

Voices from an Educational World

Some issues of gender-conscious teaching and learning

Linda Lökvist & Tove Hjørungdal

This paper conveys different voices of experience within a gender-conscious discourse on education. The aim is to make more explicit and visible some questions that we feel are of importance to the development of gender-conscious education in archaeology.

Linda Lökvist & Tove Hjørungdal, Department of Archaeology, Göteborg University, Box 200, SE-405 30 Göteborg, Sweden.

“One task of the intellectual is the effort to break down the stereotypes and reductive categories that are so limiting to human thought and communication” (Edward W. Said 1994:x).

INTRODUCTION

As the development of gender-conscious education in archaeology is expanding, and is also a current topic in our own environment, we feel a need for a more visible discourse on university education seen in a gender perspective. The focus of the present paper is on undergraduate teaching and learning in archaeology seen from a Swedish position. In spite of this national level, it is still interesting to note from an international direction that UNESCO has stated that higher education should “...define and foster a gender-inclusive culture through education – and notably higher education – so as to promote sustainable human development.” (Rønning 1996:145). These aims are important, but to maximise the effect of education on gender issues we need to *act through our ideas* on how to bring out the desire for learning and knowledge-making in both male

and female students and, by doing so, counteract present gender structures. However, the gender-critical pedagogical discourse within the archaeological education in Sweden is at present still limited and frequently marginalised. This is a situation we regret, and our article can be regarded as a contribution to a hopefully forthcoming, more lively debate on gender, pedagogy and teaching.

With our text we have tried to convey different voices of experience within a gender-conscious educational discourse. These voices belong to colleagues from a Swedish, Scandinavian and international arena, including our own. Together they constitute an interdisciplinary pool of educational experiences from both a teaching and a learning point of view. We will begin by giving a brief presentation of the background of the gender-critical educational discourse in Scandinavian archaeology, followed by

discussions on its current scope in Sweden and some visions for the future. Our text may be read as a list of possible topics of interest to the teacher of gender studies. But first and foremost, we will point to some questions which we think are worthy of holding further dialogues, or ‘multilogues’, on.

AIM OF THE PAPER

The aim of our paper is to make more explicit and visible some questions that we feel are of importance to the development of gender-conscious education in archaeology. To throw light on various aspects of these questions, we will focus on the following problems:

- i) how to introduce gender-critical perspectives into the curriculum of archaeology (and which methods to use);
- ii) how to understand the prerequisites for the students’ learning abilities and their interest in learning and knowledge-making, in order to help them in this process;
- iii) how to deal with (negative) reactions to engendered studies among students and staff, and how to make them gender conscious;
- iv) how to deal with existing, reductive models for prehistoric social structures and individuals, and suggestions on how to change these models.

With complex problems such as the one presented above, it is difficult, if not impossible, to give competent, ready answers. On the other hand, if the solutions to our topics were easy and general, there would be no need to discuss them. Instead, we think there are many possible ways of developing the issues we put forward, and knowledge of local solutions is seen as being of great interest to further discussion. We prefer to view the present topics as being of an open-ended character, and as such also a part of an on-going and provisional debate on gender-conscious academic knowledge and scholarship.

GENERAL BACKGROUND AND PREMISES

Before discussing the above questions, it is necessary to explain the position we have taken, as well as the general background to which our discussion is related. As will become clear in the following, we generally position ourselves within a standpoint feminist paradigm (Harding 1993; Conkey & Gero 1997; cf. Willemark 1999). In accordance with this position, the implication of the term ‘gender-critical’, or ‘gender-conscious’, is presumed to be the investigation and re-examination of reductive models of personal identities, of social relationships and of positions in the environment of the scholar, in education, as well as in representations of prehistory. Relationships of this kind have been potential relationships of asymmetrical power, at least if we regard them in historically known contexts (cf. Scott 1986). This understanding is shared by several gender-conscious perspectives focusing on different aspects of scholarship and science. The various perspectives have been given such names as ‘Women’s Studies’, ‘Gender Studies’ and ‘Feminist Studies’. Lately queer-theorists and critical masculinists (e.g. Knapp & Meskell 1997; Solli 1998; Strassburg 1999; Welinder 1999) have joined feminist critics on several points of issue. Knowledge from all of these perspectives has from a standpoint feminist stance, found to be fruitful for teaching and learning archaeology. The presence of various kinds of gender perspectives, together examining all levels of archaeology and prehistory, will enable different points of departure for teaching.

The goals of gender-critical education can be seen as twofold. One aim is to develop a critique of the power structures in education and in professional practice in order to change these structures. The other aim is the writing of democratic narratives of the past. A general vision for the future among gender critics is to develop this on a more systematic level.

In this paper we will use the denominations of Women's Studies, and Feminist Studies, as well as Gender-critical and Gender-conscious Studies, as we think that all of them are represented in our own context. What advocates of these perspectives hold in common and share with other critical perspectives, is the rejection of the so-called 'Dominant discourses', that is, sexist, racist and class-biased discourses. This criticism is present within teaching and learning in many different respects. Within the field of pedagogy, feminists have expanded on a range of issues including different aspects of how education is engendered, as well as of how feminist critique contributes to the process of teaching and learning (cf. Luke & Gore 1992).

Within archaeology and anthropology, feminist criticism is directed against androcentric/ethnocentric discourses (cf. e.g. Conkey & Spector 1984; Smith 1995). This criticism must be seen in relation to a consciousness shared by gender critics, namely that social beings and relationships are engendered through cultural notions which are problematic in essence, and as such are subjects to differing and changing interpretations. One is also aware of the potentials for sociological and epistemological change that are embedded in the notion of gender-critical scholarship. During the last few years archaeologists have contributed to the development of gender-conscious perspectives and concepts on all of these different levels and within several parts of the discipline. The production of gender-conscious knowledge concerns interpretations of the past, offering alternatives to traditionalist images of women, men, children, and of human relationships in prehistory, including the process of growing up (e.g. Gilchrist 1994; Gero &

Conkey 1991; Walde & Willows 1991; Moore & Scott 1997; Caesar *et al.* 1999; Werbart 1999). It also deals with analyses of the context of scholarship and its engendered power structures (fig. 1), and among the analyses we find biographical issues seen in a new light (e.g. Engelstad 1991; Wylie 1991a, 1991b, 1992; du Cros & Smith 1993; Diaz-Andreu & Sørensen 1997; Karlisch *et al.* 1997; Kresa & Lövkvist 1999). General overviews and reviews of gender-critical texts, of women's studies and of feminist theories in archaeology, are also available (e.g. Dommasnes 1992; Sørensen 1992; Hjørungdal 1995a; Conkey & Gero 1997; Lövkvist 1998 and cf. references in these works).

We find one of the feminist discourses, standpoint feminism, particularly useful. Our respect for some of its ideas is expressed in our article in the following way: The attempt to highlight the connections between knowledge and politics in order to explore how the production of knowledge is influenced by different kinds of politics (Harding 1993:55f). The basic view is that all knowledge is socially, culturally, politically and



Fig.1. This photograph shows the ceremonial installation of several professors. Out of twelve professors, only two are women. This photo could in principle have been taken at any time during the last fifty years, but it was not. It was taken in April, in the year of grace 1999 at the University of Gothenburg. How far has the equity issue reached in reality? Photo: Göran Olofsson. Published in GU Journalen, Nyheter från Göteborgs universitet nr. 4-5 juni 1999. With kind permission from Göran Olofsson, Allan Eriksson and the GU Journal.

historically situated, which underlies the opinion that multiple, marginalised lives have better qualities from which to start knowledge projects (Harding 1993:56ff, 61, 65ff; see also Luke & Gore 1992:47). The reason for this is, in Sandra Harding's words, that "starting off through from these lives provides fresh and more critical questions about how the social order works than does starting off through from the unexamined lives of members of dominant groups" (Harding 1993:62).

