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Gender as a form of “Tacit” knowing in the fields of Pedagogy

Anja Kraus

Abstract

In the field of research on pedagogy, since a few decades the significant impacts of corporal, spatial and material aspects of behaviour on pedagogical situations, especially their effects on teaching and learning, come more and more into sight (e.g. Abele 1996; Naujok, Brandt & Krummheuer 2004 etc.). Pedagogy is then regarded not only as ruled by planning, explicit normative framings and governmental strategies. Its topics, as e.g. the success or the failing of teaching or learning processes or a precarious or promising personality-development, are moreover seen as also decisively influenced by unspoken, silent, corporal, spatial, material, barred or alienated dimensions of pedagogy. The tacit side in pedagogical practices has already been discussed as a “hidden curriculum” (Jackson 1968) in the 1970s and within the “social systems” approach to teaching in the 1990s. Actually the tacit dimensions of pedagogy become a central topic e.g. in ethnographical, phenomenological and discourse-theoretical analyses of educational processes. In the latter discourses the central topics of “tacit knowledge”, like e.g. gender, are not any more interpreted ontologically resp. as mere categories to describe phenomena of social life or characteristics of human beings, but as analytical tools helping us to understand the constitution of certain educational practices and appreciated knowledge domains at hand. In my contribution look at “gender” as an analytical category in terms of working out the “tacit” side of gender as a dimension of pedagogy. In this regard, three sets of arguments - referring to “implicit” or “tacit” knowing, to “performativity” and “mimesis” and to “corporeality” and “bodiliness” - will be unfolded.

“Gender” as an Analytical Tool

Gender firstly signifies a range of characteristics pertaining to, and differentiating between masculinity and femininity. Then, the term gender refers to socially determined roles and relations between males and females. Secondly, it serves as a category to describe phenomena of social life. Then, it refers to a socio-cultural classification of women and men, respectively the societal norms and values that define the roles men and women should play in society. In such a context, gender is mostly used and perceived to mean ‘women’s issues’ or ‘men’s issues’. Thirdly, gender is an analytical tool helping us to understand the constitution of certain practices and appreciated knowledge domains at hand.

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

### Modern and Postmodern Approaches in Pedagogy and Educational Sciences

In general, theoretical pedagogy foremost refers to the reading of social reality as if it were a text (cp. “linguistic turn”). That is to say, it deals with social reality as if it were ruled by completeness, closeness, unambiguity and linearity. (Cp. Wulf 2007) On the basis of this preconception, important pedagogical concepts such as “competence”, “effort”, “learning” etc., and also gender are put into the logic scheme of a text, respectively pedagogical phenomena are supposed to exactly fit to their description. The pedagogical concepts and categories are in a second step standardized and even on a large scale metrified.

Pedagogical theory and practice gets thus to a great deal reduced to (a kind of “text” on) norms. This is the case e.g. in terms of the idea of caring, in which the individual child and youngster and his or her developmental tasks are foregrounded. Today this idea is foremost spelled out as an orientation to the future of a youngster in the society in terms of personal, social and political-economic demands; such anticipations serve as the most important normative framing for effective practical pedagogy today. In school it is thus widely regarded as the main aim to impart available knowledge and abilities oriented at certain objectives by making use of distinct learning and teaching arrangements (cp. the concept of the “good school”). This is hold up by the belief in or even bias of pedagogy consisting of definite interventions in well-defined social situations. Definite personality profiles, such as e.g. professional personality schemes like the “good teacher”, also the “good (that is to say “high-performing”) pupil” play a more and more important role in school today. On the other hand, pedagogy is still led by a high esteem for the personality and the autonomy of the child; there even lies a certain overstress on the idea of a “competent child” (cp. Dornes 1992, et al.) as a self-determined learner. These logics are mirrored also in the antinomy of gender-autonomy and social formation of gender.

These outlines of pedagogy are deeply rooted in the tradition of Enlightenment. (Cf. Horkheimer & Adorno (2002) That is to say, they refer to mankind as being governed by rational and explicit decisions and planning, by rules, transparent procedures, unambiguous facts and other characteristics of the rational order. If reality does not follow such an order, “pedagogy” (and with it each child and each pedagogue) is usually addressed as one of the first responsible instances to change the situation for the better.

Anyway, this practical discipline usually fails in reaching its goals respectively the goals that are set for it.

