INFORMATION TO USERS

DEVELOPMENT, POPULAR EDUCATION AND FEMINISMS: MENDING THE GAP THROUGH PRAXIS

© Nadien Godkewitsch

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in International Development Studies
Saint Mary's University
Halifax, Nova Scotia

March, 1997

Signatures of Committee:

Dr. Linda Christiansen-Ruffman:
    Thesis Supervisor

Professor Gerry Cameron:
    Thesis Reader

Dr. Daniel Powell:
    Thesis Reader

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-22796-0

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research and writing of this thesis has been quite a year-long experience for me, and I have a significant group of people to thank for helping me through this challenge. I am grateful to all the people who shaped my ideas and contributed to this work.

My thesis Supervisor, Linda Christiansen-Ruffman, deserves the biggest thanks, for her support, understanding and patience throughout my slow but steady progress; for her consistent reminders to stay on the radical direction from which I sometimes found myself straying; and also for giving me the opportunity to share in a critical liberatory-transformational learning context. Thanks also to my readers, Gerry Cameron and Dan Powell, for their encouragement throughout my university education. Thanks also to John Oughton who spent great chunks of time editing and helping me to pick up the pace of writing when I was stuck. Of course, my family deserves a big mention for their constant reminders that this was not nearly as painful as my undergraduate thesis. In fact, I must acknowledge that I really enjoyed this experience (the research, the writing and re-writing, the frustrating moments, the waiting, and the cathartic moments), and feel that it has really allowed me to recognize the culmination of years of learning (and to propel me into my future).

A deep gratitude goes to all the women with whom I have worked in popular education and critical pedagogy settings (both abroad and in Canada). They showed me that we can do a lot more than just reflect on our situations; we can create real, meaningful, and liberatory change.

ABSTRACT

DEVELOPMENT, POPULAR EDUCATION AND FEMINISMS; MENDING THE GAP THROUGH PRAXIS

Nadien Godkewitsch
March, 1997

This thesis addresses the issues and intersections of where development, feminisms, and popular education meet both in theory and in practice. It is argued that, at the intersection of these three diverging fields, we see methodological issues, practical contradictions, theoretical debates, and resulting implications for praxis. For all three, a complicated array of theories look at their functioning, and the result has been an apparent division between theory and practice. This argument is supported through an examination and evaluation of development theory and practice, critical pedagogy and liberatory-transformative (popular) education, and feminist post-structural/postmodern and radical debates. This work offers a new approach to looking at women in the process of development by using a liberatory-transformative learning process: the Integrated Feminist Gender And Development approach. This approach is argued to be that which can provide the basis for a development process that is truly radical, feminist, liberatory, and transformative. The hope is that educators, feminists, and development practitioners will discard frameworks that de-politicize and fragment struggles for social transformation, and will instead focus their attentions on truly radical, feminist liberatory praxis. The conclusion of this thesis includes a consideration of how the original argument can be translated into action: what might be the contexts in which the new approach will succeed; and what the shift toward praxis might mean for the realm of academics.

ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Why This Thesis?

This thesis reflects the culmination of my learning through academic and practical work over the past six years. Although it takes a mainly theoretical stance, it is informed by my personal hands-on experiences doing work in development, with women's organizations, and with popular education both in Canada and abroad. During my undergraduate degree in Comparative Development Studies at Trent University in Ontario, I spent an academic year abroad in Ecuador (1990/91). There I had the opportunity to volunteer for my field placement with a grassroots women's organization called Centro Ecuatoriano para la Promocion y Accion de la Mujer (CEPAM). This organization was my first practical contact with the intersection of development, feminism, and popular education. At the time, I was studying development, focusing primarily on community-based initiatives. I was at a stage in my life where my feminism was expanding beyond my personal urban Canadian realm. As well, I was for the first time exposed to a very exciting method of social analysis, information gathering, and information sharing: popular education. These experiences led me to a search for future study and work in an area where development, feminism, and popular education converge.

Throughout my Masters degree I have been preparing myself for the writing of this thesis, knowing that I wanted to look theoretically and practically at the intersection between development, women and popular education. Finding a research problem and formulating an argument continued to be a hurdle for me, as I did research in diverging

1

disciplines and fields (including education, international development, sociology, gender studies, and feminism).

Originally I had planned to write a very different thesis from the one I have here. I struggled for a long time with the idea of writing a thesis that relied heavily on the documentation of my experience with CEPAM. Over time, it became evident that this was not possible, as it was becoming harder and harder for me to collect written documentation on the organization and its process of working. As well, while I had been doing work with them, I had not collected any official "data", and so any case study focusing on CEPAM would have to have been based mainly on my experiences with the organization, and would be only to illustrate the theory discussed in the other chapters. I decided instead to allow my experience with the women at CEPAM to be the stepping stone towards what has now become a theoretically-focused paper, occasionally referring to their work to illustrate points in the thesis.

The other great turn that my research on these topics took was in formulating my main argument. I found that most of the accessible writing on the topics (especially feminist critical pedagogy) was being heavily influenced by post-structural and postmodern views of the world. In the preparation stages of this thesis, I was taking much of the writing and the arguments in it for granted. I was dangerously close to falling into the academic trap of believing the views of the ivory tower, and only because I was not getting access to the more alternative literature (that which comes from more radical perspectives, that which is written in the South, and that which is not academic but reporting on the practical). Luckily, with this limitation brought to my attention, it became clearer to me that I needed to look at my topics from a more radical and alternative

2

perspective and embark on exploring the contradictions in the existing academic literature. In this process, I was able to find what would eventually become my main argument: that there is a deeply embedded dichotomy between theory and practice evident in all three of the components I wanted to research for my thesis.

The Argument and Rationale

This thesis is an exploration of where development, feminism and critical popular education intersect. At the intersection, we find methodological issues, practical contradictions, and theoretical debates. It is these issues, contradictions and debates that I explore in the chapters of this thesis. My rationale for this exploration is to offer to the fields of development, critical education, and feminism a coherent and holistic model that can provide the basis from which a truly transformative and liberatory, radical, and feminist development process can take place. These three components, in the past, have generally been explored in isolation from each other, or two of them have been analyzed in relation to each other. This, however, has resulted in a complicated array of theories that have taken part in isolating the theoretical from the practical. In providing a framework that acknowledges the intersections of the components, I hope that educators, feminists and development practitioners (who are committed to a development process that necessarily includes a liberatory pedagogy) will discard the frameworks that de-politicize and fragment struggles for social transformation, and will instead focus their attentions on

truly radical, feminist and liberatory praxis. Praxis is defined as the point at which theory and practice meet.[1]

Why is this important? Throughout my research on theories and practice of development, critical education, and feminism, I have encountered striking contradictions between theory and practice. Often the theories do not correspond with the practices they propose to inform. In many cases, the theoretical is manufactured in the realm of the academic and has no bearing or relevance in everyday reality of those people that work at the grassroots level (women in a small rural community in the South, for example). Moreover, I have found that while some theorists do take part in articulating their work through practical means, primacy is given to academic theory, without the proper consideration afforded to grassroots practice that actually results in a liberatory transformative process. The argument that I make in this thesis is that it is crucial -- in acknowledging the intersection of feminist struggles, development processes and liberatory-transformative education -- to find a way to bridge this gap between theory and practice. In this thesis I have developed an Integrated Feminist Gender And Development (GAD) framework which bridges the gap between de-politicized theory and critical transformative practice. This framework helps to focus the lens through which the practice of liberatory-transformative education (popular education) can be seen as a method for a transformative woman-defined and woman-focused development praxis.

---

[1] "Praxis" is the Greek word meaning action with reflection. "Praxis invites an examination of an action just completed so that relevant theory can be applied. The cycle of praxis entails looking at what you did; reflecting using theory; and changing... Praxis is not practice - which could be a repetition of a given approach without the reflective analysis and new dimensions" (Vella, 1994: 10).

The first chapter is called "Re-Defining Development in Global, Empowerment, and Feminist Terms." In this chapter, I show how mainstream development theories that lay the foundation for development practice have major inconsistencies and inadequacies that cause them to be unable to place social inequalities (especially gender inequalities) at the centre of analysis and action. Of particular importance, is the failure of traditional development practice to support and nurture the radical and emancipatory struggles of women in the development process. The identification of gaps between development theory and a truly liberatory practice for women in the development process points to the need for a more holistic model that melds theory with practice. What I claim is crucial then, is to theorize and identify the components of a development theory and framework for practice that is able to provide a more holistic approach to development and that focuses on the critical and empowering transformation strategies of women.

Some of the questions I will answer in Chapter One include:

• what are the mainstream and dominant theoretical frameworks relating to development?

• what are their propositions and assumptions about the development process?

• why do they not meet the requirements for a participatory and liberating development process that attempts to alleviate (gender) inequalities?

• how have some of the earlier development models looked at women in the development process?

• what are the theoretical underpinnings of a new and alternative theoretical framework and development methodology that does inform a practice that results in radical transformations?

5

- and how must "development" be defined -- theoretically, conceptually and practically -- for a liberatory-transformative and radical praxis?

In Chapter Two, "Liberatory-Transformative Pedagogy – Popular Education," I look at the importance of alternative, group-based critical education techniques (popular education) to assess, analyze, and act on strategic issues of concern for marginalized groups (women, in particular). The purpose of this chapter is to show how *popular education*, a participatory method of social research (information gathering) and education (information sharing), fits into an Integrated Feminist GAD framework to facilitate the identification, analysis and transformation of gender inequalities. I uncover, in this chapter, the theoretical basis upon which critical pedagogy, feminist popular education, and other non-formal liberatory-transformative education models have been built. In reviewing the theoretical, methodological and practical components of popular education, the gaps between theory and practice become evident. I argue that these gaps constitute fundamental contradictions to a radical liberatory-transformative process. It is for this reason that popular education is looked at in the context of an appropriate tool for an Integrated Feminist GAD analysis and action. The importance of this chapter is to show the ways in which popular education can help to nurture an approach to development and education that is participatory, radical and transformative. Popular education, in this light, can be seen as that which provides the praxis, bridging the gaps between theory and practice.

In Chapter Two I will address the following questions:

- what are the methods, assumptions and principles of popular education?

• what is the development of a critical consciousness, and why is it of importance to both the learning process and the development process?

• how do popular education techniques help groups to define and act on strategies for social transformation?

• what are some examples of the gaps between theory and practice in liberatory-transformative education?

• and how can popular education be used to empower women in their struggles against gender inequalities?

"Theory Opposing Practice or Leading to Praxis in Liberatory-Transformative Pedagogy? The Feminist Debates" is the title of the Third Chapter of my thesis. The gaps between theory and practice that I identify in previous chapters, are placed into the perspective of two divergent theoretical, conceptual, and practical frameworks. On one hand there are those frameworks that maintain and exacerbate the dichotomy between theory and practice: "theory versus practice" -- post-structural/postmodern positions. And on the other hand, there are those frameworks that bridge that gap: "praxis" -- radical Integrative feminisms and the work done through the Integrated Feminist GAD framework.

In the Third Chapter I argue that a radical Integrative feminist stance is the base upon which a development process using popular education tools can build a bridge between de-politicized (academic, sexist, static, etc.,) theory and radical transformative (participatory, grassroots, empowering, liberatory, etc.,) practice. Why is this analysis important? In my opinion, it brings to light the need for theorists and practitioners (as well as those who do both) of education, feminism, and development to be aware of the

prevailing post-structural/postmodern wave of thought which necessarily breaks the power of a radical (political) transformative movement by placing too much emphasis on the theoretical and not enough on radical practice. My concluding argument, then, is for theorists and practitioners in these fields (and/or those that are involved in a combination of any of the three) to look toward people and groups that do reject these paralyzing academic views, to celebrate attempts and struggles of Integrative feminists, to maintain radical approaches, to continue working at grassroots levels, and to keep in mind that development must be defined and done by its beneficiaries. The liberatory-transformative education practiced by small community-based groups (i.e. Sistren and CEPAM) is what promotes the type of development that is political in nature and that challenges systems that maintain sexist inequalities.

CHAPTER ONE: RE-DEFINING DEVELOPMENT IN GLOBAL, EMPOWERMENT AND FEMINIST TERMS

Introduction

This chapter presents the theoretical and definitional contexts that inform the analysis in the following chapters. The chapter is divided into three sections: the first outlines the mainstream development theories that have informed, and in many cases, continue to inform development practice. Critiques of these frameworks illustrate their inadequacies, and support the need for a framework that promotes practice that addresses inequalities, and works toward changing them in the development process.

The second section examines the evolution of development thought and process as it relates to women. This leads to the synthesis of elements of existing conceptual frameworks into an Integrated FeministGender And Development (GAD) theoretical framework. This framework integrates the premises from which a GAD analytical approach is drawn, and links it with socialist feminist theories, Global feminist practice, and Integrative feminisms. It can, in its holistic view, fill the gap between theory (which is shown to be de-politicized and generally institutionalized) and a critical transformative practice. The framework will provide the lens through which popular education (liberatory/transformative pedagogy) is examined, in the following chapter, as a tool for a critical transformative feminist development praxis.

The third and final section of this chapter offers a number of different definitional aspects of the term development. Development has a variety of meanings, depending on

9

the underlying assumptions and social and political basis upon which the practice is built. A particular definition of development is of importance to the development and practice of an Integrated Feminist GAD approach. Development is defined in this section within the context of an ethical rationality, "Another development" theory, and the Empowerment approach.

1. Mainstream Development Theories And Their Critiques

Mainstream development theories, although diverse in focus, are generally categorized into two main groups: those that are informed by a set of values and underlying assumptions of a liberal modernization paradigm, and those derived from analysis of a Marxist dependency paradigm. An examination of the feminist critiques of modernization and dependency theories points out the inadequacies of these dominant paradigms in promoting a development praxis that is truly transformative and emancipatory.

Modernization Development Theory

Modernization approaches to development theory arose out of the emergence and expansion of capitalism as it has been shaped by the Industrial Revolution. Theories and models of development based on the modernization approaches were derived from the experiences of Western economic expansion. Development was defined in terms of economic growth, progress, and the linear movement from 'backward societies' to ones that became 'civilized'. Modernization approaches were most popular in the 1950's and 1960's, but in many cases they continue to inform economic development policy today. Modernization theory sees the development of a society as the positive transformation of a

10

'traditional' society (Rostow, 1960: 4-6) to one that is 'modern' (exhibiting a more complex division of labour, forward looking, adhering to an ideology of individual freedom, and with a capitalist production mode). This process includes urbanization, rationalization, the accumulation of capital (Rostow, 1960: 7-12), transformations in institutional structures (Eisenstadt, 1968: 256-279), and changes in family, household, and village community structures.[2]

Stan Burkey summarizes modernization as being a theoretical model imposed on developing nations to move them into an industrial state. "Development in the Third World [sic] was expected to be an imitative process in which the less developed countries gradually assumed the qualities of the industrialized nations" (Burkey, 1993: 27).[3] The qualities referred to here go beyond those of economic infrastructure to include attitudes, behaviors, consumption patterns, social values, social institutions, and political structures (for details of the changes prescribed by early Modernization theorists, see Rostow, 1960). This critical view of modernization has been mirrored by many, such as Hettne:

> The early concerns of development economics to a large extent reflected the interest of the ruling elite in developing countries. The modernization paradigm took it for granted that the societies characterized by industrial capitalism are universally desired, but in fact no people ever voted for capital accumulation and industrialization, processes that have usually implied a substantial amount of coercion (Hettne, 1990: 152).

---

[2] Traditional family, household and community structures are often treated as obstacles to the achievement of modernity, and therefore in modernization theory, the loss of a "traditional way of life" is prescribed. For an in-depth explanation of the public/private, modern/traditional dichotomies in mainstream development thought and practice, see Scott, 1995.

[3] Scott (1995:3) agrees with Burkey, extending the analysis to critique the "ethnocentric positioning of the West as the universal model of development for Third World [sic] countries".

Modernization relied on the assumption of the 'trickle-down'[4] effect of the economic development process. This suggested that during the gains achieved through capitalist industrialization and rapid expansion of the economies of the South, the benefits would 'trickle down' to the poorer and more marginalized strata of society (Rathgeber, 1990: 3, Todaro, 1989: 162). This would ultimately, it was assumed, benefit society as a whole, with an overall increase in the standard of living. This assumption, however, was proven wrong (Todaro, 1989: 532). In theory the poorest of the poor would benefit, but in practice, the marginalized sectors of society became further pushed to the edges of society, breaking them off from access to basic social services, employment, political processes, and the ability to fulfill their basic human needs.

Modernization theory has had its share of criticism. The main point of the critics is that it is based on a Western-biased assumption that the development process of the Southern nations should follow the path that the Western industrialized nations took. This reliance on "evolutionary and linear notions of social and political change" has resulted in the theory's "reductionism and oversimplification of the development process" (Scott, 1995: 23). The theory was that by promoting industrial development and economic

---

[4] Todaro defines the "trickle-down theory of development" as "the notion that *development* is purely an 'economic' phenomenon in which rapid gains from the overall growth of *GNP* and *per capita income* would automatically bring benefits to the masses in the form of jobs and other economic opportunities. The main preoccupation is therefore to get the growth job done while problems of *poverty, unemployment,* and *income distribution* are perceived to be of secondary importance" (Todaro, 1989: 651, emphasis as in original).

growth in the Two-Thirds World[5] (based on a Western industrialization model), the benefits would eventually find their way to the poorest of the poor. The practice was that the poorest of the poor have found themselves in adverse conditions that have been directly created and perpetuated by the model whose supporters used in the original pretense of 'helping' them.

Feminist critiques of modernization theory focus on the masculine standpoint of the concept of modernity. Scott offers an in-depth analysis of how constructs such as modernity are "anchored firmly in pervasive social constructions of gender differences. Modernity has been envisioned, particularly by modernization theorists, in opposition to a feminized and traditional household..." (Scott, 1995: 5, 124). The conditions of modernity that include rationality, technical progress, urbanization, and economic growth are seen to be accomplished in the public realm. The pejorative association with the traditional sectors of society and the values associated with tradition and women were seen by early modernization theorists as "absolutely incompatible with modern institutions" (Scott, 1995: 24).

Although gender was not completely left out of the analysis, when it was incorporated, it was (and is) done in a co-optive way, justifying the continuation of gender inequality, and essentially offering a patriarchal version of what gender analysis is. A key

---

[5] The term Two-Thirds World is one that I borrow from Angela Miles. In her words, it refers to "...those nations that share a history of colonization and exploitation by and resistance to the capitalist nations of the West. ... This term names historical power relations, of domination and resisted domination, that other terms such as "North" and South" do not. I have head the term Two-Thirds World used recently and use it myself periodically because of the timely reminder it provides the North American reader of the South's predominance in both population and land mass" (Miles 1996: 148). I would also add to her explanation of the term that it can be used as an alternative to "Third World" which has connotations of hierarchy which necessarily take part in sustaining relations of subordination between nations, cultures, and classes.

point for feminist critiques of development theory is that the exclusion and/or co-option of gender analysis (and the resulting lack of identification of women's concerns and issues) does not rule out the existence of underlying social constructions of gender differences. These covert constructions mutually resulted in the dichotomy between the traditional, private, and feminine on one hand, and the modern, public, and masculine, on the other.

Feminist critiques of the modernization approaches to development include analyses of the literature in terms of its inability to identify women, their conditions and needs within the development process. "Women rarely, if ever, were considered a separate unit of analysis in the modernization literature of the period" (Rathgeber, 1990: 3). In fact, in a recent review of the literature of early modernization theorists, almost nothing was said explicitly about women.

> The argument ... is that modernization theorists brought deeply held masculinist and dualistic views of the world of tradition and modernity that relied upon configurations of the public and private spheres, the household, and evolutionary progress. ... Women are either invisible, treated paternalistically, or used as a litmus test for determining the degree of "backwardness" of a particular Third World country (Scott, 1995: 24-25).

In sum, the Modernization approaches to development have not proven to support a development process that empowers marginalized people and allows for transformative action. The approaches were generally imposed on less developed societies because they were considered inferior and required to move toward industrialization. The result was massive social dislocation. Modernization did not result in the benefits of capitalist industrialization 'trickling down' to the poorer and more marginalized strata of society. In fact, over time these categories have become pushed to the margins of the social, economic, and political spheres of their societies. As feminist critiques point out, the

concept of modernity itself is bound with Western and sexist assumptions. Modernization pits the traditional household, family, community, and subsistence lifestyle against the competitive, urban, waged capitalist spheres of society, essentially making the former a relic of a "backward" past. Finally, Modernization approaches have absolutely no feminist-based analysis (except for a co-opted one that serves to justify patriarchal oppression), and therefore are unable to provide a development practice that challenges underlying social constructions of gender differences.

Dependency Theory

Dependency approaches to development theory and practice grew out of a critique of the modernization approaches which assumed that a growth-oriented development strategy would have mutual benefits for the industrialized nations, as well as for those in the process of developing (Burkey, 1993: 28; Levitt, n.d.: 82; Allen and Thomas, 1992: 227). The anticipated economic growth of the less developed nations, especially as noted by Latin American social and economic theorists in the mid 1960's and 1970's, had failed to occur with the modernization strategies. Propositions of dependency theory evolved from Neo-Marxist principles that saw society as a hierarchy of strata that have differing levels of social, political, and economic power, as well as differing levels of access to the resources of society (Schuurman, 1993: 3-5). Through the influences of colonialism[6] and

---

[6] Allen and Thomas offer the following definition of colonialism: "The direct political control of a people by a foreign state: control of a non-European people by a European state or the USA" (Allen and Thomas, 1992: 168). It should be noted that this definition must be extended to include other nations and/or states (i.e., China can be said to be a colonial power over Tibet).

Neo-colonialism,[7] Southern countries were forced into specialization of production,

namely, production for export to the industrialized countries. In many cases, this was in

the form of mono-crop production, and in others it was in the form of raw materials or

manufactured goods for export. The idea was to get the pre-capitalist sectors of the

society integrated in the international economy. The dependency theory hierarchy sees the

'core-periphery' model as illustrating the power relations between the North and the

South. The relationships between cores and peripheries constitute a chain of dependency,

as a developed country exploits ones that are less developed. The core of the North exerts

control (in the form of a Multi- or Trans-National Corporation or plantation) on the

periphery of the South to extract resources (Schuurman, 1993: 6; Todaro, 1989: 79;

Cardoso and Faletto, 1979: 16-21). There is a dependent alliance between the cores of the

North and South for the movement of capital to maintain an upward flow of economic

growth benefiting only the cores[8] (Todaro, 1989: 100). For Frank (1975: 1), this also

resulted in the "underdevelopment" of the peripheries.

---

[7] Neo-colonialism is a concept originally used by dependency theorists (an outgrowth of Marxist thinking), which is based on (as is the term colonialism) the understanding of "unequal international capitalist system of rich country-poor country relationships". Todaro defines the neocolonial model of underdevelopment as a "model whose main position is that the underdevelopment exists in *Third World* countries because of continuing exploitative economic, political, and cultural policies of former colonial rulers toward less developed countries" (Todaro,1989: 638, emphasis as in original). To add to this definition, it should be noted that generally this term refers to the exploitation of marginalized categories of people in the Two-Thirds World by ruling elite who may or may not be nationals of the country. For examples of neocolonialism, see Samir Amin's Delinking: Towards a Polycentric World, (1985), Zed Press, London.

[8] Allen and Thomas clarify dependency theory by explaining: "In its most crude version, dependency thinking simply substitutes countries for classes so that capitalism is not so much a system of class exploitation as one of exploitation of Third World countries by the First World. In less crude versions, the international capitalist class, together with allies from the ruling elite of Third World countries, is able to exploit workers and peasants in Third World countries, at the same time as 'buying off' its own working class with a mixture of material rewards and racist ideology" (Allen and Thomas, 1992: 137).

There are a number of critiques of dependency theory. Those critiques of most importance to this thesis are those which point to the inability for dependency theory to promote a development process that looks specifically at structural inequalities that perpetuate and exacerbate the subordinate position of women in the Two-Thirds World.

Dependency theory, following the Marxist tendency, focuses primarily on class relations and their position within the social relations of production.

> [D]ependency theory shares with Marxism a blind spot about gender and, as with modernization theory, its concerns about development derive from a masculinist preoccupation with constraints of a rationalized public sphere (Scott, 1995: 88).

Sexual and family relations, and relations between men and women tend to be seen by dependency theorists as 'private', and therefore not as central as the public realm (Jagger, 1984:146). The dominance of men over women, therefore, is looked at as a "secondary contradiction", which would be addressed through changes in the social relations of production (Scott, 1995: 9).[9] This emphasis on class is also evident in the revolutionary (more left-wing) radical theorists' writing. These revolutionaries demand that women become involved in the public productive sphere so that they can be elevated from a situation of backwardness and ignorance. Revolutionary discourse, then also embraces the dichotomous oppositions of traditional/backward and modern/progressive (Scott, 1995: 19).

For dependency theorists, development is defined as the process of achieving a certain level of autonomy and self-reliance (breaking the cycle of dependence). These

---

[9] It should be noted that for some Dependency theorists, women, (when discussed as a category) are assumed to be "the exploited and oppressed victims of capitalism. Centuries of capitalist exploitation have left women isolated and trapped within society's most backward institutions" (Scott, 1995: 103).

challenges, however, are conceptualized as essentially masculine: "...to be overcome, through separation from and then modernization of the female-headed household" (Scott, 1995: 5). Furthermore, to challenge the unequal relations between the dependent periphery and the all-powerful core, dependency theory prescribes a class struggle. This class struggle is depicted as one that takes place outside the household, within the public realm, and by men. In this model, "women remain isolated in the household and thus are not situated to develop a collective consciousness and lack the capacity for organizing opposition to dependency. Challenging dependency is men's work" (Scott, 1995: 97).

Dependency theory does not specifically address the issue of the unequal relations between men and women.

> Dependency theory ... fails to challenge the social constructions of gender evident in the theory of its mainstream rival. These gendered assumptions are not only evident in theories of development and underdevelopment, but are also revealed in the dominant policies and practices of international lending agencies... (Scott, 1995: 1-2).

Although this theory may be more sensitive to social inequalities than the modernization approaches, it does not focus on women as a fundamental social category of analysis (Scott, 1995: 20). To add to this critique of dependency theory, one must also note that "there is little evidence of the participation of women in the evolution and conceptualization of this development theory" (Thurlow, 1992: 12).[10]

Summary and Conclusion

The perspectives taken by the dominant modernization and dependency

---

[10] Thurlow cites "Moore, 1986" as her reference for this; however, she does not give a full bibliographical citation.

frameworks do not fit with the notions of a critical, radical, transformative and participatory action-oriented form of development (this is defined more thoroughly in the third section of this chapter). The practices (mainly around information gathering, research, information sharing, and education) which stem from these frameworks are unable to meet the emancipatory needs of those who are affected by them. This inability results in the need for a methodology and conceptual framework which radically questions and analyses authoritarian practices and the "mechanical transmission" of knowledge that is characteristic of information gathering and sharing based on traditional goals and assumptions (Magendzo, 1990: 50).

What is most problematic regarding the mainstream and dominant approaches to development thought and practice is that they are, as Scott claims: "grounded in elaborate ideas that revolve around social constructions of gender differences" (Scott, 1995: 1). Both modernization and dependency have an underlying "powerfully masculine view of what it means to be modern" (Scott, 1995:89).

The mainstream field of development studies is clearly part of the continued perpetuation of the systems that serve to subordinate women, especially those that live in Two-Thirds World areas. Clearly it is crucial for development theorists and practitioners who oppose this oppression to challenge the assumptions of the mainstream theories. The challenges must also be directed at new development efforts that propose to be radical in nature (and contain the rhetoric of emancipation, empowerment and a participatory development process) but are, in fact, constrained by the assumptions of modernization and dependency theories. The following section explores some alternative options.