This also helps create a strong reflexivity, which also includes putting the subject of knowledge in the same critical light as the object of knowledge (Harding 1993:69). Another prerequisite for a strong reflexivity has a hermeneutic side to it, in that "the subject of knowledge /.../ must be considered as part of the object of knowledge from the perspective of scientific method" (Harding 1993:69). Therefore we try to explore how knowledge is mediated and activated, as well as explore the situation of students, who are, by definition, at the bottom of the hierarchical ladder and empowered influence. Our attempts to present multiple voices can be seen as a desire to make visible a heterogeneity, and in some cases a similarity, of experiences from different positions.

Gender critics are not restricted to the implications of traditionalist science and scholarship. It is just as crucial to be aware of current constructions of academic knowledge and structures. It has been pointed out that the relationship between general critical scholarship and feminist theory is ambiguous. This concerns critical pedagogy and its relationship to feminist pedagogy (Luke & Gore 1992), as well as the relationship between general post-processual archaeology and gender-critical and feminist archaeology. One criticism put forward is that post-processual science tends to ignore relationships which traditionally have been connected with the exercise of asymmetrical power. The exercise of power in post-

processual archaeology is recognised through the ignorance of the nature of problematic relationships, but not least through the nature of the language in academic papers. This is the case concerning androcentric as well as ethnocentric aspects (Engelstad 1991; Smith 1995). Texts seem to have been written exclusively for scholars, and are inaccessible to non-learned people because they are simply too difficult. The Swedish students that *Tove* has been teaching have to a great extent reacted and commented on texts, especially texts produced by English-speaking post-processualists, including some feminists. The students feel strongly that the texts represent exercises of power.

Our last point to make in this general background is that through its critique, and through its potential for changing relationships on different levels, gender-conscious archaeology makes up a force in academic discourses. From these international influences, we will now move to their effects on the creation of gender-educational issues in a Swedish archaeological context.

INITIAL EFFORTS IN SWEDISH ARCHAEOLOGY

For many years now, there have been sporadic discussions on gender and education in Swedish archaeology. *Tove* is one of several teachers of archaeology to have shown interest in these issues from an early stage. She tells here about two of the early events concerning gender-conscious teaching in archaeology:

Tove: Although not all teachers were involved, the interest was great enough to get as many as about one third of us, a representative number of about 20 colleagues, to a special conference in Lund on gender-critical university teaching in archaeology, in the autumn of 1994. Questions about gender and teaching in archaeology had first been raised as a topic at a general archaeology teachers'

conference in the spring of 1993. At the 1994 conference, teachers from all of the five ordinary Swedish university departments of archaeology, as well as representatives from a couple of university colleges, were present. We also had the pleasure of having Professor Gro Mandt from the University of Bergen, Norway as our guest. She deserves, at least in my eyes, the name “the Grand Old Lady” of teaching gender issues in archaeology in Scandinavia, and is also a pioneer of issuing didactics in archaeology in general. In addition to the departments of prehistory, also medieval/historical archaeology and historical osteology were represented at the conference, all of which are closely connected in Sweden. Both male and female teachers attended, and they contributed to the dialogues through papers and topics of discussion. Several of my colleagues have expressed their interest in following up these initial teaching and learning discussions in future conferences, but as yet no further conferences on gender-informed education in archaeology have been held.

In 1994 I also had the opportunity to attend a university teachers’ course on didactic questions, given by representatives of the Staff Development Unit at the University of Umeå. Each course participant had to choose an educational topic for evaluation and enlargement. This gave me the possibility to start a systematic documentation and discussion of gender-critical education for archaeologists (cf. Hjørungdal 1995b). This pedagogical course has had great impact on my work ever since, and has left clear imprints also on the present discussion. Several of the projects from this educational course are also published in a conference report (Staff Development Unit 1995).

The efforts carried out during these meetings stress the need for discussions on gender

issues in university education, and they also point to a will among teachers and staff to develop gender-conscious education. There are, however, obstacles that have to be crossed. We will discuss some of them with reference mainly to *Tove’s*, but also *Linda’s*, experiences.

SOME SCANDINAVIAN EXPERIENCES

Around the mid-1980s, Women’s Studies as well as other gender-critical directions in Swedish archaeology slowly became visible through published works and through researchers’ participation in conferences abroad. The Göteborg archaeological department played the most active role in this early development of engendering Swedish archaeology in general.

In Norwegian education, graduate students of archaeology in Bergen could already in 1974 attend a seminar on Women’s Studies, led by Professor Mandt (cf. Dommasnes 1992). Lectures, lessons and undergraduate seminars on a regular basis were, however, not usual at any of the Scandinavian universities before the mid- or late 1980s.

Having had experience from various departments in Scandinavia, and from different educational positions, *Tove* has the possibility to convey a broad range of encounters with gender issues from different universities, which not all of us may have the opportunity to experience ourselves. She invites us to share her memories of her undergraduate education, her post-graduate years as well as teaching situations, together with a few remarks by *Linda*:

Tove: During my undergraduate studies in archaeology in Bergen in the late 1970s, we had the possibility to do a seminar exercise on the subject of women’s position in prehistory. I did not dare write about this, because I felt I did not have any knowledge of it, and as far as I recall only one person (a woman) had the courage to accept this task. The education

we received did not include lessons or literature on the subject of women, as not much had been written yet from a critical perspective. Other subjects usually included in the degree of a Scandinavian archaeologist did, perhaps, start teaching women's studies at an earlier date, or at least introduced some literature to their students. When I studied history of art in 1977, we could for instance choose some books on women artists, although nobody explained them to us.

Linda: Yes, in that respect things have really changed since then. However, in my first encounter with the academic world and the various theoretical discourses, I had a similar experience. When I first started my university education in 1989, I studied within the "Social Geography on Building Conservation" programme (Sw. *Bebyggelseantikvariska linjen*) in Göteborg. During the 3-year education not much was said about either gender structures or feminism, as far as I can remember. I began my archaeological studies in 1993, in the Göteborg department, and I remember encountering feminism and gender issues especially during the third term, which I will have to consider as my 'awakening hour'. It was really a process finding out about gender structures, especially the current ones. Although it was sometimes a struggle to face the reality of these facts, I started work on gender issues already the following term. However, accepting the gender structures as well as feminism, and realising its great importance was a gradual process and therefore took a bit longer. This was in spite of the fact that we had a special course on gender, where we learned about present, historic and prehistoric gender arrangements from a critical perspective, with lots of literature as well as instructive and enlightening lectures mainly by Elisabeth Arwill-Nordbladh. Feminism is

not only about literature but also about personal reflections, and they may take some time to develop and mature. This is therefore a position where much encouragement and support is needed.

Tove: Well, in my case it was not until 1980, when I completed my undergraduate studies in social anthropology, that I found that women's studies were in some cases integrated into this discipline. Papers written by the Ardeners held a central position in women's studies of anthropology in those days. This represented my first learning about women in culture and society. I also think that my first clear awareness of the issue of women and scholarship was conceived through the study of social anthropology. Yet the insight that scholarship is engendered through asymmetrical power came to me much later, in the mid-1980s. That was when Conkey & Spector (1984) published their seminal paper, and when the Norwegian K.A.N. was established in 1985 (K.A.N. = Kvinner i Arkeologi i Norge, which in translation means, Women in Archaeology in Norway).

My earliest experience of teaching gender topics in archaeology was a special course I gave in 1987 while a graduate student at the University of Lund. The course, named 'Gender roles in prehistory', was an extra-curricular course. I think you can guess which group of students came to my course. Yes, five female students, all of whom were already familiar with gender- and equity issues, either through their studies or by own personal experiences and maturation. I think it played an important part that none of them was very young, and that some of them had experience from other fields and professions than archaeology, some of them were mothers, and some of them had a background in foreign cultures. I cannot say that I was surprised by the

presence of these special participants. Rather, I found myself disappointed by the lack of interest and absence of the rest of the students. Later on, when I had the opportunity to work through some questions on why and how we should teach gender-critical archaeology, I reached the conclusion that, rather than confine our support to the few already conscious and interested students, we ought to try to inspire all of our students. Students already aware of gender issues would be those expected to turn up anyway, if we exclusively gave gender courses outside of ordinary teaching schedules.