Whereas in the beginning of the 1970ies emancipatory and rationalistic concepts have been at their peak of success in politics and pedagogy, in 1979, Francois Lyotard (1984) proclaimed the “end of master narratives”, such as “emancipation”, “autonomy”, “societal progress” etc. By this he described the paradigm shift from modernity to post-
modernity. Instead of the outstanding human ideals and the normative frames characterizing “modernity” the concept of “post-modernity” stresses the materiality of the body, experience and history, lines it out and investigates it scientifically. The multimodal utterances and self-interpretations of the acting persons, the contingency of social and cultural phenomena, the discoursivity of all kinds of individual, social and cultural orders as well as the stage-character of phenomena is focused. In the field of scientific-theoretical and empirical research the concept of “objectivity” is problematized, and the principle of consensus is put at stake, respectively is investigated. By this, new fields of social research are opened up. Beside others, the concept of gender has been brought up as a post-modern discourse, describing an interpretative process as well as a continuous social ascription (cp. Butler, Barad, Haraway and many others). Outgoing from the post-modern paradigm shift, worldwide a huge volume of research and concepts on post-modern topics has been produced, mainly within the Cultural Sciences.

Since about two decades, in Educational Sciences the significant impacts of social, corporal, spatial and material aspects of behaviour on pedagogical situations and their effects on teaching and learning have come more and more into sight (e.g. Naujok, Brandt & Krummheuer 2004 etc.). We concentrate on the (post-modern) approaches that are “[...] critical of rationality, however, without surrendering the claim of reason to the irrational” (Gebauer & Wulf 1995, p.10). The pre-reflexive and not easily graspable aspects of pedagogy, such as e.g. its iconic, creative, poetic, discourse- and power-related as well as material aspects, are put into the foreground of Educational Research and practical pedagogy. In empirical research, the micro-analytic analysis of practices is foregrounded. Pedagogically framed practices are thus investigated in terms of their performative and bodily aspects as well as of their implicit and explicit meanings and the power relations they are involved in.

Thus, we speak of a “tacit turn” in the Educational Sciences and in the field of theoretical pedagogy.

The “Tacit Turn” in the Educational Sciences and in Theoretical Pedagogy

The tacit side in pedagogical practices has already in the 1970s been discussed as a “hidden curriculum” (Jackson 1968) and within the “social systems” approach to teaching in the 1990s. Actually the tacit dimensions of pedagogy become also a central topic in ethnographical, phenomenological and poststructuralist analyses of educational processes that follow up the post-modern paradigm shift.2 In the discursive fields opened up by these and other scientific approaches the central topics of the tacit dimensions of pedagogy, like e.g. gender, are not any more interpreted ontologically resp. as mere categories to describe phenomena of the social life or the characteristics of human beings as it is true for rationalist approaches. Moreover, the central concepts of the tacit dimensions of pedagogy are regarded as analytical tools helping us to understand the constitution of certain educational practices and dominant knowledge domains at hand. Then, they serve as analytical tools. “Gender” is used to describe discourses causing certain power relations, especially with the aim to re-signify and to change them. Besides that, there is a whole spectrum of applications of the term, up to the point of bringing the body into the discussion on knowledge acquisition. (Cp. e.g.

---

2 See e.g.: https://tacitdimensions.wordpress.com
Lund 2013) Masculinity and femininity are then patterns or configurations of social practices linked to the position of male bodies in the very gender order.

My hypothesis is that especially the following three theoretical frameworks for empirical research on the tacit dimensions of pedagogy can be regarded as affirming the postmodern paradigm shift: It is the “implicit knowing” concept (Polanyi, Neuweg, et al.), it is anthropological approaches that describe human existence by terms like performativity and mimesis (Wulf, Zirfas, Krämer et al.), and bodily-phenomenological approaches (Merleau-Ponty, Waldenfels, Meyer-Drawe et al.) referring to corporeality. All these approaches can be regarded as a reference as well as an answer to this paradigm shift. In the following, I will make up some main points of these approaches and compare them in reference to different “gender”-concepts. By the critique on them the fact should be stressed that there is no “right”, but only a limited understanding of gender and the “tacit turn” in pedagogy.

Implicit or Tacit Knowing

“Implicit learning” is a psychological concept of a non-episodic, incidental learning that goes along with the unawareness of what is learnt. For implicit learning not a focal, but a “tacit”, that is to say more complex visual, sequential and as well functional attention is supposed to be required. In different stimulus structures implicit learning shows biases, dissociations and a complexity that cannot be reduced to linear, definite, unquestionable arguments as it is usually true for focal/explicit learning. Moreover, one regards implicit learning as based on distinct memory mechanisms - the dependence of implicit learning on particular brain areas today is broadly discussed and scientifically investigated. The result of implicit learning and knowing is supposed not to be articulable in a formal and systematic language, scientific formulae, specifications, and so forth. It is thought as being abstract and represented mostly in practice.