2. The Integrated Feminist GAD Approach

With social, political and economic crises[11] expanding throughout the world, it is imperative that a new global understanding be reached on how to alleviate the unceasing inequalities in our societies. These crises have generated specific situations for women, at times, creating greater inequality between men and women.[12] Because of these situations, women have developed multiple and diverse strategies for survival, and many of these strategies need not be viewed in isolation from each other. In fact, it is the inability of mainstream development theories and research paradigms to acknowledge these strategies through a holistic lens that causes the situations of oppression to continue. It is therefore crucial to come up with a development framework that acknowledges inequalities, and works to radically transform the structures that perpetuate them, so that people are not placed into positions of subordination based on structured relations of power (race, class and gender).

Through an examination of the evolution of development thought as it relates to women in the development process, an Integrated Feminist GAD theoretical framework is offered. This framework is an integration of segments of different existing feminist frameworks. It, in its holistic view, can fill the gap between theory (which has been de-politicized and generally institutionalized) and critical transformative practice. This

---

[11] This refers to the growth of interconnected and detrimental situations and conditions which have resulted from mainstream approaches to development, mainly in Two-Thirds World nations. These crises will not be outlined in this paper, however; many are fully documented in many of the published works found in the attached bibliography.

[12] There are numerous examples of the ways in which women in the Two-Thirds World have been adversely affected by global crises. One example is women working more hours per day both inside and outside the home due to detrimental changes in lifestyles brought forth by structural adjustment programs.

framework will, in the following chapter, provide the lens through which the practice of popular education can be seen as a method for a transformative woman-defined and woman-focused development praxis.

The Evolution of Development Theory as it Looks at Women in the Development Process. Liberal, Marxist, and Socialist Feminisms; WID, WAD, and GAD

Feminists have critiqued the mainstream and dominant theories for their lack of analysis of gender relations. According to a wide variety of feminist theorists and practitioners, the dominant development paradigms have informed projects which in turn have failed, or in many cases exacerbated, the marginalization of women, because the development plans ignored women as a specific category of people with specific needs and situations. These criticisms have come from the three main frameworks in development thought which have focused on women as a category in the development process: Women In Development (WID), Women And Development (WAD) and Gender And Development (GAD).

Although modernization theories did not consider gender issues in their approaches, liberal feminist theorists have re-worked the mainstream modernization approach to include a feminist perspective. Liberal feminist perspectives that look at women in the development process (which grew in popularity in the late 1970's) are referred to as Women In Development (WID). The main thrust of WID is to get women as a category integrated into the development process on a global level (Brett, 1991: 1-2). The underlying rationale of WID is that women can be seen as an untapped resource, and that they should be viewed as a category that can "provide an economic contribution to

development" (Moser, 1993: 2). Part of the WID argument stemmed from the understanding that women had been left out of the development process (which had been modeled on a Modernization approach), and that "women are key actors in the economic system, yet their neglect in development plans has left untapped a potentially large contribution" (Overholt et al. 1984: 3).

The liberal feminist perspective is mainly concerned with removing barriers to women's full and equal participation in society. Liberals focus on the inequality between men and women, and their aim is to break this inequality through strategies of gradual reform from within systems in which the inequality exist. This perspective does not seek to challenge the *status quo*, nor does it attempt to radically transform any existing social, political, and economic structures. This perspective takes for granted that social and economic equality will be the inevitable outcome of free competition among equal contenders in the marketplace. With this assumption, the Liberal feminist perspective sees its most important struggle as the removal of barriers that hinder the full and equal participation of women in the free market (Thurlow, 1992:14; Jaquette, 1982; Razawi and Miller, 1995: 3). [13]

Liberalism originally developed as a challenge to the aristocratic hegemonic[14] rule and the feudal lords who accessed their power through their birth right. Within the context

---

[13] Thurlow cites "Jaquette, 1982" as a reference for this information; however, she does not offer a full bibliographic reference.

[14] Gramsci uses the term *hegemony* to describe more than a simple political alliance: "it is a complete fusion of economic, political, intellectual, and moral *leadership* which will be brought about by one fundamental group, and groups allied to it through ideology. ... Hegemony is *constructed*, not by the domination of one class or group, but with the consent of different groups - it is the terrain on which ideological struggle takes place" (Sarup, 1983: 141).

of a liberal democracy, Liberal thinkers began to acknowledge the similarities between the unfair political system built on birth right and the illogical system of discrimination based on sex. Liberal thinkers also argue that the economy as a whole will benefit from a fuller participation of women in the work force. In order for this to happen, they prescribe the removal of barriers to promote women's integration into the system. WID strategies reflect this prescription, in their attempt to integrate women into the (modernization) development process. The main policy focus stemming from this perspective is the need for education, and the need to break down barriers that women face in accessing it. Liberal feminists are likely to rely on already existing political, legal, and social systems to ensure that women and men are given equal opportunities to compete in the labour market.

The main problem of this approach is that it works within the boundaries of the modernization paradigm of development. Like modernization, the emphasis that WID placed on women's productive roles meant that women's subordination was seen primarily in terms of an economic framework (Razawi and Miller, 1995: 4). The underlying rationale of WID is that "the development process would proceed much better if women were fully incorporated into [it] (instead of being left to use their time 'unproductively')" (Moser, 1993: 3). WID accepts the principles of individualism that are part of a Liberal approach, and hence promotes individualistic strategies such as access to education, employment and credit as means by which women can become more involved in the process of economic development (Moser, 1993: 3; Razawi and Miller, 1995: 12). Allen and Thomas summarize a common critique of this approach, stating that its assumptions are fundamentally flawed:

23

> it starts from the premise that women have been excluded from development. But ... women's time, energy, work and skills are involved in every aspect of the development process; it is the inequality of gender relations and the continuing subordination of women that ensure that women's contribution is not matched by recognition and remuneration in social, political and economic terms (Allen and Thomas, 1992: 308).

WID policies placed emphasis on objectives and goals that were instrumental in nature, such as integration and mainstreaming. Emphasis was placed on strategies which promoted gender equality, through the process of fitting women into a system that was essentially masculine in nature. The focus was to see women as equals to men, working within structures that continued to favour the masculine norm. What was greatly lacking in WID policies was the empowerment of women. With WID's focus on the institutionalization of women in the development process and gender equality, this approach lost sight of the women's agenda (Jahan, 1995: 126).

In response to the limitations of the WID approach, the Women And Development (WAD) approach emerged in the late 1970's. It is generally considered a Marxist feminist approach, has been associated with the dependency theory of development, and focuses primarily on class relations in its analysis. The assumptions made by WAD theorists and practitioners are that women are active in the economies of their societies and that they work both inside and outside their homes. WAD uses a class approach to analyzing inequality, but it neglects to analyze the social relations of gender within classes. A critique of both the WID and the WAD approaches is that they focus heavily on the productive sector and miss out on a full understanding of women's experiences in the reproductive realm. While WAD recognizes the integral role of women's productive and reproductive work in the perpetuation of class structures, gender subordination and

24

patriarchy are not included in this analysis (Thurlow, 1992: 16).[15] Women are seen to be unequal to men, but this is identified as the result of global structures of inequality and dependency. Relations between men and women remain unaddressed in this perspective.

Gender And Development (GAD), which grew in the 1980's, is a response to the WID and WAD perspectives. GAD, considered to be based on a socialist-feminist framework, offers a more holistic approach and attempts to incorporate alternatives based on the critiques of the former approaches. It integrates, on a theoretical level, an analysis of class relations and gender relations. Where WID and WAD analytically fall short, GAD theory challenges the structures of patriarchy and capitalism as perpetuating inequalities between men and women.

The GAD approach has its roots in socialist feminism, which in turn, is rooted in the feminist critiques of classical Marxist thought. Recently it has placed emphasis on the inability of socialist societies to balance gender inequalities. The GAD approach has also been influenced by radical feminist[16] analysis, especially the analytic concept of the

---

[15] Thurlow cites "Rathgeber, 1989, WID WAD GAD: Trends in Research and Practice, International Development Research Centre, Ottawa " as her reference for this information; however, she does not provide a page reference.

[16] Of course, there have been and continue to be diverging opinions between radical feminists and socialist feminists. They are linked in this section for their common critiques of the mainstream and Liberal feminist stances. Diane Richardson (1996: 152) offers the following regarding radical feminist politics: "The stress is on the importance of women's experience and the understanding that the personal is political, the significance of 'consciousness-raising' as a political strategy, the insistence on the relationship between theory, activism and personal life, the importance placed on making radical feminist ideas more accessible and to de-mystify theory, are all fundamental aspects of a radical feminist politics."

personal as political.[17] GAD analysts realize that an economic analysis alone would not address the specific and common situation of women and therefore they emphasize the role of patriarchy within the family structure as a major source of women's oppression.

GAD's socialist feminist roots stress the importance of analyzing reproductive sphere work (generally unpaid work done in the home) as an integral component of both capitalist and socialist productive relations. This analysis also suggests that the subordination of women, and the lack of value placed on women's work within the household, is supportive of the capitalist system by reinforcing, perpetuating, and exacerbating relations of inequality between social categories.

While a socialist feminist analytic framework highlights the inter-connectedness of patriarchy and capitalism, and analyzes their workings in relation to the oppression of women, it has been critiqued for its narrow focus on class alone as an instigator of inequality. The critiques of this perspective note that it has fallen short of confronting discrimination of women based on other social factors such as religion, nationality, ethnicity, etc.(Thurlow, 1992: 18). The GAD approach, with its roots in socialist feminism, attempts to rectify this fundamental flaw.

---

[17] One of the fundamental premises of the "personal as political" is that in order to change our world, we must change ourselves - and vice-versa (Mary Bricker-Jenkins and Nancy Hooyman, 1987: 37). Jocelynne Scutt (1996: 102) identifies the Women's Liberation movement's attachment to "the personal is political" as being a message "...to the world at large that it is time to give up the fragmented view of reality which has persisted in accordance with dominant views." Angela Miles (1996) explains that the personal as political was part of the growth of the feminist struggle that she terms "early feminist radicalism". She quotes Bunch: "In this struggle, separations that have frustrated previous movements – separations between analysis and program and between personal and political life– are breaking down. Ending sexism means destroying oppressive institutions and ideologies and creating new structures and images to replace them. There is no private domain of a person's life that is not political and there is no political issue that is not ultimately personal." Originally in Bunch, Charlotte. 1970. "A Broom of One's Own." In J. Cooke and C. Bunch-Weeks (eds.) The New Woman: A Motive Anthology on Women's Liberation, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis. p. 168.

26

GAD identifies the fact that the former approaches focused on women in isolation, thus ignoring the real problems related to the subordinate status of women in relation to men. Therefore, this new perspective prescribes the need to look at gender *relations* rather than women. Supporters and contributors to GAD theory underline the importance of making a distinction between the concepts of gender and sex (for examples see Brett, 1991: 2-3). Carolyn Moser notes that the GAD proponents "were concerned about the manner in which the problems of women were perceived in terms of their *sex* - namely, their *biological* differences from men - rather than in terms of their *gender*[18] - that is, the *social relationship* between men and women, in which women have been systematically subordinated"[19] (Moser, 1993: 3, emphasis added). GAD looks at the shaping of society in terms of politics, economics, and social organization. It does so through an approach which sees all of these as related to each other. It assumes that gender is socially constructed and that specific (and differentiated) roles, expectations, and responsibilities

---

[18] A. Oakley discusses the conceptual difference between sex and gender in her ovular work: Sex, Gender and Society, 1972. She states: "'Sex' is a biological term: 'gender' a psychological and cultural one. Common sense suggests that they are merely two ways of looking at the same division, and that someone who belongs to, say, the female sex will automatically belong to the corresponding (feminine) gender. In reality this is not so. To be a man or a woman, a boy or a girl, is as much a function of dress, gesture, occupation, social network and personality as it is of possessing a particular set of genitals" (Oakley, 1972: 158). Oostergaard offers this on gender: "Gender refers to the qualitative and interdependent character of women's and men's position in society. Gender relations are constituted in terms of the relations of power and dominance that structure the life chances of women and men. Thus gender divisions are not fixed biology, but constitute an aspect of the wider social division of labour and this, in turn, is rooted in conditions of production and reproduction and reinforced by the cultural, religious and ideological systems prevailing in a society" (Oostergaard, 1992: 6).

[19] Allen and Thomas offer a concise definition of the concept 'subordination of women': "A phrase used to describe the generalized situation whereby men as a group have more social and economic power than women, including power over women. As a result, women come off worse in most measurable indices of the outcome of social and economic processes. In short, the way the two genders relate to each other is that the male gender is dominant and the female gender is subordinate" (Allen and Thomas, 1992: 294).

are assigned to women and men; that it is within the relationship between these that oppression exists and is perpetuated (Whitehead, 1979; Allen and Thomas, 1992: 292, MATCH and CIDA, 1991: 24). Proponents of GAD agree that men and women play different roles in society, that they have different levels of access and control over resources,[20] and as a result have different needs and concerns that inform their struggles (Moser, 1993: 8; Allen and Thomas, 1992: 292; Brett, 1991: 4-5). They also maintain that women across the world are not a homogeneous category and that they therefore do not share the same political or social aims.[21]

The GAD perspective includes a holistic analysis of the social relations of gender through a lens that includes the contradictions and inter-relatedness of class, race, gender, and development (and perhaps other categories such as sexuality, and/or religion, depending on the society being analyzed). In this holistic analysis, GAD attempts to see how and why gender is related to other forms of social inequalities. Development work informed by GAD can effect social change, which in turn can be affected by any of the following factors: socio-cultural, economic, political, environmental, demographic, legal, educational, international, and religious (MATCH and CIDA, 1991: 29). This approach

---

[20] In an outline of the GAD analytical tools, a MATCH and CIDA document (1991) explains the importance of looking at access to and control over resources: "Productive, reproductive and community work all require the use of resources. Engaging in work and using resources usually generates benefits for individuals, households and communities. The GAD approach requires sensitivity to women's access to the resources needed for their work, their control over those resources to use as they wish, their access to the benefits derived from family and personal work, and to the control they have over the benefits. Resources can include: a) economic or productive resources...; b) political resources...; and c) time" (MATCH and CIDA, 1991: 27).

[21] Rounaq Jahan articulates the diversity among women: "Women are not a homogeneous category, but are differentiated by class, race and nation, and often their choices and opportunities are determined more by these factors than by their gender" (Jahan, 1995: 125).

sees the fundamental restructuring of social institutions and social structures as being the solution to the unequal allocation of status, power, and resources in the world.

It is the above points of GAD that are useful for the Integrated Feminist GAD approach. There are some parts of the original theory and policy model that have been critiqued, and for their weaknesses, do not fit into the model proposed in this thesis, as they do not lead to a liberatory-transformative process. The main reason for the problems associated with the original GAD approach is that it has become an example of how theory and practice around women in the development process have diverged. For the most part, GAD seems to be practically used for gender-sensitivity training for Women's Bureaus and/or ministries in government or other institutional settings. Aside from this sensitivity training, it appears to be an approach found principally in academic research (Moser, 1993: 2). Here is an example of a dichotomy between theory and practice. It should be acknowledged that many of the conceptual and methodological approaches that are part of GAD have come from grassroots initiatives in the Two-Thirds World; however, as some Southern feminists have noted: "they have been systematized and packaged primarily in Western academic institutions or in the donor agencies, and in the English language" (Jahan, 1995: 128). It appears that much of the actual development done by GAD practitioners has been done at an institutional level, taking part in the de-politicization of development practice.

The shift from WID to GAD and a gender roles framework of a GAD analysis has been described as a way of watering down the radical nature of a transformative feminist struggle. The WID to GAD shift, for example, has been seen to dispose of both "women" and "equity":

...two issues presumably most likely to meet a wall of resistance from policy makers primarily interested in 'talking economics'. The framework thereby translates some important components of the gender division of labour into a language that is unthreatening and accessible (Razawi and Miller, 1995: 15).

The focus on institutionalizing GAD theory to have it articulated into practice, has meant the molding of its theoretical principles into what is considered important in the field of development by mainstream agencies and governments. With the recent revival of neo-liberal economics,[22] the focus of development has shifted back to economics, and policies are primarily linked to competition and the market. One can find, in this model, words such as gender, women, participation, empowerment, etc., however, it is crucial to be aware that these terms have been co-opted and have no radical or liberatory-transformative value.

In attempts to put women on the agenda of development practice, the GAD theory has been diluted in practice, so as to be acceptable to institutions that recognize the need to acknowledge gender in the development process. GAD, in this way, has become an example of how theory and practice have diverged. With the de-politicization and de-radicalization of the GAD theoretical framework, it has removed itself from critical transformative practice. It is important to make this distinction,

---

[22] Neo-liberalism has been the dominant view of development since the 1980's. Those who promote this view (the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, bilateral development agencies, and many governments) are considered "direct descendants" of the free enterprise supporters of the 1950's. Modern neo-liberalism has a strong ideological component which is combined with its economic prescription for the development process. Individualism, free market economies, market competition, profit maximization, capitalist values and consumption patterns, and modernization, are all part of the neo-liberal discourse (Allen and Thomas, 1992: 134-136).

since this paper argues that there are components of GAD -- that when paired with a more radical transformative approach, when linked back with radical feminist strategy, and when maintained within an Integrative approach -- that are critical for a development practice that empowers women.

A GAD perspective can be used in the formulation of policy, but is difficult to implement in any tangible way in *already existing* projects and programs.[23] Unfortunately, awareness about the issues around gender and development has not always been translated into planning practice. It appears that there continue to be major structural barriers to the alleviation of gender inequality through a development strategy.

Although there are some weaknesses of the original GAD approach, many of the propositions and assumptions of GAD theory are crucial for a development practice that is transformative and radical in nature. It is the components of GAD that meld it with Global feminist principles that are useful for the Integrated Feminist GAD approach. For this reason, it will be argued that the propositions of the GAD framework must be integrated with other socialist and radical feminist frameworks, as well as with those of Global feminisms and Integrative feminisms. The forthcoming analytical integration of these will show how the gap between de-politicized theory and a critical transformative feminist practice can be bridged. The new model is called the Integrated Feminist GAD theoretical framework, and it will be further discussed in terms of how it can inform a development

---

[23] As previously stated, GAD was originally formulated for sensitivity training with development practitioners. The idea was to get gender on the agenda in the planning and formulating stages of development projects. It was therefore not really appropriate for tacking-onto already up and running projects, because, it was argued, women need to be considered a part of the project from the very beginning.

process that uses liberatory/transformative education - popular education in the following chapter.

Global Feminisms and Integrative Feminisms

During the UN Decades for the Advancement of Women (1975 - 1985 and 1985 - 1995), feminism began to take on a global character. The decades offered an opportunity for academics and activists from the North and from the South to share strategies, articulate differences, and to network internationally. No longer was feminism seen as a Western construct. The activists and academics who pressured the UN for this focus on women in the development process argued that development policies coordinated by the multinational development agencies (World Bank, UNIDO and FAO, to name but a few), as well as many bilateral development agencies, and also some NGOs, had essentially ignored the needs of poor women in the Two-Thirds World (Allen and Thomas, 1992: 307). Global feminism is the grassroots action-oriented model of feminist development that is putting many of the ideas of GAD (as previously outlined) into practice at the community level, but with an eye to global struggle.

Global feminism is, in the words of Charlotte Bunch,

> ...an understanding that women throughout the world have begun to take
> the concept of feminism and the movements of women and shape them for
> their own lives and their own contexts. What we have today is not a single
> global feminism but a movement of many feminisms, of many directions
> and definitions of feminism that are merging globally (Bunch, 1992: 54).

One of the key propositions of Global feminism is that it is crucial to focus attention on the historical contexts,[24] local conditions and specific situations of women in varying parts of the world that inform their feminist struggles. In this way, Global feminists avoid using one particular group's experiences as the feminist frame of reference. Women's groups and community-based organizations are taking part in defining feminism from within their own contexts, no longer adopting a feminism that is based on a definition of its relationship to the feminisms of Western nations (Bunch, 1992: 57-58). Global feminists, like many GAD practitioners of the South, note that many development initiatives have failed because of Western assumptions and underlying notions of family structures and women's lives in the South (Oostergaard, 1992: 1).

Most people acknowledge that women and men have differing social positions in any society. However, it is also important to take note that there are other social divisions such as class, race, ethnicity, age, etc. which will also affect people's life chances, conditions, needs and concerns. Global feminism, while holding that these diversities among people are important to identity and experience of inequality, starts from the premise that women across the world share a common experience of oppression and subordination.

A Global feminist movement that is required in theory to reflect the reality of women's lives has to be built on a model that views women's lives (across classes, races,

---

[24] Mahnaz Afkhami (1996; 525) offers the following regarding Global feminism: "Global feminist discourse recognizes that the problem of women constitutes an issue in its own right, not as a subsidiary of other ideologies, no matter how structurally comprehensive or textually promising they might seem to be. It insists in relating concepts to the historical contexts in which they are embedded. Since 'traditional' concepts are by definition founded in patriarchal discourse, Global feminism must be skeptical of propositions that present them as liberating."

cultures, etc.), as diverse.[25] This model must acknowledge that there are different forms of subordination, and that "...the factors that created the ways in which it must be challenged are extremely diverse. We cannot assume that we have one model of female oppression" (Bunch, 1992: 71). In acknowledging diversity among women's conditions and struggles, Global feminists experience the opportunity to share ideas, learn about how feminist struggles are waged elsewhere (from those who wage them), and gain a greater understanding of their own interactions with others, across the differences.

Feminists from the South, as well as those in North America, have made clear the importance of linking gender, race, and class-based inequalities and discrimination. They demand that the struggle against gender inequality be part of the accompanying struggles against other forms of inequality and oppression (Jahan, 1995: 8).

> ...[T]here was, for a while a battle, that, I feel, has been won for the benefit of all women: that feminism is in fact a way of looking at the world that addresses all issues and that we are not talking about feminism as simply a list of women's issues. We are not talking about those issues that only concern women but also the larger political issues that concern the world (Bunch, 1992: 60).

Global feminists, many of whom are women of the South (or Two-Thirds World), demand a "total transformation of the development agenda from a gender perspective, elaborating a feminist vision of alternative development" (Jahan, 1995: 8). The alternative form of development is most appropriately that of "Another development", which will be elaborated on in the following section on the transformative definition of development.

---

[25] Feminists of different perspectives have been debating the focus on diversity and identity. An important element of this debate for Global feminists, however, is to understand diversity not as a divisive factor used to separate feminists through identity politics, but to "...struggle to find ways of understanding diversity, and [to] start to separate the idea of diversity from the ideas of domination, power, and privilege" (Bunch, 1992: 77).

Miles has offered a number of extremely useful concepts to the feminist discourse as it relates to struggle, collective action, and the development process. Two of these terms will be discussed here, as they are important for the Integrated Feminist GAD theoretical model being developed for this thesis: they include the idea of Integrative, or transformative feminisms; and the ideas surrounding specificity and diversity.

Integrative feminisms are a diverse range of practical feminist struggles which "are committed to specifically feminist, woman-associated values as well as to equality. Since radical feminists (Integrative feminists) propose these values as alternatives to the dominant ones, they can challenge not just women's exclusion from social structures and rewards but the very nature of these structures and rewards" (Miles, 1996: xi). Integrative feminisms, although diverse in origin and specific struggle (while strategically united), have a number of basic principles in common:

1. they challenge the dualistic nature of society, "...refusing the fragmentation of industrial patriarchal society,"

2. they hold that it is integral to a woman-centered and defined political movement to resist all forms of domination,

3. they disregard "dominant separative" values, and instead endorse "life-centered" ones which are integrative (i.e., cooperation, participation, sharing, community, etc.,), and

4. they are based in "dialectical politics"[26] in that they acknowledge that

   principles that appear to be opposed (i.e., women's specificity versus women's

   commonality) must not be seen as mutually exclusive, but must be seen as

   "mutually constitutive, each transformed by the other" (Miles, 1996: xii).

Women's subordination, in a Global feminist model, must be seen as both diverse

and interconnected. The concepts of women's "specificity" and "diversity" clarify the

necessity for Integrative feminisms within the Global feminist movements. Miles argues

that the integrative project has been "broadened and deepened by a positive recognition of

women's differences from men...," which is termed "specificity", "and from each

other...," which she calls "diversity". This recognition allows feminists to identify the daily

lives of women as "sources of alternative integrative values," and to look at the differences

between women as both resources and divisions that need to be overcome within the

broader scope of a transformative struggle (Miles, 1996: 7).

The Integrated Feminist GAD framework is the model provided here for viewing

the development process as a transformative and critical woman-centered approach. It

integrates the premises upon which a GAD analytical approach is drawn, and links it with

---

[26] Miles explains her ideas about transformative feminism and dialectical politics in the following passage: "Dialectical politics neither passively accept nor avoid nor propose easy resolutions to contradictions. They attempt, instead, to *transcend* them. That is, they strive in their struggles to shift the lived relations of contradictory terms in ways that open up new possibilities. This is not easy to do and is a continuous process, for contradictions will never be fully overcome. But the commitment of integrative feminists to address tensions creatively and constructively in political struggle is neither naïve nor simplistic. It must be the heart of any transformative project" (Miles, 1996: xii-xiii, emphasis as in original).

36

socialist feminist theories, Global feminism practice, and Integrative feminism. The following is a summary of the critical components of this framework:[27]

- it is holistic, integrating class, gender, ethnicity, race, and other forms of social relations into its analysis,

- it is radical in nature, committed to the transformation of social structures that perpetuate and exacerbate inequalities between men and women,

- it works at a local and community level, with a full understanding of the strategic global struggle toward alleviation of inequalities across boundaries,

- it is based in the everyday lives of women, and works at both the levels of practical gender needs and strategic gender needs,

- it is part of an Integrative and transformative feminist struggle,

- and it is committed to the understanding of specificity and diversity.

3. Development Defined

The word "development" carries a lot of different meanings, and depending on the context in which it is used, it can refer to either a transformative process or a final outcome. Many of the differences in definition lie in the varying paradigmatic perspectives of those using the term. One's view of the world, and the corresponding assumptions about it will mold how the word development is used and to what it relates. For the purpose of this thesis, the crucial components of development include: how decisions are

---

[27] Once again, these components are a conglomeration of a) the GAD principles that can lead to a liberatory-transformative process (and not those that were previously identified as weaknesses of the original GAD model), b) Global feminist practice, and c) Integrative feminisms.

made in the process and what kind of rationality informs this; under what conditions it can be seen as radical and transformative; and how it might fit with an empowering approach.