Gender-critical compulsory courses first became real to me when I started my employment as a research fellow in archaeology at the University of Umeå in 1992. Here I was expected to integrate gender-critical archaeology into already existing third term-theory courses. This meant that all of the third-term students had to read the literature and discuss questions on gender critique in order to get their degree. When gender issues are a prerequisite, the students realise that questions on gender are not restricted to a confined area of study, or to a few specialists. Rather, it is a matter of archaeological perspective, which they as professional archaeologists are expected to have at least some knowledge about as well as an awareness of. And my experience says that most students read the gender literature well; they were able to form an opinion of it, and they discussed problems well at their exams. Experiences like these are shared by Norwegian colleagues who have practised gender-critical teaching at least as long as we have in Sweden (cf. Mandt 1994).

There are several ways of working. In Umeå we tried to give the students an overview of gender-critical archaeology, from the birth of Women's Studies in the 1970s, until today's various kinds of

gender-critical perspectives. In my teaching I have tried to enlarge on the Present/Past relationship, which has been a central topic within Swedish feminist studies in archaeology at large (cf. Hjørungdal 1995a and references in this work). In practice this is carried out through the teaching of academic sociological issues, as well as interpretations of prehistoric contexts. Students read literature written by scholars within each chronological period, from the Stone Age to Historical archaeology, and from Oscar Montelius and his participation in the Women's Liberation Movement in the 1800s to the present-day situation in academia. This includes the study of our own department, through statistical surveys on men and women employed and on which academic positions we find them in respectively.

How to introduce gender-critical perspectives to undergraduate students, turned out to be a challenge. In my own teaching, introductory questions often used to be, 'What is feminist science?', 'What is feminist critique?' 'What is a gender-critical perspective?' and 'How are these issues incorporated into and applied in archaeology?' Gradually I became convinced that these questions do not make good starting-points in undergraduate education, and this doubt led me to begin a systematic scrutiny. Rather, *in my view it is necessary to start with everyday questions* as they are found in available gender studies. This means to *start with the results* of feminist research, instead of with a presentation of some of the difficult topics within feminist theory. From my colleagues I learned that one of the better methods to introduce gender perspectives is to focus on areas of classic gender stereotypes, like the distribution of work, the manufacturing of tools, and the organisation of prehistoric households. These kinds of examples are connected with interpretations of past

material culture, as well as with areas of contemporary everyday life lived by the students themselves. The questions asked might be, 'Who lived in the households?' 'What kinds of social relationships tied the persons to each other?' Another good idea is to start gender-critical teaching by studying pictorial representations, produced by archaeologists, of prehistoric people and their social formations. A good discussion of pictures in archaeology is given by our Australian colleague Stephanie Moser (Moser 1993). Asking questions about the lives of prehistoric people, as well as about the archaeologist's images of people from different periods, seems to be one way to help students recognise and define their own views. This might in turn enable them to see how important it is to know that past people's identities and relationships have not been static or unchangeable, nor have they been mirrors of present lives. As far as the choices of clear examples presented to the students, things worked out well in most respects. This insight has grown slowly, and it comprises an important point in my own personal and professional development in university teaching. I have found that greater effort is needed in asking questions that relate to the students' own experiences, as an introductory theme in gender studies.

Linda: Yes, but to do that one has to know a few things about their earlier experiences, especially from their years at school. School has been a big part of their lives, and it has educated them in more respects than just the basic subjects like maths, history and languages. The social environments and prevailing gender structures must have had a great influence on young people, so I think it is important to keep that in mind when dealing with teaching issues, curricula and syllabi.

Finally, we can conclude this discussion by

stating that there are quite a few researchers and teachers who have started to discuss university curricula and other teaching issues. However, the situation is still such that not much effort has been made to explain the students' positions and their prerequisites for learning. In order to discuss teaching issues with positive results in agency and practice, it is important to have an idea of how the students have been shaped in situations of learning and knowledge-making in previous educational environments. We will therefore make an attempt to give a general picture of how school affects the pupils in various respects.

GENDERED KNOWLEDGE AND RE-PRODUCTION IN SCHOOL

Many researchers have shown that knowledge is gendered (e.g. Belenky *et al.* 1986; Staberg 1992; Widerberg 1995). This 'genderness' not only includes social sex, but also social class, ethnicity as well as many other factors, and it affects us in our perception, work and engagement in knowledge. It also becomes embedded in our behaviour later in life, which is why it is important for university teachers of knowing about the students' previous experiences. By knowing about these 'social historic' factors, it is easier to understand the students and their various prerequisites. We will give a short description of some of the mechanisms within the Swedish education system, from the last stage of compulsory school to college and the Scholastic Aptitude Test.

The parents' level of education and their social status affect the pupils' learning continuously, starting from an early stage. It also has an impact on the choices of different education levels (Härnqvist 1993:10; Skolverket 1996:31). The parents' attitude towards knowledge and their support of their children in this respect depend on their own level of education, and it will directly affect the grades of their children (Härnqvist 1993:10, 35). This parental influence does,

however, decrease during the college years in favour to social influences, such as the labour market (Wernersson 1991:7, 10).

Classroom interaction is another important aspect of learning in school (fig. 2). Unfortunately, all of the prejudices – in fact even more – of how social and gender structures work in school have been found valid by many researchers. For instance the girls who ask and get to answer the most questions generally have well-educated parents, while most parents of the silent girls are low-educated; but no such pattern is found among the boys (Staberg 1992:105f; Wernersson 1991:34). Boys usually act in large groups and dominate the classroom (as well as other public ‘rooms’) by getting the most attention. This is achieved by answering the majority of the questions – often without being asked, and by disorderly and noisy behaviour (Öhrn 1986:188; Wernersson 1991:75; Staberg 1992:103). Girls mostly work in smaller groups, co-operate more than the boys, and have to act as assisting ‘patrolmen’ to keep the lessons going somewhat smoothly (Staberg 1992:106, 127). However, the girls as well as the silent and ambitious boys are harassed for both success and mistakes in the classroom. An interesting comment here is that school, according to the Swedish national curriculum from 1994, is obliged to help the pupils develop the ability to empathise and show understanding and sympathy for other people and their situation (Hägglund & Öhrn

1998:1). The pupils should also learn to give these people appropriate help, according to their own ability. However, these paragraphs of the national curriculum have been found to be very ineffective (Hägglund & Öhrn 1998:12).

Another interesting observation concerns differences in modes of learning. Boys tend to learn through play and competition, while girls consider learning as work (Staberg 1992:125ff). Girls also stress the importance of understanding in the process of learning and knowledge-making. If they do not understand the issues, they blame themselves, a fact that creates uncertainty about their own competence. Boys, on the other hand, seldom confess that they do not comprehend, and when they do they put the blame on external factors. Moments of competition, which is a common element in classroom teaching, are hence unfair and especially discouraging for the more insecure girls.

Gender is a strong indicator when it comes to self-esteem. Girls, perhaps not unexpectedly, tend to estimate their own capacity lower than the boys even when there are no differences in real achievement (Skolverket 1996:33; see also Tallberg Broman 1997:14).

The factor that has the greatest impact on marks, however, is social background. So called longitudinal studies (studies carried out and followed up over many years) have shown continuous tendencies in that pupils



Fig. 2. An everyday scene in a primary school classroom in Göteborg, September 1999. Photo: S. Axelsson.

from higher social classes get higher marks than pupils from lower social groups (Skolverket 1996:28ff). Although gender differences exist – girls generally get higher marks than boys (Wernersson 1991:44) – they are less influential than the social differences in this respect.

There is a strong correlation between the choice of college programs and the educational level of the parents. Children of highly educated parents more frequently choose 3-4 year theoretical programs than children whose parents have low social status and little education: the ratio is as much as approximately 70% to 20% (see diagram in Härnqvist 1993:8,33; see also Staberg 1992:152; Reuterberg 1994:2; Hansen 1997:17). Theoretical programmes have higher status than the practical ones, but within the categories there are also status variations among the directions of the programmes. However, the college structures and most of its programmes is more adapted to male needs and wishes than to female ones.

