirical research on the tacit dimensions of pedagogy can be regarded as affirming the postmodern paradigm shift: It is the “implicit knowing” concept; it is anthropological approaches that describe human existence by performativity, and bodily-phenomenological approaches referring to corporeality. I will make up some main points of

¹ See e.g.: https://tacitdimensions.wordpress.com
these approaches and compare them in reference to different “gender” concepts. By the critique on them the fact should be stressed that there is no “right”, but only a limited and perspective understanding of “gender” in the context of the “tacit turn” in pedagogy.

“Implicit Learning and Knowing” is a psychological concept of a non-episodic, incidental learning that goes along with the unawareness of what is learnt. For implicit learning not a focal, but a “tacit”, that is to say more complex visual, sequential and as well functional attention is supposed to be required. “Gender” can be “implicit” attributions of particular qualities to a member of a certain social group. The result of implicit learning and knowing is supposed not to be articulable in a formal and systematic language, scientific formulae, specifications, and so forth. It is thought as being abstract and represented mostly in practice. Such “implicit” stereotypes or biases can be learned through past experiences, or they are activated by the environment. An example for a concept that offensively asserts as well as negates the implicit stereotypes of “gender” is that of “queer”. Originally, used to describe strange, odd, peculiar, or eccentric behaviour or looks the word “queer” was re-appropriated in the 1980ies as a neutral or positive self-identifier for not heterosexual gender minorities. Establishing community and asserting a political identity it became a programmatic term in the political sense. Today, there is the academic discipline of Queer Studies. “To appear as queer” is then understood as a means to discover and develop implicit as well as explicit “gender” discourses. - However, it can be criticized insofar as it is dependent on the relativity of language; “queer” tactics may initiate an undesirable implicit re-signification of gender if meeting other language games.

The idea of “gender” as a performance, respectively, as a concept, “gender performativity” is introduced by Judith Butler in “Gender Trouble” (1990) with a tremendous influence in a variety of academic fields. Butler characterizes “gender” here as the effect of reiterated acting producing the effect of a “static”, so to say “normal” gender while obscuring the contradiction and instability of gender acts. This effect produces what we can consider to be “true gender”, a narrative that is sustained by “[...] the tacit collective agreement to perform, produce, and sustain discrete and polar genders as cultural fictions is obscured by the credibility of those productions – and the punishments that attend not agreeing to believe in them.” (Butler 1990, 179) The critique on the concept of performativity deals with the idea of a permanent identity-revolution and mimicry (Wulf & Zirfas 2007, p.30), though social relations might not be that fluid and formable. Performative attitudes also do not entail a measure of their prevalence and of their individual, social or cultural value. One may thus miss an ethical-philosophical meaningfulness as well as a multi-levelled complexity
**Body-phenomenological concepts** reduce such a kind of arbitrariness to the limits of the human perception and corporeality. Bodies are not only social identities enclosed by thinking *about* the body, but also corporeal entities as thinking *through* the body. “Gender” can be seen as an instrumental concept of the corporeality of female and male bodies, describing (suppressive) social relations and the institutions that support these relationships (cp. Gilleard & Higgs 2014, 21), while “thinking *through* the body” (cp. Shusterman 2012) unfolds diverse perspectives on corporeal or bodily existence. According to Maurice Merleau-Ponty phenomena come up as sensual impressions, not-articulable perceptions, subluminal thoughts and as the origin of speaking in silence; as our body is our “[...] natural I and as such the subject of perception” (Merleau-Ponty 1966, p.243). We do not have a consciousness about our living body as we cannot distance from it, we *are* our body. Although we can look at our body as an object, the lived body is a kind of “point zero” of the orientation in an individual or situational field of seeing, acting or speaking. (Waldenfels 1998, p.22) At “point zero” (where we always already are) we become (tacitly) aware of the determining factors of the constitution of a phenomenon. Jagger (2008, p.29) points out the instability of gender, which, according to him, can be unravelled e.g. in educational situations where gender is presented as repetitive acts without an original that is the “[...] fictional ideal that regulates the production of sexed subjects and identities”. That is to say, “gender” can be taken e.g. as a learning task. One can interpret Jagger’s proposal in the following way: By putting oneself in terms of “gender” by e.g. changing the parameters of the own gender and exploring the reactions of others on this change, one can learn about power relations and places of gendering as well as about materials, symbolic orders, polysemies etc. connected to the different gender-concepts.

However, the phenomenological approach in general is criticized for being obscurant as it binds social acts to subjective, that is *lived* experience. The phenomenological observer attempts to acquire categories and rules of thinking and acting as a kind of “native”, thus carrying out research in the emic\(^2\) mode. Hereby, s/he is free to use extraneous categories and rules in terms of sense. Besides that one can also find the presupposition that social actions are meaningful actions per se and that they are worth studying independently of the actor's meaning or purpose. In phenomenology there is hardly any awareness of the fact that "[...] the very notion of an action requires the idea of the actor's end or purpose. That is, for an action to be perceived, purpose and meaning must be perceived. Thus a change in the

\(^2\) An "emic" account is a description of behavior or a belief in terms meaningful (consciously or unconsciously) to the actor; that is, an emic account comes from a person within the culture. Almost anything from within a culture can provide an emic account. An "etic" account is a description of a behavior or belief by an observer, in terms that can be applied to other cultures; that is, an etic account attempts to be "culturally neutral."
perceived meaning or purpose entails a change in the action that is perceived." (Wilson, 1970:67)

All three theoretical frameworks for an empirical research on the tacit dimensions of pedagogy thus include approaches to “gender” as an interpretative process as well as a continuous social ascription, and they all come to a certain limit in doing this. They thus seem to create “master narratives” themselves. The alternative could be a "non-essentialist feminist standpoint theory", as proposed by Donna J. Haraway (1997, p.305). Haraway (1995) argues for a "situated knowledge" and a fully movable thinking, in which she proposes a permanent critical reflection on the own contextual references and connections, involving also subliminal aspects of tasks, establishments and actions. She is concerned with taking a "partial perspective", that "[...] gives priority to challenge, deconstruction, passionate constructions, interwoven connections, and the hope for change of knowledge systems and perspectives." (Haraway 1995, p.85) This is a research on practices that in fact follows the post-modern agenda: It stresses and works out the multimodality of utterances and self-interpretations of the acting persons, the contingency of social and cultural phenomena, the discoursivity of all kinds of individual, social and cultural orders as well as the stage-character of phenomena etc. However, to take over a "partial perspective" also means to in a way free an individual to interpret him-/herself, it means to be aware of the contingency of social and cultural phenomena etc. In terms of the topic of this contribution, “gender” and the “tacit turn” in scientific and theoretical pedagogy, my proposal is therefor to in future work on the question how to transform the modern idea of “emancipation” in terms of a post-modern research on “gender” as a tacit dimension of pedagogy.