Development Seen in the Context of an Ethical Rationality

Denis Goulet discusses the process of decision-making[28] as it relates to action in the development process. He offers what he calls three rationalities, or "approaches to logic", that he claims underlie the process of making decisions in the process of development: technological, political, and ethical rationalities. A rationality is "any mode of thinking, universe of cognitive assumptions and methodological procedures, or body of criteria for establishing truth or validity" (Goulet, 1986: 301). The technological rationality is informed by modern science, and its goal is to get things done. Development spawned by this form of rationality has an end in mind: some sort of a product, and little energy is offered to process. Technological rationality drives most development efforts, as governments and powerful corporations that fund development initiatives must have immediate and quantifiable results to maintain their public support. Political rationality refers to that which is informed by the hegemonic power of politicians and/or institutions. Goulet explains that political rationality, while generally "exhibited by persons who wield power ... aspirants to power positions, however, are also animated by political rationality, but their logic is frequently aimed, not at maintaining the *status quo* but at destroying or altering it" (Goulet, 1986: 303). Ethical rationality can also be termed "humane rationality." The goal of this mode of thinking is value norms, "...that is, the creation,

---

[28] Goulet offers the following definition: "An arena of decision-making is the domain of assumptions, procedures, modes of reasoning, processes of classification and standards of judgment leading one to prefer one among many possible courses of action" (Goulet, 1986: 301).

nurture, or defense of certain values considered worthy of their own sakes - freedom, justice, the inviolability of persons, the 'right' of each to a livelihood, dignity, truth, peace, community, friendship, or love" (Goulet, 1986: 303). What sets ethical rationality apart from the other two forms is that it does not set as its absolute goal the performing of a particular defined task, nor does it attempt to preserve power positions or institutions. Instead, it promotes a set of values that define what is ethically right and wrong. Ethical rationality is framed by two factors that contribute to its themes of focus and its legitimacy in development practice. One is that it is generally informed by a "holistic meaning or belief system" (such as ideology, world view, philosophy, or religion) and the other is the commitment to the daily lived experiences of marginalized peoples: "the world of daily life experienced by people devoid of power, status, or expertise" (Goulet, 1986: 303).

In the present system, ethical rationality is the mode of thinking which informs decisions in a development process that necessarily challenges social structures of inequality. It works to challenge and break down structures that maintain and exacerbate inequalities between those with power, money, influence, and privilege, and those who are marginalized or disadvantaged.

Looking at Development as a Radical and Critical Transformative Process: Another Development

Many radical development theorists and practitioners view development as a process. This perception of development does not see it as an end product in and of itself. It is not an end state, but a change coming from some sort of a process, a slow unfolding

39

of a movement from one situation to another.[29] Although it is not always immediately

evident in the literature discussing the theoretical positions on development those who fit

into what can be termed a radical discourse on development, share a common definition of

it. Their underlying assumptions about development are informed by an ethical rationality:

that what is fundamentally wrong is inequality and the resulting oppression of the

subordinate categories of people. Inequality is seen as a differential access to the

distribution of a resource, whether that be education, work, food, or any other concrete or

abstract socially defined need. What is ethically right is for people to have the power to

make their own decisions, and to become involved in their self-defined process of social

transformation. Social transformation requires the breaking down of structures that

perpetuate unequal relations. Development, according to a radical process definition, is

necessarily transformative in nature.

Recent radical development theories include those which are categorized as part of

a body of diverse schools of thought and practice that have popularly been termed

"Another development." These theories include analyses of the development process that

are normative in nature. They are normative in that the theories prescribe what is and what

ought to be (Hettne, 1990: 152). Normative theories that fit into Another development are

focused on the content of development rather than the form. In mainstream development

theories, the Eurocentrism inherent in them added to the emphasis on form over content.

---

[29] This process view of development is, however, linear in nature: the movement of change from one situation (that is bad, or detrimental in some way) to another (that is valued above the previous state). A more radical analysis of the definitional issues surrounding development would venture to debunk the linear assumptions embedded in the development terminology itself. This, however, is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Even the approaches that were originally in contrast to modernization exhibited a bias toward form, for example, the Marxist focus on the development of productive forces. Dependency theory, while placing emphasis on underdevelopment and dependent relationships between core and periphery, did not place enough emphasis on the meaning and purpose of development.[30] In defining Another development, one must include the following: it is geared to human needs (material and non-material); it must be endogenous;[31] it is a self-reliant process;[32] and it is committed to the transformation of social structures (Hettne, 1990: 153-154). According to Stan Burkey, this range of theorists who look at development through this framework see it as:

> *need-oriented*, geared to meeting both material and non-material human needs; *endogenous*, stemming from the heart of each society; *self-reliant*, implying that each society relies primarily on its own strength and resources; ... and based on *structural transformation* as an integrated whole. The direction of this structural transformation is indicated by the normative content of the other four points. This implies that there is no universal path to development. Every society must find its own strategy (Burkey, 1993: 31, emphasis as in original text).

Fundamental to these radical views is an analytical understanding of the relationship between development and the process of social transformation. This importance is seen within the need for "transformations in existing economic, social and political structures

---

[30] Hettne notes that dependency theory may be more normative than other mainstream development theories, although still focused on the form of development rather than the content (Hettne, 1990: 153).

[31] Endogenous, as defined by Hettne is "stemming from the heart of each society, which defines in sovereignty its values and the vision of its future" (Hettne, 1990: 153).

[32] Self reliant "...implying that each society relies primarily on its own strength and resources in terms of its members' energies and its natural and cultural environment" (Hettne, 1990: 153).

and relationships if development is genuinely to benefit the poor and disadvantaged" (Burkey, 1993: 33).

A common element which links the diverse range of radical schools of thought which comprise Another development is that they begin their definition and analysis of development from the critique of traditional mainstream approaches which are "top-down" in nature, and subscribe to the understanding that development is part of a modernization process involving economic growth. One of the dimensions of this alternative, grass-roots, or "bottom-up" development strategy is for "every society [to] find its own strategy in accordance with its own needs"(Hettne 1990: 154). In order to do so, it is imperative that the people whom this development is meant to benefit are a full part of this process, and hence, participate in it.

> Participation is an essential part of human growth, that is the development of self-confidence, pride, initiative, creativity, responsibility, cooperation. Without such a development within the people themselves all efforts to alleviate poverty will be immensely more difficult, if not impossible. This process, whereby people learn to take charge of their own lives and solve their own problems, is the essence of development (Burkey, 1993: 56).

Participatory development means participation on a number of levels: the defining of problems which need to be addressed in the development process, the building of strategies to take action on, the prioritizing of strategies, the planning of projects, the implementation of the development process, and the ongoing evaluation of the process. In ensuring participation on all these levels, people use their own understandings to become empowered, and as a result they gain a sense of ownership over their own development process (as subjects rather than as objects), and it will inevitably be of value to them both in the short and long term. This participatory nature of this particular definition of

development makes crucial the necessity for an Integrated Feminist GAD theory that acknowledges the importance for people to be agents of their own development.

The subordination of women, however, results in their potentially being excluded from liberatory-transformative processes necessary for this full agency. The development theory that espouses the self-determination of 'people' must be careful not to translate that in action into the self-determination of 'men'. An Integrated Feminist GAD approach, while making sure that the strategic interests of a community are addressed through a people-centered development process, is committed to taking into account the strategic interests of women in particular (MATCH and CIDA, 1991: 34).

The Empowerment Approach and an Integrated Feminist GAD Framework

> *Empowerment* Though organization and consciousness-raising have been on the women's agenda all along, self-empowerment gained salience as a critical strategy only in the last decade. Over the years, there has been gradual recognition that mere access to resources or provisioning of services is not adequate to challenge the root causes of gender inequality; that women need to assert their own agency, and only through self-empowerment can they aspire to break out of gender subordination (Jahan, 1995: 7).

The empowerment approach is the most recent of the Two-Thirds World policy approaches to women, specifically related to GAD theory. Although it remains unpopular, it has grown in popularity since the mid-1970's, supported mainly through women's non-government organizations (NGOs) and grassroots groups in the South. It fits into the body of theory in development that has been termed "Another Development," and it is

radical in nature.[33] Its main focus is the empowerment of women through greater agency. The oppression of women based on gender is seen in terms of colonial and neo-colonial factors, not simply in relation to men.

This approach differs greatly from previous theories and policy approaches looking at women and their relationship to the development process. Firstly, it fits into a GAD perspective on gender issues, not the previous WID and WAD perspectives (as previously outlined). Secondly, its origins are grassroots, since it comes from the initiative of poor women who are working and struggling for social change within their own communities (assuming, of course, that it is not the co-opted version). Thirdly, it attempts to reach Practical Gender Needs (PGNs)[34] and Strategic Gender Needs (SGNs)[35] through a bottom-up approach (MATCH and CIDA, 1991: 34). Fourthly, it is a confrontational approach, and therefore has little mainstream support.

---

[33] It is crucial to acknowledge that the term "empowerment" has been used by many, and therefore must be looked at critically in terms of how and why it is being used. The term has been co-opted by organizations and agencies (governmental and non-governmental) that do not articulate their analysis into liberatory-transformative practice. Their process is not radical, and therefore, essentially serves to maintain the structural *status quo*.

[34] The following definition of PGNs is informed by both Kate Young (n.d.) and Moser (1993 pp. 38, 40-41; and 1991: 159-160): Practical gender needs stem from immediate problems or obstacles in one's life (the root of which can be seen in the subordinate position of women in society). Many women of the South face difficult conditions daily (i.e. the "double work day") in their attempts to perform their defined gender roles, which can be translated into practical gender needs. Practical needs are usually in response to an "...immediately perceived necessity which is identified by women within a specific context" (Moser, 1993:40). It is crucial to note that practical needs do not necessarily meet a strategic goal (i.e. gender equality), nor do they necessarily challenge systems of domination and gender oppression.

[35] The following definition of SGNs is informed by Kate Young (n.d.) and Moser (1993) pp. 38-40. Strategic gender needs stem from the underlying causes of the problems which identify practical gender needs. The identification of these needs, which can also be identified as interests, evolve from analyzing women's subordination in terms of their relations to men in all areas of life (education, politics, work, media, etc.). The assumption that grows from this analysis is that women, in relation to men, have less than equal access to economic, social and political resources, and that it is a strategic interest to alleviate this inequality. Strategic interests vary according to the social, political, and cultural context.

The empowerment approach fits into an Integrated Feminist GAD perspective. It does so by beginning with the voices of those who are meant to benefit from the policy that results from the approach. It has grown from the work of Two-Thirds World women writers and from the practices of Two-Thirds World women's groups, and is entrenched in grassroots feminist organization principles. It was developed in women's groups in Latin America and the Caribbean, in popular theatre groups such as: the Network for Women and Popular Education of the Latin American Council on Adult Education; the Red de Educacion Popular Entre Mujeres de CEALL (Council of Latin American Adult Educators); the Flora Tristan Centre for Peruvian Women; the Barrio Women's Organizations affiliated with Centro Ecuatoriano Para La Promocion y Accion De La Mujer; and Sistren, in Jamaica.[36] Popular education is often a method used in this policy approach, as it is a tool for participatory information gathering and strategy formulation.[37] In this way, this theoretical framework and policy approach links the identification of practical needs with an attempt to identify strategies for meeting strategic gender needs.[38]

---

[36] For more examples of early Latin American efforts of empowerment-model uses of popular theatre in Two-Thirds World women's groups, see Suzanne Doerge's Masters paper Feminist Popular Education: Transforming the World From Where Women Stand (1992).

[37] For an in-depth account of the use of popular participatory approaches within a GAD framework, see A. Thurlow's M.A. thesis (1992). Her discussion on the evolution of GAD thought and her case study on Sistren in Jamaica have informed this paper.

[38] Moser (1991: 169) notes: "It is in the means of achieving such needs (SGNs) that the empowerment approach differs most fundamentally from previous approaches. Recognition of the limitations of top-down government legislation actually to meet strategic gender needs has led adherents of the empowerment approach to acknowledge that their strategies will not be implemented without the sustained and systematic efforts by women's organizations and like-minded groups. They highlight the need for political mobilization, consciousness raising and popular education to bring about change."

The empowerment approach acknowledges inequalities between men and women and the origins of women's subordination within the family. But it also emphasizes that women experience oppression differently according to race, class, colonial history and current position in the international economic order. It therefore maintains that women have to challenge oppressive structures and situations simultaneously at different levels. (Moser, 1993: 74).[39]

The links made between oppression on levels of gender, class, race, socio-economics, and politics are integral to an Integrated Feminist GAD perspective.

The empowerment approach uses mechanisms to ensure that women are involved and that gender needs are acknowledged and included in the planning process, not simply tacked on at the end of the process (MATCH and CIDA, 1991: 25-42).[40] In this way, it is a bottom-up approach, recognizing the triple role of women, and seeking through grassroots women's organizations "...to raise women's consciousness to challenge their subordination" (Moser, 1993: 76). Here is clearly where the empowerment approach is linked with popular education and a radical, liberatory-transformative approach. It is a collective process, starting with reflection, moving to action, and working cyclically back through action and reflection, and always doing so through a process committed to participation and agency of the benificiaries of the process.

---

[39] While empowerment, as defined here by Moser, is important in the development process, one must be critical of Moser's use of the term. She works for the World Bank, and for some, the use of the term empowerment is a way to co-opt the ideas behind this bottom-up approach and to attach it to an essentially top-down institutional setting.

[40] In the MATCH and CIDA document, eight analytical tools are outlined to ensure this process: the sexual/gender division of labour, types of work, access to and control over resources and benefits, influencing factors, condition and position, practical needs and strategic interests, levels of participation, and potential for transformation.

The empowerment approach is confrontational, in that it seeks to transform the structures in society which serve to perpetuate gender subordination (this, of course is also true of a radical Global feminist approach). With its confrontational nature, and its attempt to transform power structures, this policy approach is not very popular among government bodies or bilateral NGOs which are meant to maintain a certain *status quo* while working under the rhetoric of progressive change. In fact, the most positive effects related to Gender and Development policy have been in projects which have adopted a truly participatory methodology, and have therefore met both the PGNs and SGNs as defined by the subjects of the policy.

Global feminists and those practitioners who work within the empowerment model often give the example of work done by Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (DAWN). They are a powerful example of the articulation of an empowerment approach, and adhere strongly to the values of a radical Integrated Feminist GAD framework, one which has its origins in a Global feminist movement. DAWN focuses on meeting SGNs through working for changes in structures of subordination which oppress women.

> Empowerment of organizations, individuals and movements has certain requisites. These include resources (finance, knowledge, technology), skills training, and leadership formation on the one side [PGNs]; and democratic processes, dialogue, participation in policy and decision making, and techniques for conflict resolution on the other [SGNs]. ...[T]he long-term viability of the organization, and the growing autonomy and control by poor women over their lives, are linked through the organizaion's own internal process of shared responsibility and decision making (DAWN, 1987: 89).

47

Conclusion

This chapter has set the theoretical and definitional context that informs the analysis of the following chapters. Through the three sections, development has been clarified for the purpose of an Integrated Feminist GAD theoretical framework, which, it is argued, is the model by which theory and practice can be united to ensure a truly emancipatory, participatory, empowering, critical and transformative, woman-centered and women-focused development praxis (through the combination of theory with practice). Through the outline of mainstream development theories, one can see how they have been inadequate for a development process that is able to acknowledge social inequalities, and work toward changing them in the development process. With an examination of the evolution of development thought as it relates to women in the development process, a synthesis of elements of existing conceptual frameworks into the Integrated Feminist GAD theoretical framework is offered. This framework integrates a GAD analytical approach, socialist feminist theories, Global feminist practice, and Integrative feminisms. This framework, in its holistic view, can fill the existing gap between theory and a critical transformative practice. Finally, this chapter's different definitional aspects of the term "development" highlights those conceptual and analytical issues that are integral to a practice of an Integrated Feminist GAD approach. In the next chapter, the ways in which popular education can help nurture such an approach will be examined.

CHAPTER TWO: LIBERATORY-TRANSFORMATIVE PEDAGOGY -- POPULAR EDUCATION

INTRODUCTION

This chapter offers a theoretical definition of a liberatory-transformative pedagogy, namely popular education, and explores what it offers practically to the development process. This chapter looks at the importance of alternative, group-based critical pedagogy as a way to assess, analyze, and act on strategic issues of concern for marginalized groups. The key aspects of this pedagogy: the development of a collective critical consciousness; horizontal information gathering and transfer techniques; and learning from daily lived experiences -- are looked at. These aspects of popular education critical pedagogy are placed into the context of the main argument of this thesis: that there is an apparent gap between theory and practice, evident when theoretical, methodological, and practical components of popular education are reviewed. The gaps between theory and practice related to popular education constitute fundamental contradictions for a radical liberatory-transformative process. The purpose of these discussions is to show how popular education, when placed into the context of an Integrated FeministGender And Development (GAD) framework, can help to nurture an approach to development and to education that is participatory, radical, and transformative. Liberatory-transformative pedagogy (popular education) that is used to facilitate the identification, analysis and transformation of gender inequalities is that which provides the praxis, bridging the gap between theory and practice.

Questions examined in this chapter include:

- what are the assumptions, principles, and practical methods of popular education?

- what is the development of a critical consciousness and why is it of significance to the learning process and to the process of development?

- how is the relationship between the participants and the educator[41] in the popular education process structured and why is it different from other information gathering and sharing models?

- how do popular education techniques help groups to define and act on strategies for social transformation?

- what kind of gaps and contradictions exist between practice and theory in liberatory-transformative pedagogy?

- and where are the links between popular education and an Integrated Feminist GAD framework, especially as they relate to the empowerment of women in their struggles against gender inequalities?

This chapter is divided into a number of subsections. The first half of the chapter explains the practical, theoretical and methodological components of popular education. Concepts that explain what popular education is are defined. A collection of principles of

---

[41] In this paper I use the term *participant(s)* to refer to those who are involved as learners in the popular education context. Although there are social and practical differences between terms, I also use the term *learner(s)*, and the reader should accept them as interchangeable within this paper. I use the word *student(s)* when I an referring to a formal education setting (as opposed to the non-formal setting of most popular education practices), even if the formal setting attempts to use critical pedagogical methods. The term *educator(s)* is used to refer to the person(s) who facilitate the education process for and with the participants; an interchangeable term is *facilitator*. I use the word *teacher* to refer to the educator in a formal education setting.

50

popular education is offered to contextualize it as a practical tool for development as it has been defined in the previous chapter. The development of a critical consciousness is looked at in some detail both at a practical and theoretical level. Conscientization is placed within the context of Paulo Freire and Ira Shor's writings on liberatory pedagogy and is linked with the concept of desocialization. The second half of this chapter explains how popular education can be an integral tool for the practice of an Integrated Feminist GAD approach to development. With some examples of projects which use popular education, an understanding is outlined for how it can be used for transformation strategy realization, formulation, and action.

1. Practical, Theoretical, and Methodological Components of Popular Education - Participation

A crucial element in the development process as it links with education is the level of participation of those who are meant to benefit from the process of development. In mainstream models, as outlined in the previous chapter, often a top-down approach is taken, where the beneficiaries of the development process are not fully involved in the process. This is not a satisfactory approach, as it is imperative that development be defined, formulated, implemented and evaluated by those whom it aims to serve. This means the fullest level of participation possible: a bottom-up approach that has its origins in grassroots social movements. The question that arises is how can the process of development be modeled in such a way that the beneficiaries are agents, the actors of the process rather than merely the passive recipients? Popular education is a means by which those who benefit from development can fully own the process. Through popular

education techniques, people can identify their issues of concern through the development of a collective consciousness, build transformation strategies, and take social action to change structures in which inequalities are embedded and perpetuated. Of course, this assertion is based on a theoretical model of what popular education is, and how it works. As will be discussed throughout this chapter, not all popular education processes are truly liberatory and transformative in nature. Contradictions between the theory and the practice of popular education do exist, and must be acknowledged and avoided in order for the education process to meet the empowerment objectives of the participants. More on this will come later in this chapter (and the following), but first, it is crucial to describe popular education.

Transformational Learning, Knowledge Production and Transfer in the Context of Social Mobilization and Action

Popular education is a set of tools that are critical in nature and allow for collective analysis and action regarding women's positions and conditions[42] in a given community. It is a range of holistic methods by which development, based on an Integrated Feminist GAD approach, can occur. Development in this context is a process by which change is defined and propelled by those that benefit from the change.[43] Popular

---

[42] The *condition* of a category of people refers to their immediate and practical situation (i.e., the condition of women has improved in industrialized nations over the past thirty years, as more women are now able to access the formal job market). This often refers to the material state people find themselves in. The *position* of the people in this same category, on the other hand, has to do with their social and economic situation in relation to another category, usually one with which it has an unequal relationship (i.e. the position of women in relation to men regarding equal access to formal wage labour persists in being unequal) (CCIC and MATCH, 1991, pp. 32-34; and Kate Young, 1988: 1-2).

[43] The third section of Chapter One elaborates on the definition of development as used for this paper.

education is a form of transformational learning.[44] It produces a change. It is a

participatory action-oriented method for non-formal education aimed at social change. It is

rooted in the belief that people who face oppression (on the basis of gender, for

example)[45] can -- through the development of a critical consciousness[46] and action based

on their own analysis of their situation -- change the systems which serve to oppress them

(Arnold et al., n.d: 5).

> Popular education considers its most basic role to be the strengthening of
> those groups and sectors that are systematically seeking to redistribute
> resources and power in favour of the subordinated sectors of society
> (Rosero, 1988: 16).

Education for social change is based on the idea that learners take full control over their

own learning process (Culbertson, 1995: 53; Magendzo, 1990: 50). In doing so, they

define their own issues and build action to change their specific contexts.

---

[44] A definition of transformational learning, as Clark says, "seems to be implicit in the term itself:
Transformation is about change, so transformational learning must be related to learning that produces
change. ...[it] produces more far reaching changes in the learners than does learning in general, and ..
these changes have a significant impact on the learner's subsequent experiences. In short,
transformational learning *shapes* people. [It] is ...intimately connected to the development process"
(Clark, 1993: 47, emphasis as in original).

[45] Oppression takes many forms and can be based on class, race, sexuality and gender, among
others. Oppression is socially and culturally defined. In our Canadian urban context, for example, we can
be oppressed on the level of sexual orientation, which may not be a level which other societies consider an
issue.

[46] Conscientization (or the process of the development of a critical consciousness) comes from Paulo
Freire's Portuguese word *Conscientizacao*, that, according to him refers to "...the process in which men
[sic], not as recipients but as knowing subjects, achieve a deepening awareness of both the socio-cultural
reality that shapes their lives and of their capacity to transform that reality" (Freire, 1989: 93). The term
"consciousness" is in the context of a "...conscientizing inquiry [which is a] particular kind of research
[and alternative pedagogy] carried out at the grass-roots level by activist groups, local population and
animators and is oriented toward achieving a deeper and more organized form of commitment and action
from members of the participating groups." (Social Action Commission, 1987: 9).

Principles of Popular Education

Popular education, as a method of education for social change, is a way to challenge the way that people learn (information sharing)[47] in the formal education system. It also challenges mainstream methods of research (information gathering) and dominant development models. These systems, or methods, have historically silenced marginalized categories of people, especially women. Popular education techniques, on the other hand, help participants to question, analyze and act on the political, social and economic systems that marginalize them (Mackenzie, 1992: 51; Barndt, 1989: 27).

Popular education is didactic and it has no set curriculum. It is a

> ...process of education that starts with the daily example of people (practice), helps them to critically analyze the experience (theory) so that they can collectively act to change their situation (practice); the relationship between practice/theory/practice is thus intimate, dialectical [and] ongoing (Arnold et al, n.d.: 5).

So theoretically, popular education is the point at where theory of liberatory-transformative education and its practice intersect. In many cases this is true, as the commitment to this dialectical relationship between theory and practice is passionate. The result is a process that is very much rooted in a theoretical basis of radical social transformation, and the practice is constantly evaluated against the theoretical. In some situations this is not the case, however, and the result is a process that is in theory likened

---

[47] Throughout this paper I use the term *information sharing* to refer to learning or the educational process and *information gathering* to refer to research. I find these terms more appropriate when discussing the popular education practice, as they denote a subject and participant involvement in the process.

54

to the principles of a liberatory-transformative pedagogy,[48] but the practice continues to perpetuate inequalities.

Popular education, in its ideal form, is a type of education which has a number of characteristics:[49]

- It takes place within a democratic framework. The term democratic, as used here, does not refer to the government system, but rather it is used as a participatory concept in contrast to tyrannical control of decision making.[50]

- It is based on what learners are concerned about, and not on what educators think is important. In this way it is a bottom-up approach.

- It is a collective effort, focusing on group rather than individual solutions to problems.

- It stresses the creation of new knowledge rather than the passing on of existing knowledge.

- It poses questions and problems rather than "objective truths".

- It examines unequal power relations in society (i.e. based on gender, race, and/or class, among others).

---

[48] Henry Giroux defines the term *pedagogy*: "Pedagogy is not defined as simply something that goes on in schools. On the contrary, it is posited as central to any political practice that takes up questions of how individuals learn, how knowledge is produced, and how subject positions are constructed. In this context, pedagogical practice refers to forms of cultural production that are inextricably historical and political" (Giroux, 1992: 81).

[49] These principles of popular education are adapted from Mackenzie, 1992: 51.

[50] Paulo Freire qualifies the use of the term 'democratic' as it relates to education practice: "I said 'democratic' in the way we are using it here, the liberatory teacher who makes an invitation to the students for transformation, who teaches in a dialogical way instead of an authoritarian way, who sets an example as a critical student of society" (Shor and Freire, 1987: 133).

- It encourages everyone to learn and everyone to teach, thus breaking down the teacher-student dichotomy which is apparent in formal education systems.

- It includes people's emotions, actions, intellects and creativity, and is therefore personal in character.

- It involves high levels of participation through group-based sharing tasks that are meant to facilitate power sharing amongst the participants (including the facilitators) and discourages the dominance of more verbal members of the participant group.

- It uses varied activities including role playing, simulations, theatre, drawing, collages, socio-drama, sculpture or tableaux, mime, dance, photos and photo-stories, song writing and singing, sharing, group work, etc.

An essential component of popular education is its emphasis on collective group-oriented learning. This is not to say that the individual is lost in the educational experience of popular education. The collective focus emphasizes the fact that the context of learning can be shared collectively in the daily realities of the learners, that the development of a collective consciousness is part of the agenda, and that to work on liberation and social transformation requires a group with common interests. There are a number of reasons why working in groups is crucial in a popular education process. Some of them include: to benefit from one another's diverse experiences and knowledge about issues and situations; to collectively find new and alternative ways of looking at and analyzing conditions and situations; to develop individual confidence in expressing ideas and concerns; to examine assumptions and beliefs about others who may appear to be different, but in fact have certain commonalties; to welcome diversity as a basis for sharing; to organize to formulate

transformation strategies; and to act on changing conditions and situations (Mackenzie, 1992: 84).

Some of the more important elements of popular education have to do with its methodology[51] (which will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter). It is generally seen as a cyclical process.

> Popular education also follows a cycle of stages. It begins with people's own experiences, moves from experience to analysis, encourages collective action to change oppressive systems, and reflects and evaluates its own process (Mackenzie, 1992: 51).

The process of liberation is necessarily tied to a cyclical strategy.[52] Advocates of popular education have identified four 'phases' which are followed in the process of 'doing' it, and correspond with the cycle of stages. The four stages include:

1. identifying the participants and their interests/needs,

2. naming the issues and struggles which they perceive as rooted in their oppression,

3. assessing the forces which create and perpetuate the inequalities and oppression, and

4. planning for action aimed at transforming the oppressive structures (Barndt, 1989: 27).

---

[51] The word 'methodology' is used here to refer to the system of concepts, methods, and practices that inform the praxis of popular education.

[52] Anne Bishop explains: "The spiral of human liberation has been well documented. It begins with breaking the silence, ending the shame, and sharing our concerns and feelings. Story-telling leads to analysis, where we figure out together what is happening to us and why, and who benefits. Analysis leads to strategy, when we decide what to do about it. Strategy leads to action , together, to change the injustices we suffer. Action leads to another round: refection, analysis, strategy, action. This is the process of liberation." (Bishop, 1994:83).