When the Swedish Scholastic Aptitude Test was introduced in 1977, the idea was to give people a second chance for higher education, and in the process also lessen the social uneven recruitment to universities and colleges (Reuterberg 1994:1; Hansen 1997:2). Reality shows, however, another result. Women have generally higher graduation marks than men, but in spite of this women get lower grades than men on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (Stage, Internet). Although differences between the sexes exist, they are less pronounced than the ‘differences within’. Older participants, for example, often get higher marks than younger participants, and the best results are found among those who have attended the theoretical 3-4 year programmes in high school, and have the highest social status.

These conditions show how gender is in action long before the start of the university education, but they only show what happens on the surface. What actually happens inside

these people, that is their thinking, is naturally just as important, although greatly influenced by the external prerequisites. We will therefore present ideas on how the actual thinking is educated.

THE EDUCATION OF THINKING

The above description of the Swedish school world shows that the external prerequisites for knowledge are permeated with gendered values and mechanisms, which are directly transferred to the individual knowledge-making. Another contributing factor with great impact on thinking and knowledge-making, is the socio-political framework for norms and value systems.

This is the reason that also some knowledge of thinking is important for understanding how knowledge is produced, in our case in the minds of the students.

Carl Martin Allwood, anthropologist of knowledge and professor of psychology in Göteborg and Lund, maintains that thinking itself always has a content. The content is guided by personal goals, interests and needs, as well as the individual’s mental resources and knowledge (Allwood 1988:19). The latter are in turn influenced by factors such as material and social positions. Allwood also claims that we can control our thinking only to a certain extent, and that the unconscious thinking is governed by rapid associations to earlier stored knowledge and experiences of, for example, a social and ecological character, a so called pre-conscious level, as well as the unconscious level.

The content obtains its meaning through understanding, which is a prerequisite for a more complex thinking (Allwood 1992a:4, 1992b:19). This fact throws some new light on the girls’ need for understanding (see above), which in this respect seems to be a sound one. Meaning, which thus also affects thinking, is created by both internal and external factors, yet another aspect of the pre-conscious/unconscious thinking. These circumstances contribute to govern form as well

as content in the person's thinking, for instance through experiences with social and gender implications (Allwood 1988:19f). Also aspects of individual personality are presumed to interact here, for example self-esteem. From this it follows that a student with high self-esteem dares to embrace difficult challenges with great enthusiasm and gains by these important experiences which can lead to new challenges, knowledge and visions. In light of the previous description of aspects of self-esteem in school, this problem is clearly gender-related, with insecure girls as the losers.

The pre-conscious knowledge referred to above has culturally gendered implications, manifested in tacit knowing (Kalman 1999). This tacit knowing has in turn bodily implications and is sometimes referred to as corporeal knowledge, and it will be discussed in more detail below.

BEYOND THE OBVIOUS – THE 'BODY' OF KNOWLEDGE

Tacit knowing refers, according to the Swedish philosopher, PhD in Theory of Science, Hildur Kalman, to the way we use our body as well as intellect when we direct our attention towards the world (Kalman 1999:38ff). This tacit knowing presupposes two directions, one 'from' and one 'to'. We start *from* tacit knowing to turn our attention *to* something, where our knowledge is expressed. An example of this tacit knowing is gender-based bodily experience.

Knowledge has by many philosophers, such as Dilthey, Lipps and Polanyi, been defined as depending on so called 'in-dwelling', or empathy, where knowledge is achieved by 'dwelling in' oneself during the learning process or experience (Kalman 1999:34ff). It is when we dwell in ourselves that we incorporate and assimilate knowledge and experience in our being, a phenomenon referred to as *interiorising*. When we feel threatened we narrow the boundaries of ourselves and do not dwell in ourselves any

more. We mentally leave our body, so called *exteriorising*, and as a result we limit the experiences and knowledge that we might otherwise absorb, which in turn affects also our future conditions. *Trust* is thus an important prerequisite for learning and knowledge-making.

Gender is related to thinking, meaning and knowledge in that humans are thinking creatures and that all people are gendered. We are all gendered actors, where gender is our starting point when producing new knowledge. Hence, gender constitutes a bodily experience, which precedes knowing (Kalman 1999:33). Kalman develops this aspect further:

"The fact of being gendered, gives women and men in our society a qualitatively gendered embodied experience, and thus a gendered knowledge of the world. Meaning as inherent in praxis and the world as we apprehend and remake it is thus also engraved in our bodies, influencing thoughts and language. Although it is conceptually possible to distinguish body, thought and language, they are co-constituted. Thus we cannot simply erase the gendered experience of our being-in-the-world as women and men. /—/ It is embodied knowledge of the world, that may be present in thought as well as in posture, in language as well as in movement. It may be seen in the language of the lived body, and as part of a being-in-the-world." (Kalman 1999:91)

These aspects are valid also for other categories of identities, for example ethnicity and social class. The gendered female situation has, however, perhaps even deeper corporeal implications, since women's bodies have more areas that are shamed, and are earlier shamed in comparison to men's (Kalman 1999:92). Kalman says further that our cultural gender structures are inherited and reproduced through this tacit knowing, which guides us in social relations and actions

(Kalman 1999:94). These mechanisms may help to explain the slow and viscous societal structures, both in respect to gender roles and social class (Kalman 1999:100ff). They also show that new insight and knowledge must be practised time and time again, in order for us to gradually incorporate them into our way of thinking so that they will feel familiar and safe.

In connection with these research statements, we believe that these mechanisms ought to be considered in gender teaching. For instance, there ought to be possibilities to practice the new, perhaps different knowledge of gender-structures in such a way that the students can assimilate these insights in a personal way in their own thinking and being. We will return to this later and instead turn to a kind of creative teaching/learning situation that we consider education should aim at: constructed knowing and a situated knowledge.

CONSTRUCTED KNOWING AND SITUATED KNOWLEDGE

There are many ways of knowing and of learning. If we look to professional gender-conscious educationists, some ways of learning are seen by them as being more consistent with gender-critical perspectives than others. This concerns what they call 'constructed knowing'. To become a 'constructed knower' is in short to develop a point of view where knowledge is considered as contextual, and where both objective and subjective strategies are evaluated and assimilated in the self to achieve knowledge (Belenky *et al.* 1986:15, 179; cf. Clinchy 1990; Lather 1991). In this process the gap between intellect and emotions is bridged. It is said about students having reached this kind of knowing that "There is a new excitement about learning and the power of the mind. /—/ Constructivists become passionate knowers, knowers who enter into a union with that which is to be known." (Belenky *et al.* 1986:140f). Reaching the idealistic con-

structed knowing, however, is done through an earlier phase of 'connected knowing', where a hermeneutic approach to knowledge is developed. In general terms this implies, among other things, being able to use personal experiences as integrated into scientific knowledge in one's development as a knower. It is an ability to listen to others, their personal experiences, and their ways of perceiving and knowing. It encompasses the whole person and his/her development. If teachers are to help students become constructed knowers, they must first help them to develop a connected knowing. These idealistic ways of knowing are consistent with conceiving of oneself as an integrated part of scholarship, as a creator and constructor of scientific context and of models in science, a goal worth striving for. Although the work of Mary Field Belenky and her colleagues has been carried out from the position of 'women's ways of knowing' it does not exclude the possibility that also men can develop into 'constructed knowers' through similar procedures. We believe that the above conceptions of ways of knowing are worthy of visualisation and discussion also in archaeology.

Another aspect worthy of attention is that of 'situated knowledge', which might be more familiar to us (cf. Conkey & Gero 1997), and which involves a similar attitude to learning as in 'connected knowing'. Knowledge looks different depending on the perspective of the knower. The social scientist Carmen Luke explains that situated knowledge implies that the social subject who possesses the knowledge is seen as related to and located in a historical, cultural and political situation (Luke 1992:47). The kinds of knowledge presented above are indeed remote from the received and isolated pure intellectual knowledge acquired through traditional methods of learning, or the 'banking model', to quote the revolutionary educationist Paulo Freire (Freire 1970; Belenky *et al.* 1986). To learn isolated facts by heart, and to reproduce the facts at exams, is

well known in our own environment, for example in teaching and learning about artefacts, their typology and chronology.