An example for a concept that stresses the implicit aspects of gender is that of “queer”. The expression “queer” is used to describe strange, odd, peculiar, or eccentric behaviour or looks, expressing something suspicious or not quite right, or even a person with mild derangement. In the 1980ies, this pejorative use of the word was re-appropriated as a neutral or positive self-identifier and even as a programmatic term in the political sense. “To appear as queer” is then understood as a means to discover and develop implicit as well as explicit gender-discourses.

However, there is a limit in terms of the analytical potentials of the classification of implicit (tacit) and explicit (focal) knowledge. It can be criticized insofar as it is dependent on the relativity of language. Just think of the fact that a certain language allows for formulations which are implicit in other languages (cp. the many expressions for “white” in Eskimo). To realize it the other way round: the things that are not expressed by language retreat into darkness. The language of specialists, in general, permits finer discriminations than ordinary language. A linguist might be able to formulate the grammar governing our linguistic performance. For other people this might be difficult. In the case of “gender” “queer” tactics may initiate an implicit re-signification of gender if meeting sensitivity for language, or they may not, if not meeting it. However, it is certainly worth a trial.

Taking this critique into account, one can say that “implicit” and “tacit” should not be dealt with as something or somewhat, as e.g. memory or knowledge, but as a way how something is dealt with. The “act-notion” of tacit/implicit involves the capacity to
mobilize experiences, beliefs and values in action as well as the operational side of power relations etc. In order to improve the path to re-signification I will keep up with an anthropological and then with the body-phenomenological approach to learning.

Performativity and Mimesis

The term performativity denotes the capacity of speech and language in particular as well as that of other non-verbal forms of expressive action to cause effects/realities; in a performance a certain type of being is signified. In contrast to the logics of representation, input/output and empirical facts, the dynamics of relations and processes are in the focus, which are supposed to determine, produce and validate objects. Here, in particular the body has become privileged as the site and as the medium of practices. Bodily performativity creates a forum, a ritual, social action etc. beyond the constraints of a system or structure. Such performatives acts produce what they signify. Sometimes they make a person unfold also such abilities which were not available to her/him before.

This idea corresponds the concept of learning as mimesis. “Mimesis” carries a wide range of meanings, including the act of resembling and imitating, the act of expression and representation, mimicry, receptivity, non-sensuous similarity as well as a form of presenting the self. Mimesis is an embodied non-repressive and non-violent form of reason, the repetitive character of which includes moments of alteration, that is to say learning.

As Latimer (2011, p.163) puts it, Donna J. Haraway in her “Cyborg Manifesto” (1991) describes “The Patchwork Girl” as a cybernetic post-human being in her physical multiplicity as “[...] dis-proportioned, and visibly scarred”. This appearance can be read as a mimesis to a gender-phenomenon in current society: the reproduction of the genes. Latimer (2011, p.163) points out the potentials of this mimetic cyborg in terms of a social critique: “She both facilitates and undermines preoccupations with the benefits and dangers of reproductive technologies by embracing all of the monstrosities that reproductive/fetal screenings are imagined to ‘catch’ and one day prevent.”

The critique on the concept of performativity deals with the idea of a permanent identity-revolution and mimicry (Wulf & Zirfas 2007, p.30), though social relations might not be that fluid and formable. Besides that, performative or mimetic attitudes do not entail a measure of their prevalence and of their individual, social or cultural value. One may thus miss an ethical-philosophical meaningfulness as well as a multi-levelled complexity of mimetic or performative phenomena as they are only described as emergence and as visible interdependencies.

Body-phenomenological concepts reduce such a kind of arbitrariness to the limits of the human perception and corporeality.