Critical Consciousness Development and its Significance for the Development Process – Desocialization and False Consciousness

Paulo Freire's[53] idea of transformational learning has the ultimate goal of social change. Originally, his work was focused on literacy education aimed at poor peasants in Brazil, Chile and Guinea-Bissau. His ideas on popular education, however, are transferable to any situation in which power is distributed inequitably.[54] Freire's popular education seeks to liberate through what has been called "a dialogic, problem-posing pedagogical style that challenges students to become aware of the oppressive social structures in their world, to understand how those structures have influenced their own thought, and to recognize their own power to change their world" (Clark, 1993: 48-49). Freire calls this process *conscientization*, achieved through praxis (the combination of action and reflection, theory and practice); it is collaborative rather than passive, supports freedom and autonomy of learners, and is political in nature.[55]

---

[53] Paulo Freire is widely considered to be the originator of the term "popular education". He was involved in adult learning in Latin America in the 1960's and 70's. He developed a literacy training program which taught students how to read and write through the discussion of basic problems they themselves were individually and collectively experiencing (SFU, n.d). It is important to note that Freire's pedagogy developed in a particular historical and political circumstance: one of neocolonialism and imperialism (Weiler, 1991: 451). Jorge Jeria (1990: 93) notes that the historical roots of popular education can be traced back much farther than the writing of Freire, perhaps even as far back as the French Revolution. It can also be argued that popular education grew simultaneously in a number of regions in the world. In Nova Scotia, for example, the COADY Institute in the 1930's was involved in grass-roots forms of collectivization using what is now known as popular education.

[54] Freire has stated that it is, however, crucial to adapt his pedagogical method to the particular setting in which it is being used. It cannot simply be transferred to other situations without taking the historical, political, social, and economic factors into consideration (Weiler, 1991: 452).

[55] Critical feminist pedagogues have offered to popular education theory a critique of Freire's (and others) assumptions about the collective experience of groups of people and his claim to universal truths. This is elaborated on in Chapter Three.

The formation of a "critical consciousness" is the product, and "conscientization" is the process of liberatory-transformative learning (Shor, 1980: 48). Formal education, on the other hand, can perpetuate a "false consciousness" -- a process by which people are conditioned "...to police themselves by internalizing the ideas of the ruling elite" (Shor, 1980: 55). To combat this false consciousness, Shor claims that it is crucial to study things within the students' own contexts.

The basic premise of Ira Shor's and Paulo Freire's writing on liberatory education is based on a critique of formal pedagogical methodologies, especially those that use what Freire calls the "banking method".[56] The "banking method" is the form of education in which the teacher is the subject and the students are the objects of the learning process. The knowledge is transferred from the teacher who owns the knowledge that is given to, or deposited into, the unknowing students. Both Freire and Shor place the "banking method" of education in juxtaposition to the liberatory-transformative pedagogical process.

> A pedagogy which empowers students to intervene in the making of history is more than a literacy campaign. Critical education prepares students to be their own agents for social exchange, their own creators of a democratic culture. They gain skills of philosophical abstraction which enable them to separate themselves from manipulation from the routine flow of time. Consequently, their literacy is a challenge to their control by corporate culture. Because critical literacy can detach people from mass domination, the existing social order has a stake in preventing the popular emergence of a conceptual consciousness (Shor, 1980: 48).

---

[56] The term "banking method" comes from Freire's seminal work on popular education, Pedagogy of the Oppressed , 1990 (Continuum:New York) p. 59.

The definition of literacy used by Shor extends beyond the mainstream notion of literacy as the ability to read and write. It necessarily includes, in his analysis, an element of "cultural literacy".

The process of "desocialization" (Shor, 1980: 29-32) is one in which students are able to connect their education with the social processes which serve to place them in positions of inequality and potential exploitation. According to Freire and Shor, these relations were primarily connected to class stratification in a capitalist society, and therefore oppression was conceived of in class terms. The theoretical framework for this analysis is clearly one which sees the world from a Marxist (or it may be more appropriate to use "Neo-Marxist") point of view, in which inequalities can be overcome through a radical (revolutionary) process of transformation, rather than by merely reforming the systems as they are, in this case, a radical departure from the formal education system.

Shor's argument reiterates Freire's view that a liberatory-transformative education process is necessarily political in nature, and therefore challenges the systems of exploitation (especially those which perpetuate relations of domination/subordination). In order to do this within the learning process, several things must be kept in mind: the formal systems of education must be challenged by providing an alternative that is liberatory and transformational; the development of a critical consciousness needs to be fostered, and in doing so, a process of "desocialization" takes place; the dichotomy between the teacher and the learner must be broken down; and knowledge must be based in a context of everyday reality for the learners. For most popular education theorists and practitioners these components are essential in the formulation and planning of a liberatory pedagogy as well as in the practical execution of a popular education strategy. In some

60

situations, however, the theoretical has become divorced from the practical, resulting in what may be called a popular education experience, but in fact is not the ideal radical process it in theory strives to be.

The following sub-sections of this chapter are devoted to exploring these theoretical components of a liberatory-transformative pedagogy, and through examples of popular education practice, some of the contradictions between the theoretical and practical are illustrated. The purpose of these discussions is to pave the way for the final section of this chapter in which popular education is placed into an Integrated Feminist GAD framework to show that when the two are melded the result is an approach to development and to education that results in liberatory-transformative praxis.

Vertical vs. Horizontal Dialogue in Information Gathering and Transfer

A distinction can be made between a mainstream teacher/student relationship, that can be characterized as *domesticating*[57] *education practice* (the "banking method"), and one that is informal, characterized as *liberating education practice*. Domesticating education practice most often takes place in a formal classroom setting. Information flows from the teacher (who holds knowledge and power) to the student who has neither knowledge nor power. The information flow is seen as vertical because the teacher is

---

[57] It should be noted that this term "domesticating" is a sexist term. It is used in the pejorative, referring to that which is somehow opposite to "liberating". It, of course, has connotations to the domestic sphere, one that is generally (still) the domain of women's work.

dominant over the student.[58] This form of knowledge dissemination generally reinforces power relationships and serves to continue and perpetuate the exploitation, domination and alienation of many (especially those categories already marginalized by society). The results of this form of education process include the maintenance and reinforcement of the *status quo*, and the perpetuation of a hierarchical society in which marginalized categories of people are disempowered in their learning process.

Liberating education practice also has an educator and a learner; however, the relationship between them is not one of domination/subordination. The educator may have knowledge, but also lacks some knowledge that s/he can acquire from the learner in the education process. The student or learner needs to gain knowledge, but it is understood that s/he has a great deal of knowledge that s/he can share (therefore the learner is also an educator). The information flow moves from educator to learner, and from learner to educator, and between learners. It is horizontal in nature. Both educator and learner belong to society, but their outlook, conditions and situation may differ because they may have a different relationship to society. Both are educated by the same concrete reality. The liberating education process is reciprocal. The results of this form of education practice include transforming the structures and attitudes which form the concrete reality of the educators and learners, and empowering those involved in the process to build their

_____

[58] Vinova Bhave, (n.d.: 14) in a document called "Education or Manipulation?" discusses the "student teacher comradeship": "Wherever two people live together in this kind of comradeship giving and receiving mutual help, there real education is in progress. The place of books is, therefore, secondary. This idea troubles many people, who think that if the place assigned to books is reduced the students will be deprived of the most valuable tools of knowledge. Books do have a place as tools of knowledge, but it is a very minor place. The major need is for teacher and student to become work-partners and this can happen only when the distinction between teacher 'teaching' and the student 'learning' can be overcome".

own society.

Influential popular educators (such as Jorge Jeria, Ira Shor and Paulo Freire), have discussed the importance of dialogue in information gathering and sharing. Dialogue, according to them, is integral to the critical learning process. It is intrinsic to the "democratic process", and, more importantly, allows for the erosion of the unequal relationship between the teacher (or facilitator) and the learners (or participants). Information gathering and sharing, then, must be through dialogue which (in theory) is egalitarian in nature. It also provides an impetus for mobilizing for social transformation, in that it allows for the advancing of a political consciousness.

Shor proposes a juxtaposition of "vertical anti-dialogue" (part of a domesticating education practice) on one hand, versus a "horizontal dialogue" (part of a liberating education practice) on the other. The former is characterized by an oppressive pedagogy where the teacher passes knowledge downward to the unknowing students in a one-way dialogue.[59] The "matrix" of this model is "loveless, arrogant, hopeless, mistrustful, and acritical". The latter form of dialogue is characteristic of a liberating pedagogy in which knowledge is passed from teacher to student, from student to teacher and between students. It results in a system of "inter-communication" which creates "empathy". The "matrix" of this model is "loving, humble, hopeful, trusting, and critical" (Shor, 1980: 95).

---

[59] In a written dialogue between Ira Shor and Paulo Freire, Shor says: "You've spoken before, Paulo, about the 'sleepy sonority' of the teacherly voice, the narrating voice of the 'banking' educator who sings the students to sleep while filling up the empty accounts of the students' minds with deposits of knowledge. That sing-song voice intends a transfer of the official curriculum from the teacher and the textbook to the students. It tries to habituate students to taking orders and to denying their own critical thinking" (Shor and Freire, 1987: 124).

In a liberating model of education, the role of the teacher/facilitator is to facilitate the process of converting the students from "manipulated objects into active, critical subjects" (Shor, 1980: 97).

Horizontal dialogue is not necessarily as simple as Freire and Shor make it appear. The erosion of the traditionally hierarchical relationship between the teacher and students in the learning process is based upon the following assumptions: that the students are homogeneous and that there is a certain level of equality between them (that they share an oppressed status); that unequal relations will not be reproduced among the learners; and, that the teacher is an unbiased and objective being and does not perpetuate her/his own conditioned forms of inequalities.[60] There is a division between theory and practice on this issue. Regarding the first assumption, obviously not all learners in any one given learning environment are homogeneous, in that they do not always necessarily share a common oppressed status. Some questions arise: is it even crucial, for a popular education process, that learners are homogeneous, or that they share an oppressed status? Or is it more important that they are able to unite on only one or a few things that allow them to connect for the purpose of building a collective critical consciousness (meaning that the group need not all experience the same level of oppression, but that they are all aware of how the oppression impacts their collective consciousness)? Is it (instead) more important for the popular education participant group to have a critical mass of participants who do share a common oppressed status? To illustrate these assumptions and their

_____

[60] Feminist pedagogues often point to the continuing forces of patriarchy and sexism which permeate relations between teachers and students even in a critical or popular education alternative (transformatory or liberatory) education model. For examples, see Weiler, 1991; Omer, 1992; Lather, 1992; Lewis, 1992; Doerge, 1992; and Luke, 1992.

contradictions, an example of a recent popular education workshop with 16 young

community development workers will be drawn on.[61]

The workshop, a potentially liberating experience for a few of the 16 participants

who defined themselves as non-heterosexual (and also a potentially liberating experience

for those who do define as heterosexual too), was a rather negative experience, and did

not result in any collective consciousness nor action. The following question arose in the

planning and evaluation stages of the workshop: if a group of learners are coming together

to do a popular education workshop around homophobia and heterosexism[62], is it

important that the participants are able to identify as gay, lesbian or bisexual in order for

the group to reach a collective consciousness on what impact homophobia has on

individuals? Most popular educators would say no, but what is important is that no matter

their defined sexual orientation, the participants would be required to reach some level of

collective understanding on the social roots of this form of oppression. In the workshop,

this happened at a very minimal level. What is needed, then, is not necessarily a shared

oppression by all participants in the popular education process (i.e. all gay, lesbian or

bisexual participants), but rather a critical mass of participants that can articulate their

---

[61] The popular education workshop was held for 14 Serve Canada Team Members, I being one of the facilitators. This was one in a series of anti-oppression workshops, this one being specifically on the issue of homophobia and heterosexism. It was held at The 519 Gay Lesbian Bisexual Community Resource Centre in Toronto, on October 31, 1996.

[62] Anne Bishop (1994: 130-131) offers the following definitions: "Heterosexism refers to the structures of society which favour one kind of loving—between one man and one woman in a monogamous marriage with children—over all others. Heterosexism oppresses gay, lesbian, and bisexual people, single people, one-parent families, unmarried couples, childless couples, and anyone else who does not fit the ideal mold. Homophobia is an individual reaction to gay, lesbian, and bisexual people—a reaction of hatred, fear, or discomfort—acted out through discrimination and violence."

shared oppression to the majority of the participants that do not personally identify with it. This critical mass, through collective support, forces the majority of the participants to listen to their voiced oppressed status, and therefore legitimizes their discourse.

Regarding the second assumption, far too often in popular education settings, unequal relationships are perpetuated within the education process, essentially sabotaging the process of collective liberation and action for transformation. Following the same example as above, the participants who identified as heterosexual were able to draw on the power that heterosexual people generally have in our society, openly defining their sexual orientation as the norm. We know that many people in our society see non-heterosexual lifestyles as abhorrent and deviant, for varying reasons, and some of these views were reproduced in the popular education workshop. In doing so, the very homophobia that the workshop was attempting to educate about and transform became blatantly evident. The non-heterosexual participants were silenced, not feeling comfortable to discuss their own sexual orientation and experiences with homophobia, and the result was the perpetuation of unequal relationships between the participants in the popular education process. Here again, the critical mass of those who share an oppressed status is crucial.

Included in the theory of critical teaching is that in order for a critical consciousness to develop among learners, the topics of study must be grounded in the culture and lives of those involved in the learning process. This is a crucial element, especially in pedagogical practice with adults (popular education is generally targeted at young adults or adults). When topics in the education process are significant to the

66

learners, and come from their daily life experience,[63] they learn faster and more permanently (Vella, 1994: 9). Shor uses the term "ordinariversity" to describe the process of using the daily life experiences of the learners in the process of education. (Shor, 1980: 104). This allows for the reversal of conditioning that is inflicted upon learners from various agents of socialization (that often serve to perpetuate the oppressive structures in society).

> The critical orientation towards daily life...abstracts false consciousness so that students can reflect on and transcend the ideas, language, behavior and institutions which inhibit them (Shor, 1980: 241).

Through the use of "grounded theory", the students individually and collectively go through a process of reflection emerging from their concrete practice (Shor, 1980: 123). With this reflection comes a certain sense of ownership on behalf of the learners in their own process of acquiring and sharing knowledge.

Feminist popular educators have recently taken a critical look at Freire's and Shor's writing and practice on consciousness development and the collective process, noting a division between the theory of emancipating pedagogy and the practice of perpetuating gender inequalities. Some have noted that much of the early writing and practice of consciousness development have been focused on masculine norms, and have resulted in a liberatory pedagogy that is not necessarily liberating for women (Doerge, 1992: 28). Feminist popular educators have called for the necessity to "develop a process of conscientization that breaks with all patriarchal dualisms" (Doerge, 1992: 3). This will

---

[63] Popular education begins with the daily lived experience of the participants. In Centro Ecuatoriano para la Promocion de la Mujer (CEPAM), a grassroots women's organization in Quito, the popular education facilitators called this *cotidiano*, literally meaning everyday reality.

67

be discussed in further detail in the following chapter, but first it is necessary to look at the methods and techniques of a liberatory-transformative education practice, what feminist popular education is, and what models of methodology are associated with popular education.

Methods Associated with Popular Education Practice

As previously explained, the methods used in a popular education learning scenario are necessarily geared to the participants' needs and situations, and must come from their daily lived experiences. Far too many mainstream (formal) pedagogy models prescribe a rigid series of methods which are developed without a full understanding and/or concern for the social and physical conditions in which the participants exist.[64] Ideally, in the case of a participant group with members who are semi-literate or illiterate, the methods used in the education process should reflect this situation (i.e., drama, role-play, drawing, singing, poetry, etc.).

The most effective participatory information gathering and sharing methods may combine a range of information collection tools to provide a more holistic picture. Regarding information gathering, according to ECAF and SIGAD:

> participatory data collection methods include: observations, key informants, oral histories, individual interviews, dialogues, questionnaires,

---

[64] An example of the inappropriate nature of some formal education practices was offered to me by a colleague of mine in the Masters of International Development Studies program at Saint Mary's University, Theresa Ulicki. An exam question asked of her class in Lesotho (where she was teaching the equivalent to our grade 12, the Cambridge 'A' level exams), asked the students to describe a situation in which there was a fire in their office building. The students were meant to imagine they were calling the fire chief, and were to explain what they saw and did. In the village where Theresa worked, however, there were no office buildings, nor was there a telephone which they could use, and there was no such position in the village as fire chief. The exam question was clearly culturally inappropriate in the social and physical context of a Lesotho village.

role playing and role reversals, popular theatre, songs, and/or combinations
of these and other approaches (ECAF and SIGAD, 1994: 7).

A very important component of popular education is that it is defined by the participants.
Connected with this concept is the understanding that the methods used are also ones with
which the participants have a "personal relationship", with which they can culturally
identify. This does not mean that the methods must be ones the participants have
experienced before (often a new method leads to the illumination of new ideas), but it
does mean that they have 'access' to understanding and analyzing what ideas come out of
the methods. Anne Bishop explains: "...one of the key principles of popular education is
that it builds on the cultural forms already familiar to the people" (Bishop,1988: 28).

Hansel Eyoh (1987: 4-7), a popular educator in Cameroon, offered a popular
education seminar with the purposes of contributing to the search for new methodologies
in the practice of theatre for development, and of offering practical experience in village-
based theatre. He involved villagers in the research through the process of data analysis,
story improvisation and discussion. In his project, Eyoh used an incredible array of
popular education methods with the participants. Methods included: observation,
conversation, questioning, role playing, and theatre. He claimed that "...using local media
in the form of dance, drama, songs, mime, etc.",... "...is part of an educational and
organizational process used in ...creating contexts for collective reflection and action"
(Eyoh,1987: 4-5). Popular theatre, when used for popular education, involves cultural
action for change, and the communication generated through theatre results in "...a
process of conscientization and mobilization for action" (Eyoh, 1987: 5).

Another example of a creative method for exchanging information through popular education techniques is the "fotonovela". This is a Spanish word referring to a booklet that is comprised of photographs depicting a particular scenario. Centro Ecuatoriano Para la Promocion y Accion de la Mujer (CEPAM), a grassroots non-governmental women's organization in Quito, Ecuador, works with Barrio Women's Organizations (BWOs) using a variety of popular education techniques to find out what their main issues of concern are, and then offers technical help in producing "fotonovelas" that are then used as education tools to pass on information and to reflect on situations in the everyday lives of women who live in marginalized urban communities.[65] The BWO participants, with the help of a facilitator, participate in a popular education workshop to identify their main issues of concern. One such workshop identified domestic violence as an issue that impacted many of the women. The group then made links between domestic violence and other oppressions that placed them into subordinate positions within their families and communities. The BWO participants told each other stories of their own experiences with domestic verbal, physical and sexual abuse. Using a story board, they then came up with a scenario that included some of the main points of their own experiences. The story was then translated by the participants into scenes that were able to be depicted in photographs by the participants who acted them out with help from other community members. The participants received training in using cameras, and set out to act out the scenes and photograph them in their own communities. The end result of this process was a published

---

[65] From January to March of 1991 I had the opportunity to work with CEPAM and the Barrio Women's Organization of the marginalized community north of Quito called "Lucha de los Povres". I provided technical support to the BWO participants for their "fotonovela" called Esto Me Paso A Mi: Un Testimonio De Violencia, No 2, 1991, in La Abeja Fotonovela Series.

70

"fotonovela" with a minimum of written dialogue depicting a hypothetical account of domestic violence that was based on a conglomeration of true life stories. The making of the "fotonovela" was clearly an extremely useful popular education process for the participants involved, because it not only allowed them to reflect on their own issue of concern, it also gave them an opportunity to learn skills in photography and publishing, and it also gave them a concrete tool that they then used to pass on information about the issue and to act on building transformation strategies to cope with domestic violence.

Clearly, as the above examples illustrate, using people's own culture, social realities and daily lived experiences as vehicles for their own education, awareness and action is highly effective. Unfortunately, this is where a deep dichotomy between theory and practice exists. Although many popular educators acknowledge the importance of starting the pedagogical practice with everyday life, this element is often neglected in practice (Doerge, 1992: 9).

Feminist Popular Education

The term feminist popular education is a rather new one, and is found primarily in writings from the North (i.e., Weiler, 1991; Doerge, 1992). Although practitioners in the Two-Thirds World have been implementing feminist popular education, and have been building on its methodological base, there is little documentation describing it on a theoretical level. In fact, what little published material there is on feminist popular education in the South is written as 'How-To' manuals with step-by-step games and

71

workshop suggestions, rather than academic theoretical and methodological discussions on its process.[66]

Feminist popular education, while built on the same principles as Freire's (and others) popular education pedagogy, offers some points for consideration for theory and for practice. It is a theory and methodology for social transformation, development, and information gathering and sharing. Feminist popular education is defined as:

> a creative synthesis of feminism and popular education that has evolved from the educational praxis of women across Latin America, and from other parts of the globe. In fact, [its] development has arisen out of the contradictions that have existed between education among women and popular education. It is a process of conscientization that seeks to transform the world from where women stand (Doerge, 1992: 7).

Popular education refers to the *sector popular* (in Spanish), the marginalized poor in Latin America. This mirrors the fact that popular education has been based on a class analysis, which sees the proletariat as the category that must work toward radical social transformation, and hence which focuses its work on this popular sector category. Feminist popular educators have noted that this is the primary downfall of popular education: its roots have caused its practitioners to "resist incorporating an analysis of gender, as well as other forms of oppression" (Doerge, 1992: 8). Although many popular educators acknowledge the importance of the gender issue (see Freire and Macedo in McLaren and Leonard, 1993:160-171), there continues to be a division

---

[66] There are numerous 'How-To' - style manuals for feminist popular education, most of which come from the Two-Thirds World. Two of the best (and most appropriate for adapting for use in the North) include Liz Mackenzie's (1992) On Our Feet, Taking Steps to Challenge Women's Oppression: A Handbook on Gender and Popular Education Workshops, and various works by writers who have contributed to the publication Voices Rising: A Bulletin About Women and Popular Education.

between this theoretical support for gender-sensitive practice, and the actual practical

articulation of it. As Doerge (1992: 14) notes:

> [A] unidimensional focus on class contradictions has generally been maintained. With the exception of the work being undertaken by feminist popular educators, gender contradictions have continued to be submerged within class. Based on such social analysis, women have been integrated into liberation struggles, social movements, parties, development and research projects at the high cost of not being able to name their own gendered subordination.

This is particularly true for popular education with participant groups that include both

men and women. Most often in these cases (unless a feminist stance is taken, and gender

imbalances are consciously avoided), gender inequalities in the society as a whole are

reproduced in the popular education context.

Feminist popular educators have also noted the androcentric[67] bias of the

conceptual framework of popular education. This concern illuminates yet another example

of the contradiction between theory and practice of a liberatory-transformative education

process. These and other issues of concern to feminist popular educators will be taken up

in more detail in the following chapter.

Popular Education Methodology - "Systematization"

There appears to be a lack within the existing literature of a methodology

specifically for popular education. This is probably because most theorists see popular

education as a tool or an instrument by which participatory forms of research and

pedagogy are executed, and it is therefore analyzed as a concept in terms of how it fits

into existing research and/or pedagogical methodologies. Felix Cadena argues that it is

---

[67] "Androcentrism" refers to giving primacy to the male and/or masculine as the norm (against which the feminine is judged), essentially leaving out the reality of women.

73

crucial to formulate a methodological framework within which popular education can stand.

Cadena, in his work entitled "Transformation Through Knowledge-Knowledge Through Transformation" (1991), offers the concept of "systematization" which helps to define a methodology[68] for popular education. The concept of systematization is characterized as: "the conscious process of creating theoretical knowledge and practice participatively using emancipatory transformation in the belief that this is the best way to obtain our objectives" (Cadena,1991: 63). Popular education, then, is built on the assumption that the process of transformation is aimed at developing empowerment among people, and in doing so, "...they can be true protagonists in the identification and resolution of their needs and aspirations, thus overcoming the relations and means of subordination opposed to this transformation." (Cadena, 1991: 63).

Systematization must include the following elements:

- the confrontation of challenges which "pose questions demanding original answers";

- the questions asked need to challenge praxis, and in this challenge, the answers will help to continually improve the practice; and,

- critical interpretation and reflection, which together help to build knowledge which requires the ongoing evaluation of praxis (Cadena, 1991: 64).

Although Cadena emphasizes that there is no single nor definitive model by which systematization should be accomplished, he outlines four basic components which need to

---

[68] It can be claimed that there are multiple methodologies which are appropriate to popular education. This claim follows the belief that popular education practice and methodology must be adapted to the condition, situation and environment (political, social, and economic) in which it is being used.

be acknowledged in the participatory information gathering and sharing process done though popular education techniques. The four include: identifying the limits of the process; obtaining information; interpreting the information; and the process of "socialization". The first component, the identification of the limits of the information-gathering process, allows the participants and researcher to reflect critically on these limits, and to identify how they may affect the project as a whole. In the second component, the collection of the information is presented in such a way that participants in the process can "...recover the experience of practice and...turn it into the object of analysis" (Cadena,1991: 69). The interpretation or third phase is a "...specific methodological moment in which the central effort is to respond to questions generated from practice" (Cadena, 1991: 60). The last component of systematization that Cadena identifies is that of "socialization". Perhaps this word was incorrectly translated from the original Spanish. It appears that this term, as the author uses it, does not refer to the sociological construct of socialization, but refers instead to a more subjective, reflective, and interpretive concept.[69] He claims that this "socialization" contains the most important issue of the popular education information gathering and sharing process, which is that the participants achieve the goals set out by them, and that they subjectively feel that they own the results of the process.

Cadena stresses that there is no particular time sequence in which the components of systematization are recognized. Although they are presented one by one, it is crucial to understand that "systematization is not a linear sequence of steps". Instead, the

---

[69] Perhaps Cadena is really reversing the English understanding of the word. Socialization is not (for him) how we become part of society, but how we make society accommodate us.

systematization process is "more like a spiral where the various methodological components are repeated and alternated. ... It is a cyclical and recurring process" (Cadena,1991: 69-70).

Cadena's articulation of a popular education methodology links the popular education practice with that of research (information gathering and sharing). His work is valuable in that he begins to unravel the theoretical threads which connect research systematization with popular education. His conclusion can be the preliminary step to the unraveling process: "In short, systematization assumes that emancipatory practice is based on praxis, the dialectical relationship between theory and practice whereby theory informs practice, and practice informs theory" (Cadena, 1991: 64).

Cadena's systematization (theory-practice-theory) model is useful in the case of popular education projects that face barriers to fulfilling the processes of full and egalitarian participation and consciousness development. One example is the efforts of the Tanzania Media Women's Association (TAMWA). TAMWA members have documented their mixed results in gearing a popular education method to its different audiences. Because of its language and concepts, it did not adequately communicate with some segments, therefore not meeting their goals for all participants and for consciousness development. TAMWA's AIDS awareness workshop uses the popular education method of theatre. This method is very powerful and useful in the context of Southern Africa. It is both visual and verbal, which is an appropriate method for participants who may be semi-literate or illiterate. The facilitators, a group of women concerned about raising popular awareness about AIDS, act out a short play, covering various topics related to living and dying with the disease. Members of the audience, over time, become transformed into

76

participants when they are asked to take over the roles of the characters. The rest of the audience becomes involved in the post-play discussion in which another level of analysis is reached and options are explored. In the evaluation component of the workshop, it becomes clear that the participants must have the play geared to their age. The process is shown to be successful for secondary students; however, the younger students do not reach a very high level of consciousness because the concepts used in the play are not defined beforehand, and the younger students aren't able to connect them to their lived experience. It is for these reasons that the students participate neither in the role play nor the discussion that ensues (TAMWA, 1993: 13-15). Using this experience to reflect on the barriers faced in the TAMWA project, one can re-value the importance of linking the theoretical with the practical so that the barriers to participation are overcome.