A useful and interesting genre which we think will help to visualise one's development as a knower, is represented by the professional biographical notes written by some elderly Swedish archaeologists, and from a gender-conscious stance (e.g. Strömberg 1991; Thålin-Bergman 1990) as well as a mainstream stance (Malmer 1995). Within the life-history approach in archaeology, we would like to mention an inspiring American textbook (Reyman 1992) which can also throw some light on Scandinavian traditions within archaeology, and which can help us find new ideas to try out in our own context.

Leaving these internal knowledge-making procedures for now, we will return to the external factors in education in order to highlight the realities of the social context for teachers and students.

THE CONTEXT OF TEACHER/ STUDENT

Issues with a background in feminist and other critical theories tend to concern the personal or private realms of the student as well as the teacher. The context shared by student and teacher is not made up of the transmission of knowledge from teacher to student alone. The shared context includes also matters of academic social life, such as equity issues and power. Workplace issues are in many respects thoroughly discussed in archaeology, for example by Wylie (1992). Among the topics discussed at the Swedish archaeology teachers' conference on gender-critical education, is the question of whether it matters if the teaching staff is uni-gendered, either exclusively men or women. Who is teaching archaeology, and which positions do they have in academia?

At present there are several female university teachers of archaeology in Sweden, but none of them holds a regular professor's chair. The general male-female ratio among

teachers today has not been statistically documented. The ideal situation, according to colleagues and staff, seems to be an equal representation of men and women. Students should at least be given the opportunity to be taught by female as well as by male teachers during their undergraduate years. Equal representation of male and female teachers would as such make up a real-life example of what we are teaching through gender studies.

The students' response to gender-critical education is of utmost importance. Most students, men as well as women, show a positive attitude to gender studies in archaeology. Some of them have stated that the engendering of education opened their eyes, and they are astonished by the discovery that they did not see the presence of gender earlier in their lives and education. Some students, however, both men and women, seem to get annoyed and even provoked when they are faced with gender issues. There can be many reasons for the negative reactions shown by some students, and as a teacher it takes a lot of experience and work to learn how to cope with them, and to transform such situations into acts of constructive dialogue. We consider this issue as being one of the most difficult aspects of teaching and learning gender-critical perspectives, and we will expand on this issue in the next chapter, starting with Tove's experiences.

ASPECTS OF EMOTIONALITY AND AMBIGUITY IN TEACHING/LEARNING

Advocating a 'constructed knowledge' implies, among other things, assimilating intellectual and emotional thinking into knowledge-making. Initially this is not an easy process to carry out, neither for student nor for teacher. Encountering gender and feminist issues is obviously more or less emotionally explosive, a situation that may be difficult to handle for some students. The combination of being confronted with the notion of gender structures and feminist

strivings and at the same time having an unconscious, gendered corporeal conception of the world, is a tough situation which can lead to an ‘exteriorising’ of the students’ selves. This in turn makes the teaching-learning task very difficult. If the students are not ‘dwelling’ in themselves they will have difficulty assimilating and making new knowledge a part of their own thinking. Meeting these frustrations in a teaching situation is not an easy task either, and there may be an immediate risk that the frustration becomes contagious. One means of dealing with this problem might be to distinguish and make visible features of character, in order to find possible solutions. *Tove* will present such features which she has found in her work with Swedish undergraduate students.

Tove: In this part of my discussion, I have tried to professionalise some types of awkward and emotional situations by describing them in the following four paragraphs. I have also tried to find partial explanations for some of the problems. They seem, however, to defy easy solutions.

i) *Personal attacks on the teacher as a female individual*. Students might, for instance, sometimes treat their female teachers in a different and condescending manner compared to how they treat their male teachers. The female teacher can also be attacked through distrust, for example by questioning her competence if she holds an opinion that differs from the opinion of another (male) colleague.

ii) *The student teaching the teacher*; or, rather, giving her a lesson on what archaeology is and is not. For example, a student might claim that feminist theory is a Women’s Movement issue and as such is irrelevant to archaeology, just as gender roles are marginal to the discipline, too. This reaction might depend on a lack of communication between student and teacher as well as on the feeling of being

too involved and personally affected. It was the teacher’s task to signal that she preferred a good discussion on different views of gender roles, on how politics tend to intermingle with science and so on. But this turned out to be difficult as the student was simply convinced of the idea that the teacher was mixing things up. The best thing one can do in this situation is simply to leave the annoyed student alone and not pushing her/him by giving further explanations, and leave the problem unsolved.

iii) *Emotional expressions* like “Feminism being oppressive to men”. This reaction might stem from the situation referred to in point ii). However, many people get scared when ‘feminism’ is mentioned, and I am inclined to agree with some of my colleagues who suggest that we should avoid this notion in our introductory speeches. Rather, later on, when students have become familiar with the results of gender studies, and found that they themselves are part of a scientific context, we can explain its background in feminist problem issues. As already mentioned, we should also try to use concepts that are familiar to the students in our discussions on theoretical connections. This challenging task can be met in several ways.

iv) *Students belittling the gender-critical framework of the study*, by labelling feminism and gender-themes as issues of their parents’ generation. Many students born during the 1960s and 1970s are brought up under political circumstances, aiming at being much less gender- and class-segregated than students of only a few decades earlier, when the teacher herself was brought up. This might even make them ‘gender blind’, as they were brought up according to an ideology of equity, through which schisms and the creation of favourites may have been denied despite their occurrence in real life. When the students become aware of

the fact that inequality is still present, and is being debated, they might feel disappointed or provoked, as they feel it has nothing to do with their ideals in life. This might in part explain the belittling attitude, but it is hardly the full explanation. Once again this points out the importance of using examples from contemporary lives and works in our discussions.

The belittling of the approach of study and the urge to teach the teacher a lesson have been the most common negative reactions, as far as my experiences go. According to Wylie, sceptical responses seem to be so frequent that she found she could identify a group which she named SGSs, Sceptical Graduate Students (Wylie 1991a:17). I myself have more often experienced scepticism to, as well as belittling of gender studies among undergraduates. It is necessary to confront this, and to try and find out how to cope with it in ways that represent something positive, both to the teacher and the student. The issues discussed here also touch upon the notions of emotionality and feelings, which are seen as necessary to all learning, according to feminist educationalists. You cannot learn if you are not involved, it is said. This involvement concerns also teaching.

There are additional aspects of the context shared by the student and the teacher. Professional educationalists are aware that the student/teacher relationship is hardly an equal one. Rather it appears as an asymmetrical relationship, where power might be executed by negative means. The teacher has longer experience within the academic field, he/she has the knowledge regarded as worth transmitting to the next generation, and as such is in possession of a certain amount of power. The negative responses referred to above can therefore be discussed in the light of problems of *Empowerment*, where power in itself has relative and changing connotations. This con-

cept of *Empowerment* is derived from critical and feminist teaching, as related to classroom situations (cf. Luke & Gore 1992).

In our dialogues on teaching archaeology we should also be aware of other questions relating to power. So far discussions on power and equity are confined to other contexts of archaeology than those of teaching and learning, mostly to the everyday lives of employees and the academic rules of hierarchy and careers. We also think that teachers' and students' questions of power and equity in general have been treated as if they belong to separate spheres within academia.

One example of an explicit power-related discourse that includes the teacher/student relationship is the Equity Issue Programme currently requested by the university boards of Swedish universities. Each faculty as well as each department has to make an equity issue plan. These plans must include gender-critical teaching, as well as issues of how to deal with under-representation of gender, and how to cope with sexual harassment. The aims of the equity issues program are one reason that gender-critical studies are important at Swedish universities. However, within Scandinavian archaeology, as in most Scandinavian humanities and social sciences, the assertion to learn and teach gender-critical perspectives has grown out of experiences and studies of the scholars and students themselves (e.g. Dommasnes 1992). It is not just a reply to a request from the authorities. In this particular respect university boards and other authorities have been listening to the experiences of their employees and students, and on that basis worked out strategies of gender criticism and equality rights in their plans.