Corporeality and Bodiliness

According to Maurice Merleau-Ponty phenomena come up as sensual impressions, not-articulable perceptions, subluminal thoughts and as the origin of speaking in silence; as

---

3 Cp. Wulf 1997
our body is our “[…] natural I and as such the subject of perception” (Merleau-Ponty 1966, p.243). We do not have a consciousness about our living body as we cannot distance from it, we are our body. Although we can look at our body as an object, the lived body is a kind of “point zero” of the orientation in an individual or situational field of seeing, acting or speaking. (Waldenfels 1998, p.22) At “point zero” (where we always already are) we become (tacitly) aware of the determining factors of the constitution of a phenomenon. Meyer-Drawe (2008) locates the experience of learning at the “point zero”. Learning is thus a tacit phenomenon, it is an occurrence. Neither the beginning nor the process of learning is evident in the sense of being definable. In learning former knowledge is to be rejected and new features enter familiar contexts. So to say, estrangement appears like a fissure inside the learning subject; it is an inner estrangement that enables us to respond to things we do not yet know. We thus do not exclusively gain knowledge, insight and understanding in an active way. Like every human experience learning moreover involves multiple disruptions, chasms, fissures, distances, shadows and the like. Anyway, after we have learnt something, for a sudden, things are making sense in a kind of archaic and persistent way, as if this sense had been there forever.

Jagger (2008, p.29) points out the instability of gender, which, according to him, can be unravelled e.g. in educational situations where gender is presented as repetitive acts without an original that is the “[…] fictional ideal that regulates the production of sexed subjects and identities”. That is to say, gender can be taken e.g. as a learning task. One can interpret Jagger’s proposal in the following way: By putting oneself in terms of gender to the “point zero” by e.g. changing the parameters of the own gender and exploring the reactions of others on this change, one can learn about power relations and places of gendering as well as about materials, symbolic orders, polysemies etc. connected to the different gender-concepts.

However, the phenomenological approach in general is criticized for being obscurant as it binds social acts to subjective, that is lived experience. The phenomenological observer attempts to acquire categories and rules of thinking and acting as a kind of “native”, thus carrying out research in the emic\(^5\) mode. Hereby, s/he is free to use extraneous categories and rules in terms of sense. Besides that one can also find the presupposition that social actions are meaningful actions per se and that they are worth studying independently of the actor's meaning or purpose. In phenomenology there is hardly any awareness of the fact that “[…] the very notion of an action requires the idea of the actor's end or purpose. That is, for an action to be perceived, purpose and meaning must be perceived. Thus a change in the perceived meaning or purpose entails a change in the action that is perceived.” (Wilson, 1970:67) Besides that, phenomenologists tend to dismiss etic facts – such as poverty, ruling classes, imperialist or capitalist systems etc. and processes such as evolution, adaptation and exploitation, by tending to regard them as “reifications”. Some of these facts are beyond subjective intelligibility and/or observers happen to believe in them. However, by not taking such responses and processes into account, phenomenology dismisses critical options and also possibilities of a pedagogically indicated emancipation.

---

\(^5\) An "emic" account is a description of behavior or a belief in terms meaningful (consciously or unconsciously) to the actor; that is, an emic account comes from a person within the culture. Almost anything from within a culture can provide an emic account. An "etic" account is a description of a behavior or belief by an observer, in terms that can be applied to other cultures; that is, an etic account attempts to be "culturally neutral."
All three theoretical frameworks for an empirical research on the tacit dimensions of pedagogy thus include approaches to gender as an interpretative process as well as a continuous social ascription, and they all come to a certain limit in doing this. In all the cases, the limit can be described as the abandonment to certain discourses or paradigms. They thus seem to create a “master narrative” themselves. The alternative could be a "non-essentialist feminist standpoint theory", as proposed by Donna J. Haraway (1997, p.305). Haraway (1995) argues for a “situated knowledge” and a fully movable thinking, in which she proposes a permanent critical reflection on the own contextual references and connections, involving also subluminal aspects of tasks, establishments and actions. She is concerned with taking a "partial perspective", that “[...] gives priority to challenge, deconstruction, passionate constructions, interwoven connections, and the hope for change of knowledge systems and perspectives." (Haraway 1995, p.85) This is a research on practices that in fact follows the post-modern agenda: It stresses and works out the multimodality of utterances and self-interpretations of the acting persons, the contingency of social and cultural phenomena, the discursivity of all kinds of individual, social and cultural orders as well as the stage-character of phenomena etc. However, to take over a "partial perspective" also means to in a way free an individual to interpret him-/herself, it means to be aware of the contingency of social and cultural phenomena etc. In terms of the topic of this contribution, “gender” and the “tacit turn” in scientific and theoretical pedagogy, my proposal is therefor to in future work on the question how to transform the modern idea of “emancipation” in terms of a post-modern research on gender as a tacit dimension of pedagogy.
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