The first section of this chapter has offered an explanation and analysis of the practical, theoretical and methodological components of a liberatory-transformative pedagogy (popular education). In doing so, it has become evident that gaps between theory and practice related to the execution of a popular education learning process exist, and that these gaps stand in the way of a truly radical and transformative process of learning and development. The second part of this chapter will re-visit the Integrated feminist GAD approach to development (as discussed in Chapter One). An explanation is offered of how it can be the approach that provides the basis for the use of popular education that bridges the gap between theory and practice.

2. Popular Education as a Tool for an Integrated GAD Analysis

This thesis argues that the practice of popular education is the method by which strategic interests can be looked at, and transformation strategies can be identified and acted on. In making this argument, there is an implicit assumption that in order to do so, one must acknowledge the gaps between theory and practice, and find a way to bridge them through praxis. The Integrated Feminist GAD approach fills the gap between de-politicized theory and a critical transformative practice. This framework provides the basis for popular education that is liberatory, transformative, woman-defined, woman-focused, and melds the theoretical with the practical: praxis.

Popular education is a useful tool for the execution of an Integrated Feminist GAD analysis and development approach. Before explaining why this is so, it is important to explore how popular education can fit into the Integrated Feminist GAD conceptual framework.

If the Integrated Feminist GAD approach provides the holistic framework, popular education can provide the methods by which the situations (conditions and positions) of women can be identified, analyzed, assessed, prioritized, and acted on. It should be noted that popular education has not always dealt with gender issues and contradictions. Experiences in Latin America and South Africa have shown that popular education has "...targeted the oppressed and exploited, but does not [always] deal with the specifics of women's oppression"[70] (No Author, 1993: 9 <u>Voices Rising</u>). This trend has changed, however, as more and more educators and researchers become aware of the

---

[70] These contradictions will be explored in more detail in Chapter Three.

necessity to view oppression more holistically, and to focus specifically on gender as a component of power relations.

An Integrated Feminist GAD perspective in popular education stresses the necessity of starting from women's reality, their situations and conditions, "restoring the value of the domestic sphere, women's reproductive role, their sexuality, and finally their right to pleasure -- not in order to maintain pleasure as an instrument of oppression, but on the contrary, to transform it into an instrument of struggle and liberation" (CEAAL, 1985: 5).

Popular Education and Transformation Strategies: Realization

Popular education practitioners use a "holistic" framework model, which attempts to conglomerate concepts from various frameworks, disciplines and theories. A case in point is the conceptual framework that is offered in Chapter One of this paper. The Integrated Feminist GAD approach is in and of itself a mixture of frameworks which criticize mainstream theories for not analyzing holistically gender issues and relations. Although not explicitly stated, some of the literature on popular education, especially that which is written by practicioners from the Two-Thirds World, is grounded in this same conceptual framework.

GAD theory is built on a number of assumptions and principles which are defined and analyzed in Chapter One. Some of these are revisited here for emphasis. GAD theorists and practitioners agree that women and men in diferent societies have different gender roles, differing levels of power in their societies, and differing gender interests. The latter, one's gender interests, can be determined by one's social position in society, ethnic

identity, and gender identity. Gender interests can by divided into two categories: practical gender needs (PGNs) and strategic gender needs (SGNs).[71] SGNs stem from the underlying causes of the problems which create and shape practical gender needs. Identification of these needs or interests evolves from analyzing women's subordination in terms of their relations to men in all areas of life (education, politics, work, media, etc.). SGNs differ in definition and priority in different societies, and...

> ...since they generally require social and economic change in the traditional power structures and gender relations, they are seen as 'transformatory'; that is, any attempt to address the strategic gender interests of women will result in changes to the *status quo* (Joyce, n.d.).

Two assumptions which grow from an Integrated Feminist GAD analysis are that women, in relation to men, have less than equal access to economic, social, and political resources, and that it is a strategic interest to alleviate this inequality (Mosse, 1993). The alleviation occurs through the development and implementation of transformation strategies (Elson, 1992: 36).

The principles of popular education fit in perfectly with the Integrated Feminist GAD approach in that they include: the full participation of all involved; personal experiences (which can be seen as practical gender needs); the examination of unequal power relations (between men and women); the movement from experience to analysis; and the movement from analysis to action.

---

[71] See Chapter One for elaboration of these concepts.

There is, however, a conceptual problem in connecting popular education with practical needs and in its ability to help determine PGNs in groups that have contradicting interests.

> One of the fundamental problems of popular education...is the excessive idealization of the educational process in determining the practical needs of diverse social groups (Rosero, 1993: 78).

Popular education should not be seen, then, as the tool by which participants that have conflicting social interests can be united. Practical needs cannot necessarily be defined within the popular education process if the group is so diverse that a collective consciousness is impossible to develop. With this in mind, it should be noted that diversity is not something to be avioded for popular education groups (in fact, the acknowledgement of diversity can lead to new levels of collective consciousness). Contradictory interests, however, cannot be overcome by the popular education process. Popular education can only function on the level of the issues of similarity between those participants involved in the process. Clearly, the strength of popular education is its resulting focus on strategic needs and transformation strategies, which are identified by participants after analyzing individual practical needs.

The Integrated Feminist GAD approach is committed to action, which is also an element crucial to the popular education process. Feminism, through this synthesis of approaches, has taken part in creating "new spaces of collective action". It has also taken part in the consolidation of new social topics which are tied to the political realm and start with a process of self-identification (Rosero,1993: 80).

In applying the Integrated Feminist GAD approach to both the Two-Thirds World and North, it can be argued that all people, no matter how marginalized, can be part of a mass social transformation. In connecting the Integrated Feminist GAD approach to popular education techniques used for a participatory educational experience for adults, a 'holistic' perspective emerges, that illustrates how we, as members of a global community, can act on the social inequalities which perpetuate subordination based on gender, race and class.

Popular Education and Transformation Strategies: Formulation

The development of a critical consciousness is seen as a necessary precursor for social change. Popular education, as previously explained, is a practical instrument that can be used by 'the popular masses' to become aware of their position in a society filled with structural inequalities. In mainstream social structures (media, politics, economic institutions, education, etc.), these inequalities are perpetuated, suppressed and/or denied. It is through the alternative medium of popular education that a critical consciousness, or critical knowledge (conscientization) about the relations between inequalities can be collectively developed.

Part of developing a critical consciousness, especially among marginalized categories of people, is the process of empowerment. To "empower" means to support "...people's efforts to form relationships between themselves and the world so that they may be better able to change the things that are causing them problems. This involves the creation of new knowledge. Education should be an empowering, active process" (Culbertson, 1995: 53).

In <u>Doing the Gender Boogie: Power, Participation and Economic Justice (A Popular Education Action Guide)</u>, (Culbertson,1995) various workshops are outlined. The workshops are action-oriented participatory models which groups can follow in an attempt to develop a level of collective consciousness around gender issues as they relate to development. The workshops include:

1. ideas on helping women and men to explore what 'gender' is and means in the greater social and global context,

2. women's unpaid work within the home (domestic sphere),

3. women's paid domestic work,

4. the global economy and the sexual division of labour, and

5. the challenges raised by movements for gender justice.

These workshop outlines all have a global focus, offering examples from the North and the South. Although the focus of these seminars is to create a collective consciousness around gender oppression, all sections also offer concrete steps a group can take to bring about gender justice. This guide is an Integrated Feminist GAD tool and helps any group of participants formulate transformation strategies based on breaking down the social barriers to gender equality.

Popular education, in order to be effective (to meet the goals of consciousness development and the resulting action to transform situations), must be, as previously mentioned, geared to the participants of the educational process. Adapting the methods to the participants' needs and situations will make their involvement in the consciousness development process more participatory. Consciousness development can not be imposed onto a group of people; it must necessarily come from within the group itself. In order for

the participation goal of popular education to be met, the group must develop a unified

consciousness. The assumption here is not that the group must reach some utopian level of

intense solidarity. It simply means that the development of a consciousness (individually

and collectively) needs the full interaction of all the participants. How this consciousness is

connected to the individual may vary from person to person; however, participants need to

be linked in order for the action component to be met.

An example of collective popular education work can be found in the Jamaican

women's theatre group, Sistren.[72] Sistren, founded in 1977, is a collaborative theatre

collective of a diverse group of working-class Jamaican women. The collective is

committed to a development framework that is bottom-up, providing a forum for

participation and consultation through a grassroots approach. They develop ideas for plays

based on an exploration of their own experiences both indivdually and collectively. In

doing so, Sistren offers popular theatre as the medium through which collective

consciousnesses are built. The director of the theatre company, Honor Ford-Smith, notes:

> We began meeting collectively at first. Starting with our childhood, we
> made drawings of images based on such themes as where we had grown
> up, symbols of oppression in our lives, our relationships with men, our
> experience with race and the kind of work we had done (Sisteren
> Collective, 1986: 15).

Sistren produces plays on the conditions of women, drawing on the individual and

personal experience of the women in the collective, and analyzing these experiences in

terms of how they fit into the society as a whole. This analysis then informs their work in

facilitating this process with other small community-based groups. This process is modeled

---

[72] For more information on Sistren see works by Sistren 1986; Thurlow 1992; and French, 1987.

in such a way as to ensure that the beneficiaries of projects built from these popuar theatre experiences (one of which was a women's construction workers collective) are the agents of the development process, and not merely the passive recipients of development. The work done by Sistren is a passionate example of collective consciousness-building for social change based on popular education methods geared toward women in the locally defined development process.

Some Examples of Popular Education and Transformation Strategies in Action

When using popular education methods, research and pedagogy (information gathering and sharing) become transformed into social action. Action, a component so crucial to the popular education process, involves transforming structures within a given society, as well as offering alternative structures which do not reproduce the inequalities. Women's collective popular education efforts and their resulting actions illustrate how action resulting from popular education processes can be the ultimate challenge to gender inequalities. Some examples are the Gender and Popular Education Project in South Africa, a feminist critical classroom at Saint Mary's University, and Anne Bishop's work with a Nova Scotia fish plant union.

The International Perspectives on Gender and Popular Education Research Project (GPE) coordinated by the Center for Adult and Continuing Education (CACE) is housed in the University of the Western Cape in South Africa. The GPE project is the leading forum examining the topic of gender and popular education in the world. It is an institutionalized opportunity for community-based social activists to help build the "national, regional, and global movement of women through collectively developing [an

educational] methodology for political action" (Walters, 1990: 14). The GPE project has both a local and an international focus and is collaborative in nature. The project provides, through seminars on gender and popular education, a valuable exchange of experiences and resources. Through a comparative approach, the seminars, in the words of a participant; "...bring a potential for sharpening our understanding of the similarities and differences and how these relate to the broader social and political contexts in which we work" (Walters, 1990: 14). These seminars contextualize the relevance of gender and popular education to the development of the new popular democratic movement in South Africa. The GPE project focuses on developing tools and training resources for analysis of gender issues in popular education (Walters, 1990: 14; No Author, 1990:95, Convergence). Through this work, the project aims to develop methods of education which help challenge the gender biases in organizations and educational programs. It has also evolved to work with groups in identifying and acting on transformative strategies based around local long-term gender interests in various places in the world.

The GPE project is an example of a commitment to transformational learning made by Two-Thirds World grassroots women. It is placed within the academy (in a university setting), but much of the workshop activities are done by popular educators not necessarily associated with academics. This is a crucial element in the process of disseminating information in a liberatory-transformative way, as it removes critical pedagogy from the ivory tower, and places it into the hands of those that need to have their voices heard. Here we see a great attempt by popular educators to devote their energies to praxis and ongoing reflection of both practice and theory.

There are examples of the breaking down of the teacher-student dichotomy, where students are given the chance to display initiative in their learning process (much of which can be done through popular education). In the formal education context, the role of the teacher is transformed into one in which s/he becomes a facilitator, a role that includes introducing and providing conditions for students to develop a critical perspective on their world. This process can be seen both abroad[73] and in the Canadian context. One local example is a course taught at Saint Mary's University by Professor Linda Christiansen-Ruffman, in which I was a student in 1995-1996.[74] Attempts at creating a critical classroom (through the use of liberatory-transformative pedagogical practice) are especially difficult, considering the challenges. Some of the challenges faced by the class included: the challenging teaching goal, the heterogeneity of the students, and the contradictions between the teaching style and the academic institution.

The professor's goal was not to provide only information, but to develop our analysis as students, of our situations from a critical perspective. The main point of the course was to look at things (all sorts of social issues and phenomena) using a feminist perspective, to analyze them from a feminist stance, and to reach a level of political consciousness[75] (and for some of us this included an action component, liberatory-transformative practice). A great attempt was made by the professor and some of the

---

[73] The South African Teacher's Union (SADTU) is one such example. See No Author,1993: 8, Voices Rising, for details on their work.

[74] This course was called Sociology 448: Feminist Analysis, cross-listed with Women's Studies at Saint Mary's University in Halifax.

[75] The professor's goals were articulated through personal correspondence with Linda Christainsen-Ruffman.

students to break down the traditionally defined relationship between the professor and the students. The curriculum and seminars were planned and organized by the students. Of course, there were barriers that kept a truly radical tranformatory collective process from happening in the beginning of the course. These barriers had to do with the great diversity of the students (and all were women) in the class. Some of the students were self-defined as non-feminists, or even anti-feminists, and were taking the course only as a requirement for their degrees; some were Women's Studies majors, and others had never taken a course about women before; a few were graduate students, and others were studying at an undergraduate level. Some students had trouble taking such a high level of initiative for their own learning process. Because of their previous university experiences, they had been conditioned to expect and to accept the word of the teacher, not to challenge it, and not to seek information from their everyday lives. Other students were initially intimidated by their analytic tasks, and did not see the value of acting on transformation strategies as an academic exercize. Other students found it awkward to place a critical classroom practice within the context of an institution that is hierarchical in nature (and grades students as such). Nevertheless, by the end of this full year course, almost all of the students developed a series of critical learning skills, and many understood (at a very personal level), the difference between the banking method of education and a libeatory-transformative empowering critical pedagogy.

Another Canadian example of popular education used with a gender perspective is Anne Bishop's work with a Nova Scotia fish plant union (1988). Bishop found some fascinating examples of how popular education can be used with a group of women to realize transformation strategies which meet their practical needs. She identified the

importance of using popular education methods with which the participants have a 'personal relationship', or with which they can identify culturally. The use of tools that reflect people's own culture, social realities and daily lived experiences as vehicles for their own consciousness development are extremely effective. They result in the ability of the participants to understand and analyze the ideas that come out of the methods.

In Bishop's report, she explains how she used some fascinating methods, through which the women who worked seasonally at the plant were able to come to a higher level of consciousness about their working conditions. The two cultural forms the women chose as ones they identified with were the cartoon and the soap opera. Both cartoons and soap operas were cultural forms that were enjoyed and shared by the women, and were therfore approporiate mediums for popular education. Once the media were chosen, the women began drawing cartoons and writing an ongoing soap opera, both of which focused on issues in the formation of a union, discontent among workers, safety and health issues, and other related topics (that they defined as important). Through the publication of a newsletter, a new communication medium was created. The cartoons and soap opera "..broke through the pall of fear and tension which had descended on the plant, bringing laughter and discussion" (Bishop,1988: 30). A newsletter, a popular education tool, was used to spawn informal discussion on issues of concern to the women in the plant. It was even used to discuss broader issues as well (i.e. violence against women, poverty, etc.).

The spinoff effect of Bishop's work in the plant was the empowerment of the women themselves. The most interesting component of the popular education process for these women was their ability to use their new collective consciousness once the plant had been closed down. The practical needs they identified at this point included finding

89

employment. With their previous experience in popular education, the women were motivated and organized to act. They eventually took part in developing worker co-operatives, and through these bodies, created jobs for themselves. The creation of their own jobs was a process which resulted in meeting their practical needs, and is also an example of the creation of a transformation strategy. The women found a number of barriers when they went to find work in the formal wage sector. For this reason they invented a transformation strategy, the co-operatives, which allowed them to create for themselves wage employment on a more equitable level.

These examples are inspiring accounts of how popular education can be used as a tool for alternative pedagogy and research practices which focus on gender issues in their analyses. It is the innovations of the participants involved in the projects translated into action which will make their situations, on a micro level, and the world, on a macro level, a more equitable place to live in.

CONCLUSION

Popular education is a collection of highly effective alternative methods by which women's needs, situations and subordinate positions in societies can be viewed. It is a tool by which a collective consciousness can be built. It is an instrument which can be placed into an Integrated Feminist GAD approach to social analysis and community-based development, and can be used to aid in the evolution of transformation strategies. Finally, popular education is a medium through which social transformation can take place in the form of social action which changes the fundamental structures in which inequalities are embedded and perpetuated.

90

Popular education is a useful tool for the action-based participatory reclamation of the learning process by learners. It is a liberatory-transformational approach to the generation and sharing of knowledge, and therefore is useful for emancipating categories of people who face oppression (whatever form that may take). Examples of popular education in action, as outlined in this paper, provide illustrations of both how theory and practice may contradict each other, as well as how it can be used to empower women in their struggles against gender inequalities. It is, however, a tool useful for any form of consciousness development and resulting transformational action.

There are some fundamental contradictions between the theory of popular education and its practice. The apparent dichotomy between theory and practice can be seen on a number of levels: that which defines marginalization solely on the basis of class and therefore in practice diminishes the importance of looking at gender as a component of inequality; that which in practice takes part in perpetuating gender inequalities in the popular education process; that which assumes that the teacher/educator in the process will not perpetuate conditioned forms of inequalities; and that which assumes the homogeneous process of collective consciousness development by women. The contradictions between theory and practice of liberatory-transformative pedagogy will be examined in more detail in the following chapter, where an analysis of early writings on liberatory-transformative education will be compared with the post-structural/postmodern academic writing and juxtaposed with radical Integrative Feminist GAD perspectives on the topic of feminist critical pedagogy.

CHAPTER THREE: THEORY OPPOSING PRACTICE OR LEADING TO PRAXIS IN LIBERATORY-TRANSFORMATIVE PEDAGOGY ? THE FEMINIST DEBATES

INTRODUCTION

Thus far, this paper has looked at the intersection of feminist struggles, development practice, and liberatory-transformative education (popular education). Throughout the sections and sub-sections of the previous chapters, the fact has been acknowledged that there continually appear to be gaps and resulting contradictions between theory and practice with regards to feminist struggles, development processes, and liberatory-transformative pedagogy. This chapter brings these contradictions into the perspective of divergent theoretical, conceptual, and practical frameworks: those that perpetuate the gap between theory and practice: *theory versus practice* (post-structural/postmodern positions), and those that bridge that gap: *praxis* (radical Integrative feminisms and the work done through the Integrative Feminist GAD framework).

This chapter offers a review and critical examination of the literature that looks at liberatory-transformative education including both popular education and critical

pedagogy.[76] The first section of this chapter explores the early discourse on popular education and places the writings into a radical framework, drawing on Marxism, Neo- and post-Marxism, and the ideas of Antonio Gramsci.[77] The early theorists and practitioners are assessed for their awareness of gender issues within the popular education process. The second section outlines and critiques some of the assertions and arguments existing in the contemporary post-structural/postmodern academic writing on the topic of feminist critical pedagogy. Topics covered include: the deconstruction of popular education terminology; the perpetuation of binaries in critical pedagogy thought; the role of subjectivity; the patriarchal discourse prevalent in critical pedagogy literature; and the reproduction of inequalities in a critical popular education experience. These assertions are critically challenged by exploring the contradiction between their abstracted theoretical focus, and the more embedded theoretical and praxis focus of Integrative feminisms. It is argued that a radical Integrative feminist stance is the base upon which a development process using popular education tools can build a bridge between de-politicized theory and radical transformative practice.

Formal education systems in the Two-Thirds World have been widely criticized for their Western focus, racism, and lack of respect for indigenous

---

[76] The terms *popular education* and *critical pedagogy* have been used throughout this paper to refer to similar examples of liberatory or transformative education practices, alternative to the mainstream formal education practices. It should be noted that *popular education* is more likely to be the term used to relate to practices of liberatory-transformative education outside of a classroom, i.e., in a community-based grouping of some sort. *Critical pedagogy*, on the other hand, is more often the term given to the theoretical and methodological practice of liberatory-transformative pedagogy within a formal classroom.

[77] Antonio Gramsci was a founder of the Italian Communist Party. He was arrested by Mussolini's police in 1926, and spent nine years in prison, where he worked with inmates, and wrote philosophically about the politics of revolution and the necessary transformation of the consciousness of the masses in the revolutionary process (Sarup, 1983: 129).

knowledge systems. It is not in the scope of this paper to outline these critiques. However, there are many and they contain their own arguments, assertions and theoretical assumptions. Suffice it to say that the theorists and practitioners whose views are discussed in this paper have built their views on the assumption that, in general, formal education structures in the Two-Thirds World are not the best paths to an equitable political and economic growth of human potential. This being the case, development is generally assumed by these practitioners not to be a linear process from a backwards state to one of modernized civilization (here development is an end and formal education is a means to that end). Instead, development as it relates to education is seen as an intrinsic part of an overall process of change of which a critical liberatory-transformative education process is a part.[78]

It is through this premise of the process of development and its relationship to the education of people, that critical education discourse comes into play. Pedagogical practices that are critical are seen to be liberatory. They "break the social and psychological constraints imposed by established oppressive systems" (Schapiro, 1995: 29). The premise of the writing on liberatory-transformative education is based on a critique of formal pedagogical methodologies: that the formal structures of education are part of a body of social systems which serve to reproduce social inequalities and to maintain the *status quo*. Part of this critique is placing the 'banking method' of education in juxtaposition to the liberatory-transformative education process.

---

[78] See previous chapters for an elaboration on the development process as it relates to pedagogy.

A pedagogy which empowers students to intervene in the making of history is more than a literacy campaign. Critical education prepares students to be their own agents for social exchange, their own creators of a democratic culture. They gain skills of philosophical abstraction which enable them to separate themselves from the routine flow of time. Consequently, their literacy is a challenge to their control by corporate culture. Because critical literacy can detach people from mass domination, the existing social order has a stake in preventing the popular emergence of a conceptual consciousness (Shor, 1980: 2).

1. Radical Framework of Discourse on Critical Pedagogy: Paulo Freire, Marxism, Neo-Marxism, and Gramsci

Radical educators look upon schools as social forms. Those forms should educate the capacities people have to think, to act, to be subjects, and to be able to understand the limits of their ideological commitments. That's a radical paradigm. Radical educators believe the relationship between social forms and social capacities is such that human capacities get educated to the point of calling into question the forms themselves (Giroux, 1992: 11).

There are numerous propositions which are related to what can be called the radical framework of discourse on critical pedagogy. The elements of liberatory-transformative education (critical consciousness development and desocialization, the everyday life context of what is learned, and horizontal communication)[79] underlie the propositions and assumptions upon which the radical framework is built. Different theorists have placed varying emphases on any or all of the following propositions. However, the assertions are shared by all theorists and practitioners who discuss the role of non-formal liberatory-transformative education as it relates to the process of

_____

[79] Chapter Two offers in-depth elaborations of these elements.

development.

Education for liberation necessarily implies 'empowerment'.[80] In addition to an education component, empowerment contains a political component, in that the learners attain a new level of political agency through the empowerment process. Empowerment, in the context of education, can be seen as both a process and as an outcome. Madine Vanderplaat, in her Ph.D. thesis discussing the participatory collective process of empowerment, elaborates on these options:

> [E]mpowerment as process is...the acquisition of a political voice that gives public expression to collective needs and interests. Empowerment as outcome, is...the harnessing of systemic resources to these collective needs and interests (Vanderplaat, 1995: 207).

Beyond this political voice component of empowerment, one must acknowledge that empowerment as process implies some sort of capacity building on numerous levels (psychological, social, political, collective, individual, etc.). The increased capacity results in the ability for the marginalized to make choices about their future. Empowerment then means the acquisition of resources that allows the previously disempowered to act on transforming the conditions of their situation. A liberatory-transformative pedagogy must contain elements that support this empowerment process.

The theorists and practitioners who fall within this radical framework critique the idea of value-free knowledge production and sharing. They see, in varying degrees, the

---

[80] See Chapter One for a discussion of this term as it relates to feminist development theories. "Empowering pedagogy ... move[s] from power as domination to power as creative energy. In such a system the teacher's knowledge and experience is recognized and is used with the students to increase the legitimate power of all" (Shrewsbury, 1987: 9).

flaws in conventional formal education practices (including both pedagogy and research: information sharing and information gathering) that claim to be objective. Linked with this premise is the belief that the acknowledgment of one's subjective reality is crucial to the process of developing a critical consciousness.[81]

In the radical discourse on education, there is a belief that power relationships are shaped by and perpetuated by the process of knowledge production and transfer. The assumption is that power relationships necessarily result in one component of the relationship dominating over the other, therefore creating a relationship of domination/subordination. Liberatory-transformative education, then, is seen as a way for these relations to be realized by the learners in the education process, and acted upon to transform the relations (Barndt, 1989: 27). Critical pedagogues assert that relations of subordination and domination (characteristic of hierarchical societies) are constituted and reproduced through mainstream formal educational practices.[82] Unfortunately, as will be discussed in relation to feminist approaches to, and critiques of, critical pedagogy, often these relations are reproduced in non-formal critical education practices as well.

---

[81] This subjective reality is what some theorists see as the everyday situations and conditions that inform the development of an individual and collective critical consciousness.

[82] Shor in Shor and Friere (1987: 137) is worth quoting at length on this issue: "Students withdraw into passive noncompliance or offensive sabotage in response to a disempowering education, this dichotomy of reading from living, of intellectualizing from experiencing. ...Domination is more than being ordered around impersonally in school, and more than the social relations of discourse in a transfer-of-knowledge pedagogy. Domination is also the very structure of knowing; concepts are presented irrelevant to reality; descriptions of reality achieve no critical integration; critical thought is separated from living. This dichotomy is the interior dynamic of a pedagogy that disempowers students politically and psychologically."

Theoretical Underpinnings of a Radical Critical Pedagogy Conceptual Framework

The conceptual frameworks which inform the literature on popular education and critical pedagogy are varied, although they share a fundamental opposition to mainstream frameworks. "Mainstream" refers to those more conventional frameworks which include modernization theory, dependency theory, neo-Liberal, and neo-Classical theories (as defined and critiqued in Chapter One). The perspectives taken by these frameworks do not fit with the notions of popular education in that they do not allow for a critical and participatory action-oriented form of development. The development and education practices which are born from these frameworks cannot meet the emancipatory/empowerment needs of those who are affected by them. This creates the necessity for a methodology and conceptual framework which radically questions and analyzes research and education practices characteristic of mainstream goals and assumptions.

Most of the individuals, groups and organizations which use popular education ground their work in theoretical frameworks which support the emancipation of those categories of people who face structural oppression, whatever form it may take. An analysis of class oppression is often placed within a Neo-Marxist framework,[83] wherein class is considered the main factor in the stratification of society.[84] Many popular education theorists who wrote in the 1970's grounded their critical education discourse in a Neo-Marxist framework. Class stratification is the focus of the analysis in the popular education process for these theorists and

---

[83] See Chapter One for an elaboration of this framework as it relates to development thought and practice.

[84] See works by Freire (1969, 1972, 1985); Magendzo (1990); Rosero (1988, 1993); and Shor (1987, 1980).

is often seen as the main instigator of other social inequalities. It is important to note the historic place and time of these early discourses on popular education. These theorists were predominantly Latin American men writing in the late 1960's and 1970's for whom the dominant paradigm surrounding social and political thought was Neo-Marxist. Their writings must also be seen within the context of mass political struggles against military dictatorships in the 1970's.