Having discussed the Swedish educational context, we will now return to the international arena and suggestions for solutions to some of the problematic issues presented above. We will, however, keep one foot in our national discourse as well as make attempts to offer some solutions of our own.

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR STRATEGIES

There are, of course, many ways to reach the goal of gender consciousness and equality in academia and scholarship. To us, our foreign colleagues' publications and their experiences of teaching feminist archaeology/anthropology have been a great pleasure and inspiration. Their records have conveyed situations that reflect our own context and have introduced new ideas, and their suggested strategies are worth reflecting upon.

Some of the creators of new strategies are the anthropologist Sandra Morgen and her colleagues, who have managed to develop critical gender issues assimilated into the 'ordinary' archaeological programme. In an anthology edited by Morgen herself, she and her colleagues have compiled papers on most of the themes central to introductory teaching in anthropology (Morgen 1989, in particular pp. 1-20; see, however, also Balme & Beck 1993 for a similar approach). They have so to speak, *mainstreamed* their gender-critical anthropology courses. By *mainstreaming* they simply mean "... incorporating material on women's lives and considering gender as a fundamental category of identity and social structure throughout courses" (Morgen 1989:12). This strategy differs fundamentally from the strategy of reserving topics on women, and on gender at large, for special courses attended by people with a special interest in them.

The book, which is a guide to gender-critical teaching in anthropology, is organised according to various themes. An anthology like this, could be a good point of departure also for Scandinavian scholars and students, with themes adapted to our own Scandinavian context. Another type of strategy, advocated by the American archaeologists Spector and Whelan (1989), is that of incorporating gender studies into archaeology courses. In their courses, traditionalist and gender-critical literature on the same issue are read parallel, for example the theme of Human

Evolution. The underlying idea is to make comparisons between androcentric models on the one hand, and gender critical models on the other.

Regarding the question of how to develop a mainstreamed gender-critical education, we do not have any ready-made programmes or strategies. However, it would be stimulating to see this question as a serious topic of discussion among our colleagues. There might also be other archaeology lecturers, readers, or professors who have different opinions, and have tried out other methods and strategies in the development of gender-conscious education. They might have found success as well as failure in their teaching, or something in-between failure and success, and they might have defined themes that they find worth treating and expanding on. Continued discussions of all aspects of teaching and gender criticism are in our opinion of greater importance than confining oneself to plans and teaching programmes for 'correct thinking'.

In this context we would like to return to the issue of different ways of knowing. We believe, namely, that practicing the pedagogy of 'connected knowledge' that leads to 'constructed knowing' would in its full consequences, change education and professional life more profoundly than we can immediately grasp. In dealing with this, however, there ought to be conscious reflections conveyed to the students by the teacher on the issue of tacit, corporeal intelligence and its implications in practice. One suggestion for doing this would be to let the students make minor studies of their own context, be it of their private life or academic milieu, to make them more conscious of the structural patterns that they themselves are part of. In this way it is less likely that they will feel that gender issues exist only in literature (mainly foreign) and not in their own world, and hence not consider them as being of their own concern. Insights like this, which come from their own context, will probably be

easier to incorporate into their ways of thinking, knowing and being. This can be regarded as an answer to Hildur Kalman's call for the practice of new knowledge, and hence the incorporation of knowledge into the students' own modes of thinking in a way which they will feel is familiar and safe.

Other aspects of such profound changes concern the preparation and the organisational work, which would need to precede a thorough re-orientation of educational practice. A radical renewal of learning practice would change physical and spatial arrangements as well as social relationships. These changes would in turn challenge power structures embedded in material and social arrangements, and encourage discussions of alternative solutions.

Another important question about gender-critical education is what content it should have, and this is also the next topic of discussion.

SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTENT

First of all, we will make clear that our opinion is that the idea of a pervasive gender-conscious education excludes neither the heritage of traditional and conventional literature, nor current texts which are not gender-critical in viewpoint. On the contrary, we want to state that one has to know the academic tradition to be able to understand why a feminist critique has developed from androcentric traditions, as being in favour of white, European, middle-class males. Familiarity with the history of archaeology, as well as with texts from all its stages of intellectual and social influences, is viewed as important to the archaeologist's education. Instead, it is the learning of how to take a gender-critical stance that is important. The act of taking a gender-critical view includes the act of focusing on people and their possible engendered identities and relationships, as individuals as well as groups, and as the subjects of research. This implies asking new questions instead of applying ready-made

reductive models and meta-narratives of the development of individuals, relationships, and communities. We advocate throwing new light on archaeological concepts and tools in order to enable the students to see social relations as an ongoing, historically created and changing process, in which human beings take an active part.

Another point we find important in our own environment, is that strategies of education as well as literature should be chosen with the aim of helping to bridge what is experienced as a too wide gap between research scholarship and undergraduate teaching. This is also a point made by Morgen *et al.* (Morgen 1989:12). Literature used in basic courses is full of uncritical presentations of gender-, ethnicity-, and class-hierarchies, as well as water-proof master narratives of human society that are seemingly difficult to address critically. We, like many of our colleagues, therefore advocate a general updating of the relation between current research and teaching.

Returning to the linguistic problem touched upon earlier in this text, it can also be stated that for instance some post-processual lingual practices are very alienating because of their level of abstraction (Engelstad 1991). Such texts might demand extra attention and comments as a supportive strategy for helping the students to absorb their content.

An important matter connected with this, if perhaps on another level, is that we need to incorporate feelings, engagement, and personal development into teaching and learning in such a way that the students can recognise themselves in educational issues. Knowledge related to one's own experiences and maturation is also far remote from alienating topics and an abstract language. The aspects of emotionality, ambiguity, and negative responses could as such become more pronounced through an active development and application of the perspective of the 'connected' and 'constructed' knower.



Fig. 3. Sarasvati is the Hindu goddess of knowledge and culture. Her knowledge and brightness is said to be the powerful, pure light of wisdom, so great, that it alone has the power to destroy the darkness of ignorance. This virtue of wisdom is something that we as researchers and conveyors of knowledge should aim at; to highlight problematic issues and situations in order to combat ignorance due to nonchalant attitudes, indifference, airiness or asymmetrical power structures.

education ought to position itself, as a critical and questioning force in search of knowledge about human subjects, about ourselves as well as about relationships and the environment in which humans live and create.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUDING REMARKS – LEAVING SOME OPEN ENDS

The principal goal of this paper has been to throw light on four multifaceted sets of questions posed initially in this paper, all of them relevant to gender-conscious education in archaeology. Our discussion includes questions about how to introduce gender-critical perspectives in undergraduate education. Another aspect involves the importance of trying to understand some background prerequisites for the students' ability to learn and create knowledge in order to help the students to learn. Further, our discussion includes possible ways of coping with emotional and ambiguous reactions to engendered studies in archaeology. Last but not least, some aspects of aims and strategies for change are touched upon. In this text we have conveyed some educational experiences, among which you will find voices belonging to ourselves, professional pedagogues, as well as our colleagues in Sweden,

Another point of importance is that topics of sexism, racism, and class biases make up a related area of problems for those concerned with the interpretation of cultures (cf. Wylie 1991a; Claassen 1992:137ff; cf. fig. 3). Wylie maintains that gender should be recognised as a fundamental structuring principle, but also as cross-cut by other structuring forces such as class, race, age, and sexual orientation (Wylie 1991a:21; cf. Harding 1993). We agree with this view that all power elements aiming at oppressing groups of people should be acknowledged and problematised. Therefore we strongly recommend that prehistorians try to include this set of issues more clearly in their work. This set of issues is an integral part of the criticism against dominant discourses, also with regard to other academic subjects. This is also where gender-conscious

Norway and the Anglo-Saxon-American-Australian world. The works of these people have been a great help and a source of new ideas for us, and as they have helped to make different national and local contexts visible to the rest of us.

We regard our own text as a presentation of open ends put forward for further dialogues, rather than as final and thoroughly discussed conclusions. The open ends we leave reveal questions about what to teach as well as how to teach. Fruitful questions like, 'How can we, as university teachers of archaeology, best contribute to the students' learning of our discipline?' which aim at 'constructed knowing', need to be sorted out in many respects. We should also consider the need to highlight issues of power in the oppression of various groups in society, not only concerning gender relations but also, among other things, class, age and ethnicity. Not least have our social identities and relationships in our own context once again turned up, and many points need to be discussed and questioned concerning both our attitudes and positions, our roles as well as relationships in scholarship and in the everyday life of academia.

We consider the current gender-conscious education in archaeology to be comprehensive in many respects, but in spite of this we think that there is a gap between on the one hand knowledge and desire among colleagues, and on the other hand teaching practices and possibilities for change. The open ends should therefore first and foremost be seen as opportunities to leave room for local solutions, or 'situated' solutions. These kinds of solutions and strategies are seen as being more creative and more in line with a gender-conscious education than is a master solution, and should be more visible in general forums for discussion. In this respect all of us have something interesting and important to contribute.

English revised by Laura Wrang.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have given us help and inspiration, and as we have largely organised our work so as to be responsible for different thematic parts, we have also had individual contacts with people. For this reason we will once again make use of our individual voices in forwarding our thanks.

Tove: I wish to thank my colleagues who attended the conference on gender-critical education in archaeology at the University of Lund in September 1994. Many thanks to the Staff Development Unit and the seminar of Women's Pedagogy at the University of Umeå, for inspiration and help in self criticism, and for helping me see ways to further develop educational issues in my own discipline. Thanks also to Professor Joan Gero. She visited my Göteborg department in December 1997 and gave me a lot of inspiration concerning the question of how to learn. I am also grateful for the opportunity to read a brief version on parts of this paper at the First Annual Meeting of the European Association of Archaeologists in Santiago de Compostela, Spain, September 1995. Thanks to Raimond Thörn, some annoying computer problems close to the paper's deadline, were solved. Last but not least, thanks to Professor Lotte Hedeager, and to two anonymous referees for suggestions on how to improve earlier, shorter versions of my part of this paper.

Linda: I would like to thank Docent Ingegerd Tallberg Broman and Docent Annelis Jönsson at the Department of Education and Educational Research at the University of Lund for giving me some advice on important literature. The anthropologist of knowledge and Professor of psychology at the University of Lund, Carl Martin Allwood, has sent me some of his articles which have both inspired me and given me new insights into the world of knowledge-making. I am also grateful to senior lecturer Elisabeth Öhrn, Professor Inga Wernersson and Professor Sven-Eric Reuterberg, all of whom work at the Depart-

ment of Education and Educational Research at the university of Göteborg. They have all given me advice on good literature and also sent me some of their own works. I would also like to thank the PhD in Theory of Science, Hildur Kalman, for literature advice, and the University Library in Umeå for sending me Kalman's recently defended doctoral thesis, which was otherwise difficult to get a hold of.

We would, however, finally like to state that we alone are responsible for the final version of this paper. Special thanks to our colleague Susanne Axelsson who provided us with a photograph of her daughter Disa's classroom (fig. 2 in this text), and to Laura Wrang for revising our English.

REFERENCES

- Allwood, C. M. 1988. Skolans inverkan på tänkandet. In: Strömqvist, S. & Strömqvist, G. (Eds). *Kulturmöten, kommunikation, skola*. Norstedts. Stockholm. Pp. 18-32.
- 1992a. Vad är kunskapsantropologi? *VEST 2/1992*. Pp. 3-13.
- 1992b. On the anthropology of knowledge. In: *Proceedings from the 1992 4S/EASST Conference*. Pp. 9-21.
- Balme, J. & Beck, W. 1993. Archaeology and Feminism – Views on the origins of the division of labour. In: duCros, H. & Smith L. (Eds). *Women in Archaeology. A Feminist Critique*. Occasional Papers in Archaeology, No. 23. Canberra. Pp. 61-74.
- Belenky, M.F., Clinchy, B. McVicker, Goldberger, N.R. & Tarule, J.M. (Eds). 1986. *Women's Ways of Knowing. The Development of Self, Voice and Mind*. Basic Books.
- Caesar, C. et al. (Eds). 1999. *Han Hon Den Det. Att integrera genus och kön i arkeologi*. University of Lund. Institute of Archaeology. Report Series No. 65.
- Claassen, C. (Ed). 1992. *Exploring Gender Through Archaeology*. Selected Papers from the 1991 Boone Conference. Monographs in World Archaeology No. 11. Madison Wisconsin.
- Clinchy, B. McVicker 1990. Issues of Gender in Teaching and Learning. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching 1/1990*. Pp. 52-67.
- Conkey, M. & Gero, J. 1997. Programme to Practice: Gender and Feminism in Archaeology. *Annual Review of Anthropology 26*. Pp. 411-37.
- Conkey, M. & Spector, J. 1984. Archaeology and the study of gender. In: Schiffer, M.B. (Ed). *Advances in Archaeological method and theory*, Vol. 7, Academic Press, London. Pp. 1-38.
- Diaz-Andreu, M. & Sørensen, M.L.S. (Eds). 1998. *Excavating Women. A History of Women in European Archaeology*. Routledge. London.
- Dommasnes, L. H. 1992. Two Decades of Women in Prehistory and in Archaeology in Norway. A Review. *Norwegian Archaeological Review, Vol. 25, No. 1, 1992*. Pp. 1-14.
- duCros, H. & Smith, L. (Eds). 1993. *Women in Archaeology. A Feminist Critique*. Occasional Papers in Prehistory, No. 23. Canberra.
- Engelstad, E. 1991. Images of power and contradiction: feminist theory and postprocessual archaeology. *Antiquity Vol. 65. No. 248*. Pp. 502-514.
- Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Herder & Herder. New York.
- Gilchrist, R. 1994. *Gender and material culture. The archaeology of religious women*. Routledge. London.
- Gero, J. & Conkey, M. (Eds). 1991. *Engendering archaeology. Women and prehistory*. Basil Blackwell. Oxford.
- Hansen, M. 1997. *Social bakgrund och resultat på högskoleprovet*. Utvärdering genom uppföljning. Rapporter från institutionen för pedagogik. Rapport nr 1997:08. Institutionen för pedagogik. Göteborgs universitet. Göteborg.
- Harding, S. 1993. Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: "What is Strong Objectivity"? In: Alcoff, L. & Potter, E. (Eds). *Feminist Epis-*