Paulo Freire, Marxism and Gramsci

Paulo Freire is widely considered one of the founders of liberatory (popular) education. He wrote about theories and experiences of how marginalized peasants used popular education tools to acquire literacy and a political consciousness, making them actors in their own development process. His theory of conscientization was, in its original conception, oriented toward training in literacy, however, it has been adapted as a general critical pedagogy (Morrow, 1990: 48). His work has influenced transformative education theory and practice both at the non-formal level (modern-day *popular education*) as well as the more formal level (*critical pedagogy* as practiced in the liberatory classroom).

A diverse range of writers and thinkers have written on the topic of Freire's theoretical and methodological implications for critical pedagogy.[85] Theorists and practitioners of Freire's pedagogy although coming from different backgrounds (in both theory and practice), take part in illustrating how Freire's conceptual framework (which

---

[85] See works by: Aronowitz,1993; Cadena,1991; CEALL,1985; Clark,1993; Doerge,1992; Ellsworth,1989; Freire and Macedo,1993; Giroux,1988,1992; Gottlieb and LaBelle,1990; hooks,1993; Jeria,1990; Leonard,1993; Luke and Gore,1992; McLaren and Leonard,1993; Morrow,1990; Orner,1992; Picon,1991; Rosero,1993; Shor,1980,1987; SFU, n.d.; Torres,1993; Weiler,1991; No Author,1993.

includes concepts such as "subjectivity", "experience", and "power") fits in with and/or clashes with the current interdisciplinary wave of thought, including post-structuralism and postmodernism.[86] Two main elements of analysis are drawn upon in this sub-section to illustrate these similarities: the theoretical framework of Freire's work as it relates to Marxist, Neo- and post-Marxist and Gramscian paradigms; and a reworking of Freire's ideas into a modern and locally specific process of struggle and liberation.

The context of Freire's writing is entrenched in the history politics and society of Latin America in the 1960's and 1970's. It is this context which has led some theorists to link Freire to a Neo-Marxist theoretical paradigm. Some theorists venture to construct a new thrust of this radical tradition called a post-Marxist Critical Social Theory, which although similar in scope to the Marxist and Neo-Marxist positions, is adapted to "...the problems and lived experiences of the twentieth century", and breaks "with Marxism as

---

[86]Although there is a great body of literature on post-structuralism and on postmodernism, it is very difficult to come up with succinct definitions of the two. I find Somer Brodribb's position on these frameworks to mirror my own. She says: "There is no clear conception of the meanings of poststructuralism and postmodernism, their relation, distinction or significance. Profoundly elusive, purposively ambiguous, these are terms which are not used systematically, and about which there is no consensus. Yet they have come to dominate the critical and cultural landscape." Andreas Huyssen (1990: 236), while discussing postmodernism, refuses to attempt to define what it is. Chris Weedon (1987: 19-20) discusses the term 'poststructuralist': "It does not have one fixed meaning but is generally applied to a range of theoretical positions. ... The work which their theories inform varies considerably. ... While different forms of poststructuralism vary both in their practice and in their political implications, they share certain fundamental assumptions about language, meaning and subjectivity." Madan Sarup (1993: 3) explains that post-structuralism, although conceptually "difficult" and "abstract", "involves a critique of metaphysics, of the concepts of causality, of identity, of the subject, and of truth." 'Postmodernity', for Sarup "...emphasizes diverse forms of individual and social identity. It is now widely held that the autonomous subject has been dispersed into a range of plural, polymorphous subject-positions inscribed within language. Instead of a coercive totality and a totalizing politics, postmodernity stresses a pluralistic and open democracy. Instead of the certainty of progress, associated with the 'Enlightenment project' (of which Marxism is a part), there is now an awareness of contingency and ambivalence."

the master discourse of any emancipatory project" (Morrow, 1990: 48).[87] The conceptual

differences between Marxism and the newer strains of radical theory are crucial for the

placement of a liberatory-transformative educational practice, especially with regards to

the consciousness development process. Specifically, a post-Marxist social theory

challenges Marxist and Gramscian understandings of revolutionary transformation which is

seen as led by a unified (homogeneous, through the consciousness-raising process)

working class (Morrow, 1990: 49, 53).[88] As the nature of social movements changes in a

Latin American context, there is a shift from the Marxist view of "the popular" sector of

society being that which is composed of a unified working class, toward one which allows

for the re-conceptualization of a diversity of subjective positions of popular sectors.[89]

The above issue points to a critique of Freire's conceptualization of 'the

oppressed'. It must be noted that ambiguous terminology such as 'the people' or 'the

oppressed' may not be appropriate to the language or modern reality of both industrialized

and Two-Thirds World contexts. As previously noted, Marxist and Neo-Marxist theories

(i.e., Dependency theory), which greatly influenced the works of many who wrote

---

[87] Originally In Aronowitz and Giroux 1985. Education Under Siege: The Conservative, Liberal and Radical Debate Over Schooling, Bergin and Garvey, Massachusetts, pp. 116.

[88] Morrow's slant on post-Marxism and Freire includes the following: "[O]ne could assume that dialogical methods properly used would necessarily reveal the diversity of subject positions and the absence of a highly centered class identity. Indeed, it is precisely for this reason the Freirean pedagogy has often been attacked from the Marxist left because of its refusal to 'indoctrinate' the oppressed into the ideology appropriate to their 'objective' class interests. It could be argued that Freirean *methodology* is thus implicitly post-Marxist *avant la lettre*" (Morrow, 1990: 53, emphasis as in original). For more analysis of the homogenization of the category of the oppressed, see Weiler, 1991: 444.

[89] Patti Lather discusses the usefulness of a post-Marxist analysis: "In this post-Marxist space, the binaries that structure liberatory struggle implode from 'us versus them' and 'liberation' versus 'oppression' to a multi-centred discourse with differential access to power." Post-Marxism takes into account "...the argument that Marxism is not so much dead as limited within a context so changed from Marx's day that it needs to be supplemented with other modes of analysis" (Lather, 1991: 25-26).

critically of power and oppression in the 1960's and 1970's (and even into the 1980's), assumed that the main factor of oppression was based on class. This critique is especially relevant for practitioners of an Integrated GAD approach to development or other feminist theorists and practitioners working for social change. These people criticize Marxism for its "...totalizing ambitions, its claim to account for every form of social experience. But this claim is characteristic of all theoretical discourse, which is one reason women frequently condemn it as phallocratic" (Owens, 1983: 63). More contemporary theories (Integrated feminisms, Gender and Development, Global feminism, etc.,) look at oppression as a more holistic concept, found in levels relating to class as well as gender, race, sexuality, ethnicity, and ability (among others), and look at how these levels interact with each other through the structures in any given society.

Stanley Aronowitz (1993: 22) notes that Freire has gone through a process of distancing himself from the Marxist/Neo-Marxist paradigm and has moved closer to Antonio Gramsci's "open Marxism". Originally, Freire's analysis, like that of Gramsci, was based on in the idea that class is what defines political discourse (Weiler, 1991: 451). On the other hand, Aronowitz claims that Freire has evolved from this analysis over time to see "other social categories of oppression, resistance and liberation". That is, that the objective realities of people's situations are not defined purely by the conditions of the class structure.

Carlos Alberto Torres (1993: 139) identifies how Freire's concept of the process of "critical consciousness" is similar to the Gramscian process of "counter hegemony". As Giroux explains (1992: 186-188), hegemony requires involvement in a pedagogical process. For Torres, a counter-hegemonic struggle requires oppressed categories of

people to individually and collectively become aware of the factors of domination and the process of hegemonic control. This awareness development is similar to the Freirean conscientization process.

Naomi Rosenthal (1984: 313), notes how radical feminism's use of consciousness raising techniques has its roots in Marxism: "The ... notion that politics and experience are intertwined (i.e., the personal is political) was combined with the Marxian dictum that the development of class consciousness inevitably results in action of and for the class".[90]

For both Freire and Gramsci, the subjectivity of the participants in the learning process is of great importance (Leonard, 1993: 161). Subjectivity, relating to the daily lived experiences of the participants, molds the conditions and situations that in turn impact the individual and collective consciousness development process. Inter-subjectivity (the awareness of the interplay of subjectivities with others through a shared critical perspective on a shared situation, therefore reaching a new analytic level) is crucial in the case of the oppressed, as their own oppression is often internalized through what Freire and Shor call "false-consciousness". Both theorists prefer "...to focus on subjectivity and its social construction which reflects the tradition of critical theory, and more recently, feminist politics and scholarship" (Leonard, 1993: 156). As will be discussed in the

---

[90] In contrast to this linking of radical feminism to Marxism (although it does so only on the issue of consciousness raising), Robin Morgan (1996: 5) claims that "...radical feminism is not socialist (or Marxist) feminism. This is because radical feminists reject a politics positing: a) that sexism is merely a by-product of capitalism, b) that patriarchy ...will wither away under communism, c) that women automatically become free and equal ...in socialist or communist societies, d) that boring words ending in "-tion" and "-ism", written by white, heterosexual, middle-class, nineteenth-century European Jewish men (however bright or bearded), could actually constitute feminist theory, or e) that imitating leftist men could possibly be good for women."

following section of this chapter, post-structural/postmodern obsession with subjectivity can be taken too far, resulting in the paralysis of practice.

One great difference between Freire's pedagogy and the position of Gramsci is that the latter proposed the need for "didactic, authoritative teaching and the disciplined application by the learner to academic work" (Sarup, 1983:131). What connects them, however, is their common commitment to the interdependent and horizontal relationship between the student (learner) and teacher (educator) and their understanding of the learner as an 'active recipient'.

> For Gramsci, ...the purpose of schools is to develop a critical consciousness through intellectual application. ... The aim of education is that it should guide people so that they may come to know and transform the world (Sarup, 1983: 139).

Much of the recent writings about Freire (1980's and 1990's) is concerned with his intellectual contribution to the issue of struggle and how it relates to liberation, this being the object of traditional Marxism, as well. Specifically, Peter McLaren and Peter Leonard note (1993: 1), his work in relation to:

> ...how to struggle for the social transformation of our postmodern and post-colonial world in the interests of the liberation of subordinate populations and cultures from the structures and ideologies which dominate them.

Some contemporary popular educators attempt to show how Freire's notions of struggle and liberation can be made appropriate for today's struggles when placed into a context of place, time, and social/cultural factors. For example, Freire's philosophy includes confronting of the Eurocentric dominant tradition of social and political thought. He goes through the process of deconstructing the categories of "the oppressed". In

doing so, there is an acknowledgment of diversity, and therefore the education process "...provides a rationale for the development of alternative forms of progressive thought" (McLaren and Leonard, 1993: 3).

Although Freire's pedagogy originated in the Two-Thirds World, it can be seen to have significance to various contexts, including the industrialized world, and to different historical circumstances (McLaren and Leonard, 1993: 5). Ira Shor, for example, in his essay "Education Is Politics: Paulo Freire's Critical Pedagogy", notes how in the context of urban American education there is a level of student resistance to critical pedagogy (as there would also be, presumably in Two-Thirds World contexts). This resistance is due to their "underdevelopment", their training by the "banking method" of pedagogy in which "...students internalize values and habits which sabotage their critical thought". Students, then develop an "authority dependence" through the traditional education methods (Shor, 1980: 29).

A well-known African American feminist, bell hooks, notes that Freire's process of "conscientization" is useful in the situation of African Americans in their own process of de-colonizing. She goes a step further to emphasize that, like in Freire's analysis, this conscientization is not an end in itself, but must be combined with meaningful "praxis" (hooks, 1993: 147), the joining of the theoretical with action. As is discussed throughout this paper, this praxis is crucial for the radical liberatory-transformative agenda of a radical feminist struggle, a critical education process, and an empowerment development practice.

Freire's work also has implications for new forms of colonization which stem from the mainstream system of thought which serves to polarize everything in our society. Part of liberatory-transformative education as it is currently being practiced is to involve those

in positions of domination (not just "the oppressed") in the reworking of their own subjective understanding of their position(s) in society. Rather than buying into the polarized view that the oppressors are 'bad' and the oppressed are inherently 'good', there is room for the understanding that the oppressors are often unaware of their positions, and can be an integral part of the liberation process.[91] This view implies a structure that is responsible for the perpetuation of the unequal relationship.

Early Writing on Popular Education and its Connections with Gender Issues

As previously indicated, much of the early writing (from the 1960's and 1970's) on liberatory-transformative education (popular education and critical pedagogy) was influenced by the Marxist and Neo-Marxist political ideologies and agenda for social mobilization. The theoretical underpinnings, therefore included a reliance on class as the factor upon which social inequalities rested. Class awareness, consciousness raising, mobilization and struggle were considered and assumed to be the ways in which the marginalized would overcome their oppression. This focus on class meant that other forms of oppression were left out of the analysis (or at least relegated to a less important status).

Freire and Shor in their early writings rarely, if ever, mention gender in either their practical work or their theoretical discussions. When they did, it was in relation to the importance of cooperation between men and women facing structural inequalities based on political and class issues. Paulo Freire writes in the foreword to the anthology Paulo

---

[91] This is, of course quite an idealistic way of looking at the oppressed and oppressors. A Neo-Marxist view might point out that by merely knowing one's position of domination does not guarantee the relinquishing of power and the dissolving of inequality. The oppressors might be seen as bound by their social position, perhaps unlikely to challenge their position of status in society even if they are aware of it.

Freire: A Critical Encounter, (1993) that in his optimal vision for the future, women and men work together in a pedagogy of liberation "...structured as a partnership...devoid of hierarchical control and free of patriarchal assumptions." This form of pedagogy is such that both sexes can "...participate in the construction of new social formations dependent on divergent cultural and gendered practices, discourses, and identities" (Friere, 1993: x). For the purpose of this paper, the most important analysis offered by contemporary theorists and practitioners of critical pedagogy is the rethinking of Paulo Freire's work as it relates to feminist struggles and feminist critical pedagogy. It is to these analyses that this paper now turns.

2. Post-structuralism/Postmodernism[92] and Feminist Critical Pedagogy

Many contemporary feminist critical pedagogues (writing in the late 1980's and 1990's) use post-structural/postmodern analysis of where feminist ideas and critical pedagogy intersect. Other theorists and practitioners challenge those relying on post-structural/postmodern frameworks. This section will discuss the assertions and arguments of the former, and will explore the critiques by the latter. In doing so, this section argues that a radical feminist struggle that includes the use of a liberatory-transformative pedagogy must be committed to radical political transformative action. To

---

[92] I have chosen to use these terms together following the general confusion many (myself included) have experienced in seeing the two perspectives as intrinsically separate. Somer Brodribb (1992: ix) also uses the two together, and indicates that many writers known as post-structuralists are often discussed as postmodernists. Jane Kenway (1995: 52) and Parlo Singh (1995: 200-201) also collapse the two terms in relation to their use in educational theorizing. Denise Thompson (1996: 325) claims "...the terms are interchangeable for most purposes", and so, for most purposes, they will be used together here. There are instances when I refer to only one or the other, and this is due to the focus in the literature I am reviewing and/or critiquing.

maintain this commitment, feminist critical pedagogues should discard the academic, theoretical masturbation of the post-structural/postmodern theorists which ultimately de-politicizes[93] and fragments individuals[94] from what should be a political, collective liberatory-transformative praxis.

The post-structural/postmodern frameworks, or lenses through which some critical feminist pedagogues[95] view the world (and specifically critical education practice and thought) leads them to: deconstruct concepts and terms as they are used in critical education thought;[96] acknowledge binaries in critical pedagogy thought and action which, they claim, undercut its attempt to be egalitarian in nature;[97] discuss issues related to subjectivity;[98] outline how critical pedagogy has been entrenched in a

---

[93] The potential de-politicization of post-structuralism/postmodernism is touched on in the following works: Hoff, 1996: 406; Kipnis, 1988: 158; Lather, 1991: 36; Spretnack, 1996: 321; and Thompson, 1996: 325.

[94] For an elaboration on the fragmentation process of a postmodernist politics, see Giroux, 1992: 122, 172; and Ross, 1988: xiv.

[95] Angela Miles clarifies that "postructuralist feminists range from those who propose deconstructionist theory as a superior alternative to what is perceived to be an almost total lack of feminist theory... to those who detect or want to add deconstructionist sensibility in feminist theorizing. Nevertheless, they all ultimately reject the recognition of women's specificity, ... and the desire for clearer understandings of the world as essentializing and totalizing practices that replicate and reinforce rather than challenge structures of power" (Miles, 1996: 81).

[96] See works by: Butler, 1990; Gottlieb and LaBelle, 1990; Kenway and Modra, 1992; Lather, 1991; Luke and Gore, 1992; Orner, 1992; Sarup, 1988; Smith and Wexler, 1995; and Weedon, 1987 for more information on the process of deconstruction.

[97] For information on binaries, see works by: Doerge, 1992; Giroux, 1992; Luke and Gore, 1992; Orner, 1992; Poovey, 1988; and Sarup, 1993.

[98] Regarding subjectivity, see works by: Bricker-Jenkins and Hooyman, 1987; Butler, 1990; Ellsworth, 1992; Giroux, 1992; Lather, 1991; McLaren, 1988; and Weedon, 1987.

patriarchal form of discourse;[99] and show how critical pedagogy, under certain conditions, can reproduce inequalities that are found in society and that it tries so hard to overcome.[100]

Post-structural/Postmodern Deconstruction

Deconstruction is the term given to the critical practice of placing texts and their meanings into a context of, and in relation to, other texts. Post-structuralist deconstruction insists that "...meaning is not only plural, but constantly deferred in the never-ending webs of textuality in which all texts are located" (Weedon, 1987: 163). According to Patti Lather, deconstruction involves three "steps": firstly, one must identify in an argument, what are the binaries, or the oppositions; secondly, one removes the "dependent" term from its "negative position" and repositions it as part and parcel of the "condition of the positive term"; and thirdly, one must "create a more fluid and less coercive conceptual organization of terms which transcends a binary logic by simultaneously being both and neither of the binary terms" (Lather, 1991: 13). The rationale for this process of deconstruction is to acknowledge the "multiple determinants that figure in any individual's social position and (relative) power and oppression" (Poovey, 1988:58).

Although radical Integrative theorists (those not of the post-structural/postmodern camps) understand the use of deconstruction as a theoretical tool, they argue that it

---

[99] See works by: Ellsworth, 1992; Fraser and Nicholson, 1988; Gottlieb and LaBelle, 1990; Luke and Gore, 1992; and Orner, 1992 regarding the patriarchal discourse in critical pedagogy literature.

[100] See works by: Giroux, 1992; Lather, 1991; and Orner, 1992 for information on the reproduction of inequalities in the critical classroom.

contributes to the de-politicization of the critical liberatory transformative process. Moreover, some argue that the post-structural/postmodern theorists' ownership claim over the deconstruction process is unfounded, as it is an exercise that has been in practice since well before the academic post-structural/postmodern theorists came onto the scene of theory-making.

A popular level of analysis offered by post-structural/postmodern contemporary feminist critical pedagogues is the deconstruction of certain concepts and underlying assumptions upon which critical pedagogy has been built. These assumptions cause it in practice, they claim, to be a sexist process. It is critical to note that the deconstruction of these assumptions is not a new process, and credit should be given to earlier feminists who do not fall into the post-structural/postmodern camps.

Feminist pedagogues who adhere to post-structural/postmodern feminist analyses, focus on: power and knowledge relations, the harm done by "master-narratives" (Luke and Gore, 1992: xi; Orner, 1992: 77-78), the way institutional education structures are controlled, "historically contingent cultural practice" (Luke and Gore, 1992: 4), and the deconstruction of the basic concepts of the education process. Through their analyses, these feminist critical educators illustrate how they feel a sense of "...theoretical, political and pedagogical 'dissonance' with male-conceived pedagogy meant to be used for 'empowerment' and freedom from oppression" (Luke and Gore 1992: 1).

Carmen Luke, in her essay "Feminist Politics in Radical Pedagogy" shows how the main task for post-structural feminist theorists is to bring women from the periphery to the center of social analysis (this, it must be noted, is certainly not unique to post-structural/postmodern feminists; it is originally a proposition of radical feminists). She

110

adds that part of a feminist post-structuralist agenda is to be involved in the

"deconstruction of master narratives" (Luke, 1992: 25).

> Feminist criticism is deconstructing the master narratives of patriarchy and
> thereby moving gender onto the critical agenda even if, in many discourses,
> it remains institutionally contained at the margins (Luke, 1992: 45).

In the case of critical pedagogy, it is not enough, Luke argues, to 'add women and stir'

into the meta-narratives that are essentially patriarchal in nature. An important distinction

needs to be made here: between those post-structural/postmodern academic theorists who

think about the meta-/master-narratives in academic writing and critique their existence

from a philosophical stance, and grassroots community-based women who challenge these

narratives for inadequately representing their realities.

> ...the practice of feminist politics in the eighties [and nineties] has
> generated a new set of pressures that have worked against meta-narratives.
> In recent years, poor and working class women, women of color, and
> lesbians have finally won a wider hearing for their objections to feminist
> theories that fail to illuminate their lives and address their problems (Fraser
> and Nicholson, 1988: 99).

Kathleen Barry underlines this distinction by accusing the post-structural/postmodern

theorists of being obsessed with deconstruction to such an extent that they lose their

ability to work outside of the realm of academia. "Deconstruction theories properly float

only in the rarefied atmosphere of the ivory tower" (Barry, 1996: 192).

The deconstruction of concepts as done by feminist critical pedagogues, according

to Jane Kenway and Helen Modra, illustrates a deep dissatisfaction of contemporary

feminist educators with the ways in which other critical theorists (namely, Paulo Freire and

Ira Shor, among others) fail to address the issue of gender in critical pedagogy discourses.

They fail to "examine the gendered assumptions embodied deeply and subtly in their theoretical premises or to grasp the full significance of the presence and power of gender in educational settings" (Kenway and Modra, 1992: 138). Critical pedagogy has not always been able to deal with gender issues and contradictions. Experiences in Latin America and South Africa have shown that critical pedagogy as done through popular education techniques has "...targeted the oppressed and exploited, but does not [always] deal with the specifics of women's oppression" (No Author, 1993: 9).

Radical feminists have identified the obsession with deconstruction on the part of post-structural/postmodern theorists to be contradictory with a liberatory-transformative practice. Three arguments are given to support this critique. Firstly, the very tool of deconstruction can be seen as a "master's-tool" (Singh, 1995: 201). The weapon used by post-structural/postmodern theorists to disrupt the "masculinist voice" is in and of itself based on a patriarchal model of the supremacy of academic theory over grassroots practice. Secondly, post-structural/postmodern deconstructive criticism is essentially "apolitical" (Weedon, 1987: 19), allowing theorists to detach themselves from practice by obsessing over text, meaning and linguistic specifics. Thirdly, following the apolitical nature of deconstructive criticism, post-structural/postmodern theorists can detach themselves from any position - claiming that any position (theoretical or practical) can be composed of its opposite. In Somer Brodribb's words (1992: 9): "Mostly, deconstruction means never having to say you're wrong. Or a feminist."

Binaries in Critical Pedagogy Thought

Post-structural/postmodern theorists place importance on the deconstruction of

binaries which they see as dominating social and political thought and practice. Binaries

are a way of drawing distinctions between conceptual opposites. Post-structuralists,

following the work of Jacques Derrida, attempt to "subvert" the meanings inherent in the

opposition, and identify how the terms are inseparable, and in fact rely on each other

(Sarup, 1993: 38).[101]

Valerie Walkerdine offers an analysis of the political strategy of progressivism,

linking the concepts of power and liberation to the formation of a modern democratic state

(Luke and Gore, 1992: 10). Her analysis attempts to show how binaries in political and

social thought undercut the ability for critical pedagogy thought and action to be fully

egalitarian in nature. Luke continues this analysis in her examination of the growth of

Western political thought, which she claims intrinsically values the division of public and

private life (Luke, 1992: 34). This division has implications for men and women, as

women, feminists argue, have been traditionally relegated to the private domain, and men

have full reign over the public. Mimi Orner also touches on the issue of dualisms in

Western societies which reproduce power relations through the historical construction of

opposites (Orner, 1992: 78). This duality has a number of gender implications which are

transposed onto all action including those that attempt to be emancipatory in nature.

---

[101] Sarup elaborates on the post-structural agenda of deconstructing binaries: "In each of the pairs, private/public, masculine/feminine, same/other, rational/irrational, true/false, central/peripheral, etc., the first term is privileged. Deconstructors show that the 'privileged' term depends for its identity on its excluding the other and demonstrate that primacy really belongs to the subordinate term instead" (Sarup, 1993: 50-51).

There is a contradiction between the Integrative (radical) feminists' focus on

specificity (while embracing commonalities) and the post-structural/postmodern theorists'

obsession with deconstruction. The latter do not provide tools for analyzing specificity,

nor do they provide a model upon which a transformative praxis can be built. As Mary

Poovey explains:

> If we cannot describe why a particular group came to occupy the position
> of "other" or how its tenure in that position differs from the effect such
> positioning has on other groups, we have no basis on which to posit or by
> which to predict any other state of affairs. We have no basis, in other
> words, for political analysis or action (Poovey, 1988: 61).

Subjectivity and Identity

Post-structural theorists hold fast to terms such as the subject and subjectivity.[102]

They do so in critique of the humanist construct of the individual which they claim is "still

central to Western philosophy and political and social organization" (Weedon, 1987: 32).

> ...for poststructuralism, subjectivity is neither unified nor fixed. Unlike
> humanism, which implies a consciousness, knowing, unified, rational
> subject, poststructuralism theorizes subjectivity as a site of disunity and
> conflict, central to the process of political change and to preserving the
> status quo (Weedon, 1987: 21).

With regards to the issue of subjectivity, Luke shows how the agenda of post-

structuralism includes challenging the "liberal progressive discourses that make vocal

claims to social justice on behalf of marginalized groups while denying their own technologies of power" (Luke and Gore, 1992: 7). Part of the process of critical pedagogy is to become identified with one's individual identity, and through this process reclaim a sense of subjectivity which is generally removed in the traditional education systems (in the name of objective superiority). According to Orner, this subjective identity is intrinsically related to one's position within society.

> Feminist poststructuralist discourse views the struggle over identity within the subject as inseparable from the struggle over the meanings of identities and subject positions within the culture at large (Orner, 1992: 74).

The issues of subjectivity and identity awareness are crucial for the students or learners in a critical liberatory-transformative education situation. It is equally crucial, however, to be aware that an obsessive post-structural/postmodern focus on identity and the individual takes part in de-politicizing the collective struggle (which is key for a radical feminist agenda). The awareness can be of equal importance in the case of the educator.[103] As has been previously indicated, critical liberatory pedagogues hold important the issue of horizontal dialogue between the educator (teacher) and the learners (students). However, the erosion of the traditionally hierarchical relationship between the teacher and students is based on an assumption that the teacher is an unbiased, objective being who does not perpetuate her or his own conditioned forms of inequalities within the critical

---

[102] Chris Weedon offers the following definition: "Subjectivity is used to refer to the conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions of the individual, her sense of herself and her ways of understanding her relation to the world" (Weedon, 1987: 32). Weiler (1991: 467) also acknowledges that "[t]his kind of analysis considers the ways in which 'the subject' is not an object; that is, not fixed in a static social structure, but constantly being created, actively creating the self, and struggling for new ways of being in the world through new forms of discourse or new forms of social relationships."