- temologies. Routledge. London.
- Hjørungdal, T. 1995a. Gender Critical Archaeology in Sweden. A Review. *Current Swedish Archaeology*, Vol. 3. Pp.105-119.
- 1995b. Genusperspektivet – en kvalitet i arkeologiundervisningen. In: *Konferensrapport. Kvalitéer i studier och utbildning. Universitetspedagogisk konferens i Umeå 15-16 februari 1995*. Pp. 165-175.
- Härnqvist, K. 1993. *Den sociala selektionen till gymnasieskola och högskola. Analyser i den longitudinella databasen*. UGU 67. Utvärdering genom uppföljning. Rapporter från institutionen för pedagogik. Rapport No 1993:10. Institutionen för pedagogik, Göteborgs universitet.
- Kalman, H. 1999. *The structure of knowing. Existential trust as an epistemological category*. Doctoral thesis at the Department of Philosophy and Linguistics at the University of Umeå. Acta Universitatis Umensis. Umeå Studies in the Humanities 145. Swedish Science Press, Uppsala.
- Karlsch, S., Kästner, S. & Mertens, E.M. (Eds). 1997. *Vom Knochenmann zur Menschenfrau. Feministische Theorie und archäologische Praxis*. Agenda Frauen 9. Agenda Verlag. Münster.
- Knapp, B. & Meskell, L. 1997. Bodies of Evidence on Prehistoric Cyprus. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, Vol. 7, No. 2.
- Lather, P. 1991. *Getting Smart. Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/in the Postmodern*. Routledge.
- Luke, C. 1992. Feminist Politics in Radical Pedagogy. In: Luke, C. & Gore, J. (Eds). 1992: *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*. Routledge. Pp. 25-53.
- Luke, C. & Gore, J. (Eds). 1992. *Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy*. Routledge.
- Lövkvist, L. 1998. Gender som metafor. En diskussion om förlorade dimensioner. In: Jensen, O. & Karlsson, H. (Eds). *Arkeologiska horisonter*. Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion. Stockholm/Stehag. Pp. 200-235.
- Lövkvist, L. & Kresa, D. 1999. Ransacking equality. *K.A.N. Kvinner i Arkeologi i Norge. (Women in Archaeology in Norway)* No. 22-23. Pp. 3-21.
- Malmer, M. 1995. Grunden till mitt arkeologiska liv. In: Nordbladh, J. (Ed). *Arkeologiska liv. Om att leva arkeologiskt. GOTARK. Serie C: Arkeologiska skrifter* No 10, Pp. 123-135.
- Morgen, S. 1989. Gender and Anthropology: Introductory Essay. In: Morgen, S. (Ed). *Gender and Anthropology. Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching*. American Anthropological Association. Washington D.C.
- (Ed). 1989. *Gender and Anthropology. Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching*. American Anthropological Association. Washington D.C.
- Moore, J. & Scott, E. (Eds). 1997. *Invisible people and processes. Writing gender and childhood into European archaeology*. Leicester University Press.
- Moser, S. 1993. Gender stereotyping in pictorial reconstructions of human origins. In: duCros, H. & Smith, L. (Eds). 1993: *Women in Archaeology. A Feminist Critique*. Occasional Papers in Archaeology, No. 23. Canberra. Pp. 75-92.
- Reuterberg, S-E. 1994. *Selection of Swedish Scholastic Aptitude testtakers as a function of socioeconomic background and ability*. Evaluation Through Follow Up. Reports from the department of Education and Educational Research. Report no 1994:05. Department of Education and Educational Research. Göteborg University.
- Reyman, J.E. (Ed). 1992. *Rediscovering our Past: Essays on the History of American Archaeology*. World Wide Archaeology Series 2. Avebury.
- Rønning, A. H. 1996. The Curriculum in the Humanities: A Case Study and some Reflections. *Kvinneforskning No 3/96*. Pp. 58-68.
- Said, E. D. 1994. *Representations of the Intellectual*. The 1993 Reith Lectures. Vintage.
- Scott, J.W. 1986. Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis. *American Historical Review (91) 5, 1986*. Pp. 1053-1075.
- Skolverket 1996. *Vad betyder social bakgrund och kön för resultatet i matematik? En longitudinell studie av betydelsen av social bakgrund och kön för tre årskullars resultat i grundskolan*. Liber Distribution. Stockholm.
- Smith, L. 1995. What is this thing called post-processual archaeology... and is it relevant for Australian archaeology? *Australian Archaeology, No. 40, 1995*. Pp. 28-32.
- Solli, B. 1998. Odin – the *Queer*? Om det skeive i norrøn mytologi. *Universitetets Oldsaksamlings Årbok 1998*.
- Spector, J. & Whelan, A. 1989. Incorporating

- gender into archaeology courses. In: Morgen, S. (Ed). 1989: *Gender and Anthropology. Critical Reviews for Research and Teaching*. American Anthropological Association. Washington D.C.
- Staberg, E. M. 1992. *Olika världar, skilda värderingar. Hur flickor och pojkar möter högstadiet fysik, kemi och teknik*. Akademisk avhandling vid Pedagogiska Institutionen No 32, Umeå universitet. Umeå.
- Staff Development Unit (Eds). 1995. *Konferensrapport. Kvalitéer i studier och utbildning. Universitetspedagogisk konferens i Umeå 15-16 februari 1995*.
- Strassburg, J. 1999. Hands On, Hands Off: Getting at the Attribution of Sex and Gender to Late Mesolithic Graves on Zealand. In: Caesar, C. et al. (Eds). 1999. *Han Hon Den Det. Att integrera genus och kön i arkeologi*. University of Lund. Institute of Archaeology. Report Series No. 65. Pp. 37-62.
- Strömberg, M. 1991. Min erfarenhet av att vara kvinnlig akademiker. *K.A.N. Kvinner i Arkeologi i Norge. (Women in Archaeology in Norway)* 12. P. 82.
- Sørensen, M.L.S. 1992. Gender Archaeology and Scandinavian Bronze Age Studies. *Norwegian Archaeological Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1, 1992. Pp. 31-49.
- Tallberg Broman, I. 1997. Genusperspektiv i pedagogik. In: *Aktuellt om kvinnoforskning. Nya perspektiv på naturvetenskap och teknik*. No 1 Edited by Forum for Women's Research and Science, Lunds universitet and Disa – the Association for Women's Studies.
- Thålin-Bergman, L. 1990. Arkeologi och kvinnor – kvinnor och arkeologi. *Kulturmiljövård* 3/90. Pp. 39-46.
- Walde, D. & Willows, N.D. (Eds). 1991. *The Archaeology of Gender*. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference. Calgary.
- Welinder, S. 1999. Mansarkeologi inom ett genderperspektiv. In: Caesar, C. et al. (Eds). *Han Hon Den Det. Att integrera genus och kön i arkeologi*. University of Lund. Institute of Archaeology. Report Series No. 65. Pp.126-137.
- Werbart, B. (Ed). 1999. *Gender and Prehistory*. Arkeologiska Studier vid Umeå Universitet 7. Umeå.
- Wernersson, I. 1991. *Könsskillnader i gymnasieskolan. En kunskapsöversikt*. F 91:2 Vad säger forskningen? Skolöverstyrelsen.
- Widerberg, K. 1995. *Kunskapens kön. Minnen, reflektioner och teori*. Norstedts förlag. Stockholm.
- Willemark, K. 1999. Personliga reflektioner om feministisk kunskapsteori. In: Caesar, C. et al. (Eds). *Han Hon Den Det. Att integrera genus och kön i arkeologi*. University of Lund. Institute of Archaeology. Report Series No. 65. Pp. 9-16.
- Wylie, A. 1991a. Feminist critiques and archaeological challenges. In: Walde, D. & Willows, N.D. (Eds). 1991: *The Archaeology of Gender*. Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Chacmool Conference. Calgary. Pp.17-23.
- 1991b. Gender theory and the archaeological record: Why is there no archaeology of gender? In: Gero, J. & Conkey, M. (Eds). *Engendering archaeology. Women and prehistory*. Basil Blackwell. Oxford. Pp. 31-54.
- 1992. Workplace issues for women in archaeology: the chilly climate. *K.A.N. Kvinner i Arkeologi i Norge. (Women in Archaeology in Norway)*, 13-14. Pp. 1-39.
- Öhrn, E. 1986. *Könsmönster i klassrumsinteraktion. En observations- och intervjustudie av högstadieelevers lärarkontakter*. Akademisk avhandling, Institutionen för pedagogik, Göteborgs universitet. Göteborg Studies in Educational Sciences 77.

Unpublished sources

Internet

Stage, C. 'Mellan chiffong och rubank – Om könsskillnader på högskoleprovet.' <http://www.info.umu.se/SAFARI/forskning>.

Papers

Hägglund, S. & Öhrn, E. 1998. 'The Marginalisation of 'Social-Emotional' responsibility in the Classroom'. Paper presented at the symposium *Multiple Marginalities*, Helsinki, August 28-30 1998. Department of Education and Educational Research, University of Gothenburg. Pp. 1-14.

Mandt, G. 1994. *Lecture given at the Conference of Gender-Critical Teaching in Archaeology*, Lund. September 1994.