115

education context. Elizabeth Ellsworth notes that, in fact, the teacher, or educator must also go through a process of coming to terms with her/his own place within a stratified society, and become aware of the interconnected effects of her/his 'isms' (Ellsworth, 1992: 99) Educators are not objective, and in order to avoid the reproduction of inequalities that characterize both formal education and society at large, they must be aware of their own subjective reality.[104]

Keeping this subjectivity of the educator in mind, however, must not be done in a post-structural/postmodern paralyzing method. Taking the subjectivity of the educator so seriously that s/he is rendered incapable of making any facilitation decisions, can also lead to an actionless pedagogical practice. Peter McLaren warns of this political paralysis:

> Unable to speak with any certainty, or with an absolute assurance [that] his or her pedagogy is untainted by any form of domination, the "post-critical" educator refuses to speak at all. This distressing position that has been assumed by some critical educators reminds me of a form of philosophical detachment of some social critics who, by constantly criticizing and radicalizing themselves on their path to universality, often fail to form a concrete praxis based on their own principles (McLaren, 1988: 72).

One of the assumptions of those who subscribe to what can be called identity politics (the focus on the subjective identity as being that which defines political stance and

---

[103] The inherent power held by the educator, is one point that, according to Kathleen Weiler (1991: 60) the early critical pedagogues missed in their theory. "...Freire fails to address the various forms of power held by teachers depending on their race, gender, and the historical and institutional settings in which they work."

[104] Suzanne Doerge (1992: 11) notes that although popular education among women may allow for the dissolving of the vertical relationship between educators and learners, "...such relationships can potentially become more pronounced if the educator does not recognize either her commonality with or differences from the women with whom she is learning or working. ...[T]he feminist educator needs to be in a constant process of learning with the participants about gender oppression that she and they have in common."

agenda), is that the identity of the political actor must first be acknowledged and awareness of that identity must be reached. This is necessary, it is assumed, for the elaboration of political interests and subsequent political action to be taken (Butler, 1990: 142). However, as critiques of post-structuralism/postmodernism point out, the result is an array of positions, the focus of which is difference. The danger of this is the potential for fragmentation of interests resulting in a diffusion of a common interest, which can ultimately result in the loss of a commitment to political action.[105]

By arguing that subjectivities are "constructed in language through the production and availability of diverse subject positions", postmodern theorists have developed a theory that essentially removes human agency (Giroux, 1992: 172).[106] Charlene Spretnack (1996: 321) notes that the obsession of postmodern theorists with "naming the disempowerment of everyone and everything" results in a "passivity that mocks any attempt to change the situation." Clearly, this fragmentation and resulting paralysis of practice is in direct contradiction to what a radical feminist liberatory-transformative agenda holds as necessary.

---

[105] Andrew Ross (1988: xiv) explains this well: "The result is an agenda appropriate to a modern Gramscian war of position; a field of heterogeneous positions and sometimes contradictory discourses, often with no common content and no overall guarantee of a progressive outcome."

[106] Peter McLaren elaborates on this de-politicization: "By locating the subject within the surface meaning of the image and by making our subjectivities so malleable, postmodern culture contributes unwittingly to the demise and depoliticization of the historical subject — literally suctioning its capacity for critical agency..." (McLaren, 1988;55).

117

Patriarchal Discourse of Critical Pedagogy Literature

Post-structural feminist critical pedagogues outline how critical pedagogy, because of its traditional links with formal education structures, has been entrenched in a patriarchal form of discourse. This, they claim, is due to the control that men have had, and continue to have, in academic circles. (The assumption these theorists are making is that it is only in the academy that theoretical discourse is created and analyzed!). Luke and Gore (1992: ix) word it this way: "Men, particularly in the academy, still claim discursive authority; women are still expected to identify their positions with theoretical signifiers that are fundamentally paternal."

These theorists show their discontent with the "patriarchy of schooling", and illustrate how the discourse of critical pedagogy has missed gender as a category of analysis (Luke and Gore, 1992: 8). For some feminist critical pedagogues, their understanding of critical pedagogy has come from materials written by men which stand outside the reality, position and identity of women readers. The prevailing literature on critical pedagogy, for them, is entrenched in patriarchy on the levels of knowledge, experience, institutions, and pedagogical relations (Luke and Gore, 1992: 3).

> Male authorship of theory...articulated from the standpoint of male experience, and conceptions of critique and action with which to realize visions for a better future, have historically situated the male individual at the center of theoretical, public discourse (Luke, 1992: 29).

Linked with this patriarchal theoretical backdrop for thought is the expression of male subjectivity as exemplified by the Frankfurt School's understanding of critical pedagogy.[107]

---

[107] For further explanation see Luke, 1992: 44

118

Their analysis, according to Luke, is derived from a phallocentric understanding of society and the learning process, and is therefore not applicable to explain the formation of identities in groups other than Western men (Luke, 1992: 44). Elizabeth Ellsworth argues that key issues related to the traditional literature on critical pedagogy, including "assumptions, goals and political practices" are part of a collection of "repressive myths that perpetuate relations of domination." She explains how terminologies such as: empowerment, student voice, dialogue, and critical are essentially analyzed in patriarchal, phallocentric and sexist terms (Ellsworth, 1992: 91).

Luke and Gore attempt to clarify some of the terminologies used by feminist critical pedagogues. They offer an understanding of "...the politics of knowledge and feminist identity in the academy as they are structured in...sexist, patriarchal, and phallocentric knowledge systems" (Luke and Gore, 1992: 192). Through a review of E. Grosz's article "The In(ter)vention of Feminist Knowledges",[108] Luke and Gore explore how mainstream knowledge (in formal education systems) is informed by intellectual misogyny on the three levels of sexism, patriarchy and phallocentrism. Sexist knowledge is derived from various discriminatory acts which place men into a position of superiority over women, privileging the former and depriving the latter. Patriarchal knowledge is "the scaffold which supports the structural organization and differential valuation of women and men; it serves to validate sexist knowledges" (Luke and Gore, 1992: 196). Phallocentric knowledge is based on the masculine as being the model from which the feminine is constructed. "Women", Grosz claims, "are construed on the model of the

---

masculine, whether in terms of sameness/identity, opposition/distinction, or complementarity."[109] The importance of these levels of knowledge, post-structuralists claim, is that they can be reflected in a critical pedagogical model which attempts to overcome barriers to an egalitarian learning process.[110]

Interestingly, a radical feminist critique of post-structuralism/postmodernism lays the same claim: that it in itself is patriarchal and sexist.[111] Somer Brodribb (1992: 299) offers this critique: "...I argue that it is precisely the masculine which is meant by and in post-modern texts. Their positions and arguments cannot be uncritically extended to women - to do so would render women's experiences invisible." Denise Thompson agrees, noting that the "master-texts" of the postmodern canon are characterized by male supremacy, "...whose authors authoritatively deny their own authority, and hence their own responsibility as agents within the privileged locations where those works are produced" (Thompson, 1996: 338). Ironically, the very tool that post-structural/postmodern academics use to disrupt the "masculinist voice" is the "Master's tool of deconstruction" (Singh, 1995: 201), in essence perpetuating the supremacy of academic theory over grassroots practice.

The post-structural/postmodern stance that critical pedagogy literature and theories are patriarchal in nature can also be reflected back on the theorists that make

---

[108] Originally in B. Caine, E. Grosz and M. de Lepervanche (eds.), 1988. Crossing Boundaries, pp. 92-106, Sydney:Allen & Unwin.

[109] Originally in Grosz, 1988: 94-95.

[110] Ironically, inequalities can be reproduced within this model of pedagogy which claims to allow for the emancipation from relations of inequalities. This is discussed further in the following sub-section of this chapter.

these claims. "...[B]y locating the political and theoretical problematic in invidious and hierarchical distinctions between women, 'postmodern' feminism reproduces the same paternalistic and patronizing attitudes it is supposedly challenging" (Thompson, 1996: 332).

Reproducing Inequalities in a Critical Popular Education Experience

> [T]o grant classroom time to female students, to democratize the classroom speech situation, and to encourage marginal groups to make public what is personal and private does not alter theoretically or practically those gendered structural divisions upon which liberal capitalism and its knowledge industries are based (Luke, 1992: 37).

Critical pedagogy, under certain conditions, can be said to reproduce inequalities which are intrinsic to Western social and political thought and practice. This is a claim made by some post-structural feminist critical pedagogues, noting the irony that critical pedagogy claims to be a method by which inequalities can be overcome. Orner shows one example of this in her analysis of student voice. She critiques the structural assumptions in traditional critical pedagogy discourse on silence and speaking within the critical education context which see the silence of the learner as internalized oppression,[112] resistance or false consciousness. She proposes that in fact it could be considered repressive for a

---

[111] For more detail, see Brodribb, 1992: xxviii.

[112] A personal account of self-identified internalized oppression and subsequent silence is passionately written by Ann-Louise Brookes (1992: 155). Writing about her personal experiences with sexual abuse and violence, she says: "Not able to write about [the] abuse because of perceived taboos, I was *silenced*, and I silenced myself. Silenced, I implicitly agreed to the reproduction of the male-defined forms and practices which explicitly organized me ... Silenced, I maintained the status quo. This method worked so very well because I accepted the illusions of the male-organized society which believes that I was to blame."

teacher to demand that students speak, and that student silence may be a way for them to speak more loudly than they would with words (Omer, 1992: 81).

Elizabeth Ellsworth offers an analysis of her own experience as a teacher in a critical classroom (in an attempt to have a critical education context within a formal education structure) and the resulting perpetuation of inequalities in it. She writes about her experience teaching a course at the University of Wisconsin - Madison in 1988; "Media and Anti-Racist Pedagogies". Ellsworth, as a facilitator of the class, in conjunction with her students, used the ideas from the existing literature on empowerment, student voice and dialogue. In doing so, they found that they "...actually exacerbated the very conditions [they] were trying to work against, including Eurocentrism, racism, classism, and 'banking education'" (Ellsworth, 1992: 91).

Ellsworth notes that differences among students in a critical classroom are antagonistic. "She suggests not only that there is little common ground for addressing these differences, but that separatism is the only valid political option for any kind of pedagogical and political action" (Giroux, 1988: 177). Ellsworth's analysis represents an example of the inability of a post-structural/postmodern approach to liberatory-transformative pedagogy to be engaged in a true emancipatory process.[113] It represents, in the words of Giroux (1988: 177),

> a crippling form of political disengagement. It reduces one to paralysis in the face of such differences. It ignores the necessity of exploring differences for the specific irreducible interests they represent, for excesses and reactionary positions they may produce, and for the pedagogical possibilities they contain for helping students to work with other groups as

---

[113] For a scathing critique of Ellsworth's technique of analysis, see McLaren, 1988: 72.

part of a collective attempt at developing a radical language of democratic public life.

Contemporary feminist critical pedagogues and thinkers have offered important additions to the literature on critical education. Their writings are necessary additions in that they offer post-structural/postmodern and radical feminist critiques of the traditional critical literature on the subject of emancipatory or liberatory-transformative education. Post-structural/postmodern theorists touch on an array of issues, most importantly those that deal with: the deconstruction of concepts as they are used in critical education theory and thought; the acknowledgment of polarized or binary forms of analysis that characterize Western thought and result in the deterioration of the egalitarian nature of critical education; the importance of subjectivity in critical education; the patriarchal, sexist and phallocentric nature of traditional critical pedagogy literature; and the reproduction of social inequalities within critical pedagogical practice. These critiques, and the debates surrounding them, continue to be issues of contention within the radical discourse on critical, liberatory, empowering, emancipatory popular education.

The obsession post-structural/postmodern theorists exhibit with relation to deconstruction, binaries, and subjectivity has given radical feminists (and pedagogues) fodder for critiquing them. A feminist struggle that includes the use of a liberatory-transformative pedagogy must be committed to radical, political, and transformative action. Radical feminist critical pedagogues should therefore discard the theoretical foci of the academic post-structural/postmodern theorists, which serve to de-politicize, fragment

123

individuals from each other, and paralyze struggles in what optimally should be a political, collective, liberatory, and transformative theory and practice: praxis.

3. Debate between Integrative Feminisms and Post-structural/Postmodern Feminisms

The previous section of this paper outlines some of the fundamental propositions of post-structural/postmodern theorists with relation to liberatory-transformative pedagogy (theory and practice). The propositions are briefly examined and critiqued by Integrative feminist positions. This section places the debates between the non-Integrative feminisms (post-structural/postmodern) and the Integrative feminisms (radical and global) into a context of social and political mobilization for action. In doing so, it is argued that the Integrative feminist views of praxis, linked with an Integrated Feminist GAD approach to development with the use of popular education, results in a development process that is truly emancipatory, liberatory, critical, and transformative.

Integrative Feminisms and Diversity[114]

Although Integrative feminists range in the work they do, there are some fundamental propositions that unite them. These include:

- placing emphasis on the need for feminists to organize autonomously, as well as working within male-dominated institutions;
- affirming the development of innovative processes and political agendas;

---

[114] See Chapter One for an introduction to and elaboration of Integrative feminisms.

124

- "accepting the tremendous personal-political strain and excitement involved in refusing to sacrifice means to ends, process to product";

- rejecting feminisms that see struggles as targeting separate women's issues, and promoting feminism as "a perspective on the whole of society";

- "resisting all dominations, including those of race and class and colonialism, without subordinating women's oppression or treating it as a derivative";

- placing attention on and persisting in the struggle to work towards a "solidarity and sisterhood among women not only despite but through their diversity"; and

- rejecting the separation of social, political, spiritual, public, and private elements of life that are perpetuated by a patriarchal and capitalist society (Miles, 1996: 29).

As discussed in Chapter One, Integrative feminists place significance on the diversity of women and the diversity of their differences from men. They do so without relying on theories of biological determinism.[115] "They articulate these differences," according to Angela Miles (1996: 37), "...not as women's essence or as the source of women's automatic essential voice but as the material and physical ground from which diverse women, through conscious political struggle, can build the power to articulate specific interests and alternative integrative values." It is crucial that this "integrative political articulation of difference" not be confused with expressions of diversity and identity that serve to merely tolerate difference (i.e., "reductionist, apolitical, vanguardist,

---

[115] Biological determinism argues that the "feminine" or social nature of "woman" is defined in total or in part by their biology i.e., their function as child-bearers.

essentialist," etc.,) (Miles, 1996: 40). Radical Integrative feminists understand the theoretical and practical importance of seeing difference without placing emphasis on opposition. The emphasis placed on specificity and commonality by Integrative feminists points to a necessity of viewing feminism through the lens of *"unity without sameness* and *difference without domination"* (Miles,1996: 44, emphasis as in original).

The (Male)[116] Supremacy of Theory

At the core of the debate between post-structural/postmodern theoretical positions and radical Integrative feminist positions on liberatory-transformative pedagogy is the gap between theory and practice. The former camp places far too much emphasis on the theoretical, essentially forgetting that a critical and liberatory struggle is something actually done by people. The latter camps remind us of the importance of being practical.[117] This is not to say that some post-structural/postmodern theorists are not involved in the practical, some are. However, their analysis becomes so abstract that the practical is over shadowed by the academic supremacy given to the theoretical. Nor is this divide meant to suggest that Integrative and radical feminists are not involved in the making and application of theoretical analysis. Of course they are. They, however, do not place supremacy on it, overshadowing the practical everyday hands-on struggle of the

---

[116] The idea that postmodernism is in fact a masculine theoretical stance is popular among radical feminists. Somer Brodribb (1992: 19) adds this analysis: "It is my contention that postmodernism is a masculine ideology based on a notion of consciousness as hostile, and an epistemology of negation which is one of separation, discontinuity and dismemberment."

[117] Jane Kenway (1995: 43) offers this in relation to radical feminist's focus on the practical: "They too reject claims by some postmodernist feminists that negative critique, deconstruction or parody is the best we have to offer and note the importance both of feminist utopias and visions and of political mobilizations."

average (not necessarily educated) woman.[118] The most important element is the praxis, where the practical and theoretical meet.

Denise Thompson reminds us that many feminist post-structural/postmodern writers do their work with the assumption that feminist theory is created by white, middle-class women of the North, who do so in the confines of academic institutions. This, she claims, is simply not true, as Integrative feminists and Global feminists would argue: "To assert that it is predominantly white, middle-class women who do feminist theory is an elitist exclusion which denies feminism's origins in the lived experiences of women" (Thompson, 1996: 332).

It is myopic of post-structural/postmodern academics to claim as their own the importance (in a pedagogical context) of understanding historical location and educators helping learners to understand the ways in which their realities (identities) are influenced and structured by their engagement within global relationships of difference and dominance. This is not unique to the new theoretical perspectives. Radicals from the 1970's and 1980's have made these claims, and have practiced this nurturing of understanding (in both the field of critical pedagogy and radical feminism).

---

[118] Fraser and Nicholson (1988: 92) offer an analysis of the difference between the ivory tower theories of the postmodern theorists versus the practically oriented political struggle of the grassroots: "...whereas postmodernists have been drawn to such views by a concern with the status of philosophy, feminists have been led to them by the demands of political practice. This practical interest has saved feminist theory from many of the mistakes of postmodernism: women whose theorizing was to serve the struggle against sexism were not about to abandon powerful political tools merely as a result of intramural debates in professional philosophy."

Postmodern theorists have taken part in disregarding and suppressing a truly radical and Integrative feminist voice, one that is committed to liberatory-transformative education processes as part of an overall development process that sees the removal of social inequalities. Craig Owens calls this "an insistent feminist voice".

> The absence of discussions of sexual difference in writings about postmodernism, as well as the fact that few women have engaged in the modernism/postmodernism debate, suggest that postmodernism may be another masculine invention engineered to exclude women (Owens, 1983: 61).

Clearly, what is necessary for an Integrative liberatory-transformative, political, and feminist process (that includes critical education and collective organizational structure) is to challenge these theoretical stances that do not have room for praxis.[119]

De-politicization, Disempowerment, and Critical Stasis

> Postmodernism exults female oblivion and disconnection; it has no model for the acquisition of knowledge, for making connections, for communication, or for becoming global, which feminism has done and will continue to do (Brodribb, 1992: xix).

Radical feminist struggles (Integrative feminisms) are committed to radical political transformative action. To maintain this commitment, it is crucial that Integrative feminists turn their backs on post-structural/postmodern views, which essentially de-politicize issues, disempower individuals from collective action, and perpetuate a critical stasis

---

[119] Somer Brodribb passionately calls for this shift toward an Integrative feminist agenda: "What is necessary now is feminist thinking that does not take on the masculine construction of a question, and begins with a more complex way of conceptualizing, says goodbye to all that, in a disruption of the framework posed by a masculinist methodology concerned with and concealing its subjectivity, reducing the breath and breadth of female impulse and desire. We need women's work that ... sees the incongruity of seeking in masculine paradigms a process that is without our content, or content that is without our process, refuses the silencing of women by the masculinization of the feminist project, and the feminization of patriarchy by ... postmodernism" (Brodribb, 1992: 147).

(Sim, 1992: 134). The gap between theory and practice is evident between the divergent frameworks of post-structuralism/postmodernism and Integrative feminism in that "[t]here is no counterpart to poststructuralist [and postmodernist] theory in grassroots practice..." (Miles, 1996: 73).

There is a fundamental contradiction between feminism, on one hand, which is necessarily political in nature, and postmodernism on the other hand, which breaks down any potential for political practice. For this reason, it is conceptually incorrect to claim that there is such a thing as "postmodern feminism". A reason for the inability of postmodernism to support political practice by its adherents is that it does not challenge structures of domination. "While feminism needs to be able to identify domination in general, and male domination in particular, in order to challenge it, post-modernism refuses to identify, and hence cannot contest, relations of domination and subordination" (Thompson, 1996: 325).

In the 1980's and 1990's, two forms of expressions of identity have emerged. One form is characterized by the post-structural/postmodern "...reductionist (sometimes even essentialist) expressions of identity that undermine solidarity and sisterhood among women." The other form is the Integrative political expressions of identity that recognize "...power differences among women and [are] consciously designed to build on women's diversity" (Miles, 1996: 59).

Angela Miles notes that in the 1990's, there is an apparent rise in the feminist organizations that are identified with particular identities (identity politics). She claims, as do many radical Integrative feminists, that "the resulting growth of identity-based activism

has involved an increase in exclusive, apolitical expressions of identity..." [120] (Miles, 1996: 52). This process of depoliticization has to do with the post-structural/postmodern habit of deconstructing identity positions in such a way as to mix meaning and text, allowing any subjective position to be constructed of its opposite. At a theoretical level, apolitical post-structural/postmodern theorists are detached from political action because of their primary focus (obsession) with text and language through the act of deconstruction.

With the post-structural/postmodern primacy given to subjectivity and the identity of the individual, there is a shift away from the process of collective struggle. This is a fundamental rift between radical Integrative feminist practice (which necessarily requires liberatory-transformative praxis) and post-structural/postmodern theorizing. The former places emphasis on the collective consciousness development required for a truly radical and critical social transformation.[121] As well, the subjectivity emphasis dislocates the educator in a critical education process from the learners, resulting in fragmentation and a political paralysis (McLaren, 1988: 72). The post-structural/postmodern focus on difference without the necessary (Integrative feminist) balance with commonality removes the basis for solidarity which is needed for collective and transformative action. As Peter McLaren notes (1988: 63),"...we need to find ways in which we can intervene in

---

[120] It should be acknowledged that Miles also sees some identity-based activism as transformative in nature. For some of them, she notes, "...organizing around specific yet broad identities (...as poor mothers, prostitutes, and Black women) is a basis for consciously including far more diverse women than would otherwise be possible. The groups foster communication and inclusion among their members and break down divisions imposed and enforced by structures of power" (1996: 53).

[121] Regarding consciousness raising and feminist struggles, Angela Miles (1996: 79) notes the integral process of collective work: "The core practice of consciousness raising is nothing if not a commitment to the collective work necessary to build political understandings of common systems of oppression from diverse experience."

130

dominant cultural and political formations so that we can be attentive to difference, while

sharing a 'common ethos' of solidarity, struggle, and liberation."

CONCLUSION

This chapter has reviewed and critically examined the literature that looks at

liberatory-transformative education including both popular education and critical

pedagogy. The first section explored the early discussions on popular education and

placed the writings into a radical framework. A re-examination of the mainstream

frameworks defining both education and development practice showed how the

perspectives taken by these frameworks do not fit with the notions of popular education in that

they do not allow for a critical and participatory action-oriented form of development. The

argument stemming from this is that it is crucial to find a methodology and conceptual

framework which radically questions and analyzes practices of knowledge gathering and

transfer (research and education) that are based on traditional (mainstream) goals and

assumptions. The important conclusions of this section point to the need for a liberatory-

transformative pedagogy to include elements that support an empowerment process.

This section also pointed to an important analysis offered by contemporary

theorists and practitioners of critical pedagogy: the rethinking of Paulo Freire's work as it

relates to feminist struggles and feminist critical pedagogy. The conclusion from this

analysis is that a radical feminist struggle that includes the use of a liberatory-

transformative pedagogy must be committed to radical political transformative action,

especially as it relates to the development process.

The second section of this chapter outlined the assertions and arguments existing in the contemporary post-structural/postmodern academic writing on the topic of feminist critical pedagogy. Radical feminist critiques of these were also offered. The arguments explored included: the process of deconstruction; the continued existence of binaries in critical pedagogy; subjectivity and learning; patriarchal discourse in the academic realm of critical pedagogy; and the potential for inequalities to be reproduced in a popular education experience. Through examining the critiques of these arguments and assertions, a number of crucial conclusions were made. Firstly, the very tool that post-structural/postmodern academics use to debunk what some call the masculinist voice, is in itself a patriarchal tool, and takes part in perpetuating the supremacy of academic theory over grassroots practice. Secondly, post-structural/postmodern deconstructive criticism allows theorists to remove themselves from practice by obsessing over text, meaning and semantics, resulting in apolitical theorizing. Thirdly, following the apolitical nature of deconstructive criticism, post-structural/postmodern theorists can detach themselves from any position - claiming that any position (theoretical or practical) can be composed of its opposite. The result is a fragmented theoretical stance that means one does not have to be involved in any action or solution to the identified problem. Fourthly, and finally, this section concludes that feminist struggles that include the use of a liberatory-transformative pedagogy must be committed to radical, political, and transformative action. Radical feminist critical pedagogues should therefore discard the theoretical foci of the academic post-structural/postmodern theorists, which serve to de-politicize, fragment individuals from each other, and paralyze struggles in what optimally should be a political, collective, liberatory, and transformative theory and practice: praxis.

132

The third and final section of this chapter provided a summary of the debates between the radical Integrative Feminists stance and those of the post-structural/postmodern theorists. The former was argued to be the base upon which a development process using popular education tools can bridge the gap between de-politicized theory and radical, collective, liberatory and transformative practice through praxis. At the core of the debate is the apparent gap between theory and practice. Post-structural/postmodern theorists, as argued in this chapter, place too much emphasis on the theoretical, essentially forgetting that a critical and liberatory struggle is something actually done by people. The radical Integrative feminists remind us of the importance of being practical. Contemporary radical feminist theories (Integrated feminisms, Gender and Development, Global feminism, etc.,) were shown to view oppression as a more holistic concept, found in levels relating to class as well as gender and race. It was argued that for radical feminists to maintain a commitment to liberatory-transformative action, feminist critical pedagogues must disregard the academic and purely theoretical stance of the post-structural/postmodern theorists which ultimately de-politicizes and fragments individuals from what should be a political, collective liberatory-transformative praxis.

The final conclusion to this chapter is that the Integrative feminist views of praxis, linked with an Integrated Feminist GAD approach to development with the use of popular education, results in a development process that is truly emancipatory, liberatory, critical, and transformative.

CONCLUSION: WHAT MIGHT ALL OF THIS REALLY MEAN?

This thesis, as stated in the introductory section, explores the intersection of development, feminism and critical popular education. At the various intersections of these three components there are methodological issues, practical contradictions, and theoretical debates. Through exploring these issues, contradictions and debates, I have come up with a model that could be offered to the fields of development, feminism and critical education, to provide the basis on which a truly transformative and liberatory, radical, and feminist development process can take place. The model offered is called the Integrated FeministGender And Development framework, and it may fill the gap between de-politicized theory and critical transformative practice, namely; praxis. Two sets of conclusions stem from the discussions and arguments outlined in these chapters. Both look at how the original argument can be translated into action. The first set of conclusions looks at the contexts in which popular education with an Integrated Feminist GAD approach might be most likely to succeed. The second set of conclusions looks at what a real shift toward praxis might mean for people working within the realm of academics.

1. In What Contexts Might Popular Education With An Integrated Feminist GAD Approach Be Most Likely To Succeed?

From the examples given in the previous chapters of this thesis, a range of characteristics in specific situations and contexts have proved to be either successful or unsuccessful for a truly liberatory-transformative praxis. The successful characteristics that

fit with the Integrated Feminist GAD approach point to where this approach might be fruitful for future action.

The first set of these characteristics is that the practice should be based upon a radical view, namely, one that necessarily challenges the *status quo*, and one that understands the relationships between development, education, and the process of social transformation. Inherent in this radical view is the adherence to a "bottom-up" strategy, one that acknowledges the necessity for the beneficiaries of development and education processes to be agents of them, to define them, and to implement them through their fullest participation possible.

A second characteristic set fundamental to the success of the Integrated Feminist GAD approach is that while making sure that the strategic interests of a community are addressed through people-centered development and education processes, those using the approach are also committed to taking into account the practical and strategic interests of women in particular. In doing so, practitioners draw on empowerment models of development and education practices, and link their work with Global feminist initiatives. This new Integrated Feminist GAD framework integrates the premises from which a GAD analytical approach is drawn, and links it with socialist feminist theories, Global feminist practice, and Integrative feminisms. The result is a framework that places emphasis on a holistic analysis of the social relations of gender through a foundation that includes the contradictions and inter-relatedness of class, race, gender, and development. In this holistic analysis, it places into focus how and why gender is related to other forms of social inequalities. Development work and education informed by this framework can effect social change. This approach, it is argued, sees the fundamental restructuring of

135

social institutions and social structures as the solution to the unequal allocation of status, power, and resources in the world.

Popular education is, both at theoretical and practical levels, a collection of very effective alternative techniques by which women's needs, situations and subordinate positions in societies can be viewed, analyzed, and acted upon. It has much to offer both development theory and practice, as well as education theory and practice. It is for these reasons that this thesis has argued that popular education is the method by which development and education practice can meld with an Integrated Feminist GAD perspective. Characteristics that make its melding with the Integrated Feminist GAD approach most successful include: the process of developing a collective consciousness and the resulting identification of individual and collective issues of concern upon which transformation strategies are built; the involvement of participants in social action in order to change structures in which inequalities are embedded and perpetuated; and the use of participants' own cultures, social realities, and daily lived experiences as vehicles for their own education and resulting development strategies.

Clearly, in order to truly assess the success of a development and/or education praxis, one must come up with a model for assessing these characteristics in practice. Qualitative indicators are always difficult to assess, and quantitative indicators might not be the most appropriate for the assessment of the success of a liberatory-transformative process. Further research in both theory and practice would be appropriate in this regard.

2. What A Real Shift To Praxis Might Mean

Throughout this thesis, it has been argued that there are perceived to be fundamental contradictions between theory and practice with regards to feminist struggles, development processes, and liberatory-transformative pedagogy. Components of both mainstream and radical theories have been shown to de-politicize, fragment and institutionalize what should optimally be radical, transformative and liberatory practice. The third chapter brought these contradictions into the perspective of divergent theoretical, conceptual, and practical frameworks: post-structural/postmodern positions on one hand (that were argued to perpetuate the gap between theory and practice), and radical Integrative feminisms and the work done through what is termed the Integrated Feminist GAD framework, on the other hand (that are shown to bridge the gap between theory and practice through praxis).

The challenge for development practitioners, pedagogues and feminists regarding the above arguments and discussions is to integrate theory and practice so as to avoid the contradictions between the two. There are a number of things that are worth considering if a real shift toward praxis were to happen. There is, of course, no way to know exactly how this shift would impact academia, but it is interesting to speculate. Obviously, these also are areas for further research and action.

If the gaps between theory and practice are reduced or removed, what does this mean for the accepted conception of "theory"? Does it necessarily need to change? In what direction? It has been argued that theory is given supremacy over the practical, especially within the academic realm. How might this result in barriers toward the widespread acceptance of praxis? Perhaps "theory" needs redefining. Maybe the

137

academics need to seriously look into how they define "theory" to be made, and who has the power to do so. Letting go of some of their power over the theoretical might be a place to begin this process. This, however, seems to be an unlikely step. Perhaps it is up to the powerful in the academic realm to look to those with practical insights into development, pedagogy and feminism to have more impact on the defining of the theoretical. Of course, ultimately, there should be no division between the two. Maybe "academia" needs to be redefined to include the more hands-on, grassroots realm.

On another level, one must consider the institutional milieu in which this praxis might emerge. Mainstream discourses perpetuate the supremacy of the theoretical over the practical. It follows, therefore, that the academies and institutions would have to change their discourses to accept (for example) theory embodied in popular education forms like theatre, fotonovellas, or narrative. How would this happen? What might be the barriers to this process? And how would these barriers be removed? Research on this issue would necessitate academics working closely with popular education, alternative development, and Integrative feminist practitioners on an equal basis.

It could be argued that the move toward real praxis would also result in a necessary change in the nature of academic "research". It could no longer consist simply of "reading the literature", but instead would require working hands-on with oppressed or marginalized groups, and critiquing "the literature" as one learns with and from these groups. This would be a truly radical change, and could potentially have its own barriers to fruition. How would this change come about?

Clearly, there are many considerations to keep in mind for the articulation of the movement toward true praxis. Just as a focus on praxis would necessarily change how

138

academics, development practitioners, feminists, pedagogues, and other professionals work with and for marginalized peoples, it might also change how the professionals work with and communicate with each other. This, in a sense, might provide an answer to the circular ruminations of the post-structural/postmodern theorists, especially around their obsessions with deconstruction and subjectivity.

Despite the questions and potential difficulties noted above, the Integrated Feminist GAD approach offers a real opportunity to change not only the conditions of oppressed communities, but also the professional and academic structures that work for them. This is crucial if the shift toward praxis is going to happen. Furthermore, the Integrated Feminist GAD framework, for all the reasons already mentioned, is a way to stimulate not just development, but also change toward alleviating and/or removing inequalities in gender and economic relations.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Afkhami, Mahnaz. 1996, "Towards Global Feminism: A Muslim Perspective" in Diane
    Bell and Renate Klein (eds.) Radically Speaking: Feminism Reclaimed. Spinifex,
    Australia, pp. 525-527.

Allen, Tim and Alan Thomas (eds.). 1992, Poverty and Development in the 1990s, Oxford
    University Press, The Open University, Oxford.

Arnold, Rick; Deborah Barndt; and Bev Burke. n.d., A New Weave: Popular Education in
    Canada and Central America, CUSO Development Education Centre and OISE
    Adult Education Department, Toronto.

Aronowitz, Stanley. 1993, "Paulo Freire's Radical Democratic Humanism" in P. McLaren
    and P. Leonard (eds.) Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter, Routledge, New York.
    pp. 8-24.

Barndt, Deborah. 1989, Naming the Moment: Political Analysis for Action, Jesuit Centre
    for Social Action, Toronto.

Barry, Kathleen. 1996, "Deconstructing Deconstructionism (or Whatever Happened to
    Feminist Studies?)" in Diane Bell and Renate Klein (eds.) Radically Speaking:
    Feminism Reclaimed, Spinifex, Australia, pp. 188-192.

Bernard, A. and M. Gayfer. 1983, "Women Hold Up Half the Sky: A Third World
    Perspective on Women and Non-Formal Education for Development; Report of a
    Project and Workshop of the International Council for Adult Education"
    International Council for Adult Education, Women's Program, Toronto.

Bhave, Vinoba. (n.d.), "Education or Manipulation?" an article found at the World
    University Service of Canada symposium held in 1995 at Saint Mary's University,
    Halifax.

Bishop, Anne. 1988, "Cartoon and Soap Operas: Popular Education in a Nova Scotia Fish
    Plant" in Convergence, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 27-29.

---- 1994, Becoming An Ally: Breaking the Cycle of Oppression, Fernwood Press,
    Halifax.

Brett, April. 1991, "Introduction: Why Gender is a Development Issue" in T. Wallace and
    C. March (eds.) Changing Perspectives: Writings on Gender and Development,
    OXFAM, Oxford. pp. 1-7.

Bricker-Jenkins, Mary, and Nancy Hooyman. 1987, "Feminist Pedagogy in Education for Social Change" in Feminist Teacher, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 36-42.

Brodribb, Somer. 1992, Nothing Matters: A Feminist Critique of Postmodernism, Spinifex Press, Australia.

Brookes, Anne-Louise. 1992, Feminist Pedagogy: An Autobiographical Approach, Fernwood, Halifax.

Bunch, Charlotte. 1992, "Global Feminism and Diversity" in Women and Development: Challenges for the Future, Conference Proceedings, No. 3. Spirals, Women's Studies Program, University of Ottawa.

Burkey, Stan. 1993, "What is Development?" in People First: A Guide to Self-Reliant, Participatory, Rural Development, Zed Books, New York.

Butler, Judith. 1990, Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity, Routledge, New York.

Cadena, Felix. 1991, "Transformational Learning" in Shara Merriam (ed.) New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education: An Update on Adult Learning Theory, No. 57, Spring, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cardoso, Fernando Henrique; and Enzo Faletto. 1979, Dependency and Development In Latin America, University of California Press, London.

CCIC and MATCH. Aug. 1991, Two Halves Make A Whole: Balancing Gender Relations in Development, pp. 32-34.

CEAAL, Women's Network. 1985, "Taller Andino do Metodologia de Educacion Popular entre Mujeres" Final Report, Quito, Ecuador.

Clark, Carolyn. 1993, "Transformational Learning" in Sharan Merriam (ed.) New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education: An Update on Adult Learning Theory, No. 57, Spring, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Culbertson, Debbie. 1995, Doing The Gender Boogie: Power, Participation and Economic Justice, A Popular Education and Action Guide, Ten Days for World Development, Toronto.

CUSO. 1989, Popular Education Resource Book, CUSO, Ottawa.

DAWN (Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era). 1987, Development, Crises, and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives, Gita Sen and Caren Grown (eds.) Monthly Review Press, New York.

Doerge, Suzanne. 1992, "Feminist Popular Education: Transforming the World from Where Women Stand" Masters of Education thesis, Department of Adult Education, OISE, Toronto.

ECAF and SIGAD. 1994, <u>Gender-Sensitive Policies for Sustainable Livelihood Security: Guidelines for People-Centered Research and its Implementation</u>, Nairobi.

Eisenstadt, S.N. 1968, "Transformation of Social, Political, and Cultural Orders in Modernization" in S.N. Eisenstadt (ed.) <u>Comparative Perspectives On Social Change</u>, Little, Brown and Company, Boston. pp. 256-279.

Ellsworth, Elizabeth. 1989, "Why Doesn't This Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy" in <u>Harvard Educational Review</u>, Vol. 59, No. 3 pp. 297-324. Reprinted in Luke, Carmen, and Jennifer Gore (eds.). 1992. <u>Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy</u>, Routledge, New York. pp. 90-119.

Elson, D. 1992, "From Survival Strategies to Transformation Strategies: Women's Needs and Structural Adjustment" in L. Beneria and S. Feldman (eds.) <u>Unequal Burden</u>, Westview Press, Boulder. pp. 26-48.

Eyoh, Hansel Ndumbe. 1987, "Theatre, Adult Education, and Development: A Workshop at Kumba (Cameroon)" in <u>International Foundation for Development Alternatives Dossier</u>, July/August, Vol. 60. Nyon, Switzerland.

Fagerlind, Ingemar; and Lawrence Saha. 1992, <u>Education and National Development: A Comparative Perspective</u>, Second edition, Pergamon, Oxford.

Frank, Andre Gunder. 1975, <u>On Capitalist Underdevelopment</u>, Oxford University Press, Bombay.

Fraser, Nancy and Linda Nicholson. 1988, "Social Criticism without Philosophy: An Encounter Between Feminism and Postmodernism" in A. Ross(ed.). <u>Universal Abandon?: the Politics of Postmodernism</u>, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp. 83-104.

Freire, Paulo. 1969, <u>Education for Critical Consciousness</u>, Continuum, New York.

---- 1972 and 1990, <u>Pedagogy of the Oppressed</u>, Penguin, New York.

---- 1985, <u>The Politics of Education</u>, Continuum, New York.

---- 1989, <u>Popular Culture, Schooling, And Everyday Life. Critical Studies In Education Series</u>, Bergin and Garvey, Grenby, Mass.

Freire, Paulo and Donaldo Macedo. 1993, "A Dialogue with Paulo Freire" in P. McLaren and P. Leonard (eds.) Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter, Routledge, New York. pp. 169-176.

French, Joan. 1987, "Organizing Women through Drama in Rural Jamaica" in Miranda Davies (ed.) Third World Second Sex, second edition, Zed Books, London, pp. 147-154.

Gatt-Fly. 1983, Ah-Hah! A New Approach to Popular Education, Between the Lines, Toronto.

Giroux, Henry. 1988, "Border Pedagogy in the Age of Postmodernism" in Journal of Education, Vol. 170, No. 3, Boston University, pp. 163-181.

---- 1992, Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education, Routledge, New York.

Gore, Jennifer. 1990, "What Can We Do For You! What Can We Do For You? Struggling over Empowerment in Critical and Feminist Pedagogy" in Educational Foundations, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp. 5-26. Reprinted in Luke and Gore (eds.). 1992, Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy, Routledge, New York.

Gottlieb, Esther, and Thomas La Belle. 1990, "Ethnographic Contextualization of Freire's Discourse: Consciousness-Raising, Theory and Practice" in Anthropology and Education Quarterly, March, Vol. 21, No. 1. pp. 3-18.

Goulet, Denis. 1986, "Three Rationalities in Development Decision-Making" in World Development, Vol. 14, No. 2, pp. 301-317.

Grosz, E. 1988 "The In(ter)vention of Feminist Knowledges" in Caine, B.; E. Grosz and M. de Lepervanche (eds.) Crossing Boundaries: Feminisms and the Critique of Knowledges, pp.92-106, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.

Hall, Bud. 1992, "From Margins to Centre: The Development and Purpose of Participatory Research" in American Sociologist, Winter, pp. 15-28.

Hettne, B. 1990, Development Theory and the Three Worlds, Wiley, New York.

Hoff, Joan. 1996, "The Pernicious Effect of Post-Structuralism on Women's History" in Diane Bell and Renate Klein (eds.) Radically Speaking: Feminism Reclaimed, Spinifex, Australia, pp. 393-416.

[H]ooks, bell. 1993, "bell hooks Speaking About Paulo Freire - The Man and His Work" in P. McLaren and P. Leonard (eds.) Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter, Routledge, New York. pp. 146-154.

Huyssen, Andreas. 1990, "Mapping the Postmodern" in Linda Nicholson (ed.) Feminism/Postmodernism, Routledge, New York, pp. 234-277.

International Council on Adult Education (ICAE). 1988, "Focus on Participatory Research" in Convergence, Vol. 21, No. 2/3.

Jagger, A. and Rothenberg. 1984, Feminist Framework: Alternative Accounts of the Relations Between Men and Women, Second Edition, McGraw Hill, New York.

Jahan, Rounaq. 1995, The Elusive Agenda: Mainstreaming Women in Development, Zed Books, London.

Jaquette, J.S. 1982, "Women and Modernization Theory: a Decade of Criticism" in World Politics, No. 39, pp. 267-289.

---- 1989, Women's Movement in Latin America: Feminism and the Transition to Democracy, Unwin Hyman, Boston.

Jeria, Jorge. 1990, "Popular Education: Models that Contribute to the Empowerment of Learners in Minority Communities" in New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, Winter, No. 48. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Fransisco, pp. 93-100.

Joyce, Catherine. (n.d.), "Gender and Development: An Introduction" OXFAM GAD Pamphlet, Canada.

Kenway, Jane and Helen Modra. 1989, "Feminist Pedagogy and Emancipatory Possibilities," in Critical Pedagogy Networker, Vol. 2, Nos. 2&3. Reprinted in Luke and Gore (eds.). 1992, Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy, Routledge, New York.

Kenway, Jane. 1995, "Having a Postmodernist Turn or Postmodernist *Angst*: A Disorder Experienced by an Author Who is not Yet Dead or Even Close to it" in R. Smith and P. Wexler (eds.) After Post-Modernism: Education, Politics and Identity, Falmer Press, London, pp. 36-55.

Kipnis, Laura. 1988, "Feminism: The Political Conscience of Postmodernism?" in A. Ross(ed.). Universal Abandon?: the Politics of Postmodernism, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp. 149-166.

Lather, Patti. 1991, Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/In the Postmodern, Routledge, New York.

Leonard, Peter. 1993, "Critical Pedagogy and State Welfare: Intellectual Encounters with Freire and Gramsci, 1974-1986" in P. McLaren and P. Leonard (eds.) Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter, Routledge, New York. pp. 155-168.

Levitt, Kari. (n.d.), "The State of Development Studies" Occasional Paper No. 92.1, International Development Studies, Saint Mary's University, Halifax.

Lewis, Magda. 1992, "Interrupting Patriarchy: Politics, Resistance and Transformation in the Feminist Classroom" in Luke and Gore (eds.). 1992, Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy, Routledge, New York, pp. 167-191.

Luke, Carmen. 1992, "Feminist Politics in Radical Pedagogy" in Luke and Gore (eds.). 1992, Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy, Routledge, New York, pp. 25-53.

Luke, Carmen, and Jennifer Gore (eds.). 1992, Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy, Routledge, New York.

Mackenzie, Liz. 1992, On Our Feet, Taking Steps to Challenge Women's Oppression: A Handbook on Gender and Popular Education Workshops, CACE Publications, University of Western Cape, South Africa.

Magendzo, Salomon. 1990, "Popular Education in Non-governmental Organizations: Education for Social Mobilization?" in Harvard Educational Review Vol. 60, No. 1. pp. 49-63.

MATCH and CIDA, 1991, "GAD Analytical Tools: Program, Project and Policy Applications", an OXFAM document.

McLaren, P. 1988, "Schooling the Postmodern Body: Critical Pedagogy and the Politics of Enfleshment," in Journal of Education, Vol. 170, No. 3, Boston University, pp. 53-83.

McLaren, Peter; and Tomaz Tadeu Da Silva. 1993, "Decentering Pedagogy: Critical Literature, Resistance, and the Politics of Memory" in P. McLaren and P. Leonard (eds.) Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter, Routledge, New York. pp. 47-89.

McLaren, Peter; and Peter Leonard. 1993, "Absent Discourses: Paulo Freire and the Dangerous Memories of Liberation" in P. McLaren and P. Leonard (eds.) Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter, Routledge, New York. pp. 1-7.

—— (eds.) 1993, Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter, Routledge, New York.

Miles, Angela. 1979, The Politics of Feminist Radicalism: A Study in Integrative Feminism, Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Political Science, University of Toronto, Toronto.

---- 1996, <u>Integrative Feminisms: Building Global Visions 1960s-1990s</u>, Routledge, New York.

Morgan, Robin. 1996, "Light Bulbs, Radishes, and the Politics of the 21ˢᵗ Century" in Diane Bell and Renate Klein (eds.) <u>Radically Speaking: Feminism Reclaimed</u>, Spinifex, Australia, pp. 5-8.

Morrow, Raymond. 1990, "Post-Marxism, Postmodernism and Popular Education in Latin America," in <u>New Education</u>, Australia, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp. 47-57.

Moser, Caroline. 1991, "Gender Planning in the Third World: Meeting Practical and Strategic Gender Needs" in T. Wallace and C. March (eds.) <u>Changing Perspectives: Writings on Gender and Development</u>, OXFAM, Oxford. pp. 158-171.

---- 1993, <u>Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice and Training</u>, Routledge, London.

Mosse, Julia Cleeves. 1993, <u>Half the World, Half a Chance</u>, OXFAM, Oxford. pp. 1-47, pp. 85-114.

Nicholson, Linda. 1990, <u>Feminism/Postmodernism</u>, Routledge, New York.

Oakley, A. 1972, <u>Sex, Gender and Society</u>, Harper, New York.

Orner, Mimi. 1992, "Interrupting the Calls For Student Voice in "Liberatory" Education: A Feminist Poststructuralist Perspective" in Luke and Gore (eds.) 1992, <u>Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy</u>, Routledge, New York.

Ostergaard, Lise (ed.). 1992, <u>Gender and Development: A Practical Guide</u>, Routledge, London.

Overholt, C., M. Anderson, K. Cloud, and J. Austin. 1984, <u>Gender Roles In Development</u>, Kumarian Press, West Hartford.

Owens, Craig. 1983, "The Discourse of Others: Feminists and Postmodernism" in Hal Foster (ed.) <u>The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture</u>, Bay Press, Washington, pp. 57-83.

Penny, Anne. 1991, "The Forward Looking Strategies" in T. Wallace and C. March (eds.) <u>Changing Perspectives: Writings on Gender and Development</u>, OXFAM, Oxford. pp. 8-11.

Picon, Cesar. 1991, "Adult Education and Popular Education in the Context of State and NGOs" in Convergence, Vol. 24, No. 1/2, pp. 80-90.

Poovey, Mary. 1988, "Feminism and Deconstruction" in Feminist Studies, Spring, Vol. 14, No. 1. pp. 51-65.

Prajuli, P. 1986, "Grassroots Movements, Development Discourse and Popular Education" in Convergence, Vol. 19. No. 2. pp. 29-40.

Rathgeber, Eva. 1989, "Women and Development: An Overview" in Women and Development in Africa: Comparative Perspectives, University Press of America, Lanham, pp. 19-32.

---- 1990, "WID, WAD, and GAD: Trends in Research and Practice" in Journal of Developing Areas, Vol. 24. pp. 489-502.

Razawi, Shahrashoub, and Carol Miller. 1995, "From WID to GAD: Conceptual Shifts in the Women and Development Discourse" Occasional paper, UNRISD, UNDP, for the Fourth World Conference on Women, Beijing.

Riano, Alcala. 1990, "Empowering Through Communication: Women's Experience with Participatory Communication in Development Process", IDRC Manuscript report No. 278.

Richardson, Diane. 1996, "Misguided, Dangerous and Wrong: On the Maligning of Radical Feminism" in Diane Bell and Renate Klein (eds.) Radically Speaking: Feminism Reclaimed, Spinifex, Australia, pp.143-154.

Rosenthal, Naomi Braun. 1984, "Consciousness Raising: from Revolution to Re-Evaluation" in Psychology of Women Quarterly, Summer, Vol. 8, No. 4, Human Sciences Press, New York, pp. 309-326.

Rosero, Rocio. 1988, "Growing Together: Women, Feminism and Popular Education" ISIS International document, produced in conjunction with Network for Women and Popular Education of the Latin American Council on Adult Education.

---- 1993, "Challenges of the Democratization of Popular Education From the Perspective of Gender" in Convergence, Vol. 26, No. 1. pp. 73-81.

Ross, Andrew (ed.). 1988, Universal Abandon?: the Politics of Postmodernism, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Rostow, W.W. 1960, The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Sarup, Madan. 1983, <u>Marxism/Structuralism/Education: Theoretical developments in the Sociology of Education</u>, The Falmer Press, London.

---- 1993, <u>An Introductory Guide to Post-Structuralism and Postmodernism</u>, Second Edition, Routledge, New York.

Schapiro, Robert. 1995, "Liberatory Pedagogy and the Development Paradox" in <u>Convergence</u>, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 28-45.

Schuler, M. 1989, "Women, Law and Development: Action for Change" in <u>Series on Women, Law and Development: Issues and Strategies for Change</u>, Washington, D.C. OEF International, No. 2.

Schuurman, Frans. 1993, <u>Beyond the Impasse: New Directions in Development Theory</u>, Zed Books, London.

Scott, Catherine. 1995, <u>Gender and Development: Rethinking Modernization and Dependency Theory</u>, Lynne Rienner, Boulder.

Scutt, Locelynne. 1996, "The Personal is Political" in Diane Bell and Renate Klein (eds.) <u>Radically Speaking: Feminism Reclaimed</u>, Spinifex, Australia, pp.102-110.

Shor, Ira. 1980, <u>Critical Teaching and Everyday Life</u>, South End Press, Boston.

Shor, Ira and Paulo Freire. 1987, <u>A Pedagogy for Liberation: Dialogues on Transforming Education</u>, Bergin and Garvey, Massachusetts.

Shrewsbury, Carolyn. 1987, "What Is Feminist Pedagogy?" in <u>Women's Studies Quarterly</u>, Fall/Winter, Vol. 15, No. 3&4, pp. 6-14.

Sim, Stuart. 1992, <u>Beyond Aesthetics: Confrontations with Poststructuralism and Postmodernism</u>, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Singh, Parlo. 1995, "Voicing the 'Other', Speaking for the 'Self', Disrupting the Metanarratives of Educational Theorizing with Poststructural Feminisms" in Smith, R. and P. Wexler (eds.) <u>After Post-Modernism: Education, Politics and Identity</u>, Falmer Press, London, pp. 182-206.

Sisteren Theatre Collective, 1986. <u>Sisteren</u>, Kingston, Jamaica.

SFU, Simon Fraser University, Community and Economic Development Program: (n.d.), "Popular Education: What is it?", a pamphlet and resource list.

Smith, R. and P. Wexler. (eds.) 1995, <u>After Postmodernism: Education, Politics and Identity</u>, Falmer Press, London.

Social Action Commission. 1987, <u>From the Grass-Roots: A Critical Consciousness Approach to Social Justice in PEI</u>, Diocese of Charlottetown.

Spellman, Elizabeth. 1988, <u>Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought</u>, Beacon Press, Boston.

Spretnack, Charlene. 1996, "The Disembodied Worldview of Deconstructive Post-Modernism" in Diane Bell and Renate Klein (eds.) <u>Radically Speaking: Feminism Reclaimed</u>, Spinifex, Australia, pp. 321-325.

Stromquist, N. 1984, <u>Investigacion Sobre la Mujer e Investigascion Feminista: Balance y Perspectivas de la Dicada de la Mujer en America Latina</u>, GRECMU, Montevideo.

TAMWA, Tanzanian Media Women's Association. 1993, "AIDS Outreach Work Done by TAMWA", in <u>Sauti Ya Siti</u>, No. 18, pp. 13-15.

Thompson, Denise. 1996, "The Self-Contradiction of 'Post-modernist' Feminism" in Diane Bell and Renate Klein (eds.) <u>Radically Speaking: Feminism Reclaimed</u>, Spinifex, Australia, pp. 325-338.

Thurlow, Amy. 1992, "Women, Media, and Development: Alternative Media Programmes by and for Women, A Case Study in Jamaica" An unpublished paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in International Development Studies, Saint Mary's University, Halifax.

Todaro, Michael, P. 1989, <u>Economic Development in the Third World</u>, Fourth Edition, Longman, New York.

Torres, Carlos Alberto. 1993, "From the Pedagogy of the Oppressed to A Luta Continua: The Political Pedagogy of Paulo Freire" in P. McLaren and P. Leonard (eds.) <u>Paulo Freire: A Critical Encounter</u>, Routledge, New York. pp. 110-145.

Underwood, Barry. 1991, "Gender in Development and Feminism: Related but Separate Issues" in T. Wallace and C. March (eds.) <u>Changing Perspectives: Writings on Gender and Development</u>, OXFAM, Oxford. pp. 295-298.

Vanderplaat, Madine. 1995. "A Critical Perspective On Social Intervention and Evaluation in the Modern Welfare State" PhD. Thesis, Dalhousie University, Halifax.

Vella, Jane. 1994, "Learning to Listen/Learning to Teach: Training Trainers In the Principles and Practices of Popular Education" in <u>Convergence</u>, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp. 5-21.

Walkerdine, Valerie. 1986, "Progressive Pedagogy and Political Struggle" in Screen, Vol. 27, No. 5. pp. 54-60. Reprinted in Luke and Gore (eds.). 1992. Feminisms and Critical Pedagogy, Routledge, New York. pp.15-24.

Walters, Shirley. 1990, "Gender and Popular Education, A Research Paper" and "The Relevance of the Research Project for South African Feminists and Activists" in Voices Rising: A Bulletin About Women and Popular Education, Vol. 4, No. 2 pp. 12-14.

Weedon, Chris. 1987, Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Weiler, Kathleen. 1991, "Freire and a Feminist Pedagogy of Difference" in Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 61, No. 4. Pp. 449-474.

Whitehead, A. 1979, "Some Preliminary Notes on the Subordination of Women" in Institute of Development Studies Bulletin, Vol. 10, No. 3.

Young, Kate. 1988, Women and Economic Development: Local, Regional and National Planning Strategies, Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, Paris, Berg/UNESCO, Oxford.

---- (n.d.), IDRC lecture notes, produced by MATCH Canada

(No Author) 1993, "Theory and Practice of popular Education" in Voices Rising: A Bulletin About Women and Popular Education, No. 1. pp. 7-11.

(No Author) 1990, "International Research Project on Gender and Popular Education" in Convergence, Vol. 23, No. 3, pp. 95-96.