

Questions for the Comprehensive Final State Exam SZZK MA program in Gender Studies FHS UK

(for programs under the new accreditation, starting in Winter 2020 and later)

The Comprehensive Final State Exam (CFSE) for the MA program in Gender Studies at FHS UK in Prague is divided into three parts:

Part A – **Feminist Theories and the History of Gender and Sexuality** (YMGST1)

Part B – **Intersectional Gender Analysis** (YMGST2)

Part C – **Defense of Diploma Thesis** (YMGST3)

In order to successfully pass the CFSE, it is necessary to successfully pass all three parts of the CFSE.

A student can register for the CFSE only when they have completed all mandatory GS courses and earned a minimum of 120 ECTS. Each of the three CFSE parts has its own code in SIS and students register in SIS for each part/code separately.

Parts A and B (YMGST1 and YMGST2) **must be passed together!** When students make the decision to take the CFSE in a chosen exam period, they must register to take part A (YMGST1) and part B (YMGST2) at the same time. Both of these parts of the CFSE take place in front of an exam committee as one combined oral exam in one day/time.

Part C (YMGST3) is independent of the first two parts of the CFSE and it is possible to register for it in a different exam period (or even academic year), based on the finishing and submitting one's diploma thesis. It is not possible to register for part C of the exam before passing parts A and B. However, if a student has finished their thesis and wants to take all three parts of the CFSE together, it is possible to register in SIS for all three parts of the CFSE at once and take all three exam parts together (i.e. consequently one after another within one exam period).

Simply put, the CFSE can be taken in the following formats: **A+B and later C**, or **A+B+C**.

The CFSE proceeds in the following way:

To take the oral exams in the part A and B of the CFSE, a student arrives one hour before the scheduled exam so that they have enough time to prepare their answers for the given questions. The thematic fields of the CFSE consist of 20 questions (13 in part A, 7 in part B), which interconnectedly cover curriculum encountered in all of the mandatory GS courses. The oral exam from parts A and B is based on answers to **three questions** from this list. In part A, one question is drawn by the student, one question is chosen by the exam committee. In part B, the student draws one question. Subsequently, the student goes to a separate room (without any notes and phone), where they have time to think through and prepare their answers to the given questions. The oral exam of combined parts A+B takes 50 minutes.

The defense of diploma thesis (i.e. part C) takes 50 minutes as well. If the student has already passed parts A+B in a different exam period (the above format *A+B and later C*), they don't have to come to the exam an hour early. The preparation for the thesis defense takes place at home, based on the supervisor's and opponent's evaluations of the thesis. A student can bring their own notes to the defense. The defense proceeds in the following way: the student introduces their diploma thesis for 10 minutes, concentrating primarily on stating the research questions, explaining the theoretical background of their thesis, their chosen methodology and, a list of the most important findings and a critical review of them. In this part, the student does not answer comments or questions from the evaluations yet. After the thesis introduction, the opponent's and then the supervisor's evaluations are read. The student then answers questions and comments from both evaluations, which is followed by a free discussion about the thesis between the exam committee and the student.

A student gets a separate grade for each of the three CFSE parts.

A final, comprehensive CFSE grade is given by the exam committee only after the student has successfully completed all three parts of the CFSE. When assigning the final, comprehensive grade, the exam committee takes into account not only the three partial grades from the CFSE parts A, B, and C, but also the overall performance of the student during their MA studies.

Part A – Feminist Theories and History of Gender and Sexuality

1. Discuss the definitions, theoretical foundations and differences between essentialist and constructivist approaches to understanding sex, gender, and sexuality. Explain what the practical implications of those approaches are. Define the concept of “strategic essentialism” and discuss possible examples of its usage.

Recommended Literature:

- Beauvoir, Simone de. [2009] 2011. „Introduction “. In *The Second Sex: Vintage. Volume I: Facts and Myths*. Translated by Constance Borde & Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, pp. 3–17.
- Guba, Egon G., Yvonna S. Lincoln. 1994. „Competing paradigms in qualitative research“. In Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 105–116.
- Katz, Jonathan N. 2001. „The Invention of Heterosexuality“. In *Major Problems in the History of American Sexuality*. Houghton Mifflin, pp. 349–356.
- Krell, Elías Cosenza. 2017. „Is Transmisogyny Killing Trans Women of Color?: Black Trans Feminisms and the Exigencies of White Femininity.“ *Transgender studies quarterly* 4 (2): 226–242.
- Marinucci, Mimi. 2010. „Preface: Not Just the New ‘Gay’“ and „Section I: Sexuality“. In *Feminism is Queer: The Intimate Connection between Queer and Feminist Theory*. London & New York, Zed Books, pp. xi and pp. 3–28.
- Millett, Kate. [1969] 2016. „Theory of sexual politics“. In *Sexual politics*“. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 23–58.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1984. „Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses“. In *boundary 2 – On Humanism and the University I: The Discourse of Humanism* 12 (3): 333–358.
- Loomba, Ania. 2005. „Situating Colonial and Postcolonial Studies“. In *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1–19.
- Rupp, Leila. 2001. „Towards a Global History of Same-Sex Sexuality“. *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 10 (2): 287–302.

2. Explain the term “patriarchy” and discuss how patriarchy is established on a symbolic level (for example through religion, cultural representations, art, literature, language, myths, etc.) and how it interweaves with the concepts of compulsory heterosexuality and the politics of sexual shame. Introduce the main criticisms of the concept of patriarchy and discuss alternative conceptualizations of the structural oppressions of gender and sex.

Recommended Literature:

- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2001. *Masculine Domination*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. vii-ix, 1–4, 34–42.
- Bryson, Valerie. 2016. „Radical feminism and the concept of patriarchy“. In *Feminist political theory: an introduction* (3rd ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 155–166.
- Butler, Judith. [1990] 1999. „Bodily Inscriptions, Performative Subversions“ and „Conclusion: From Parody to Politics“. In *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York & London: Routledge, pp. 163–190.
- Daly, Mary. 1978. „Prelude to the First Passage“. In *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 37–42.
- Fetterley, Judith. 1978. „Introduction: On the Politics of Literature“. In *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. xi-xxvi.
- McClintock, Anne. 1995. „Soft-Soaping Empire: Commodity Racism and Imperial Advertising“. In *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender And Sexuality In The Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, pp. 207–231.
- Millett, Kate. [1969] 2016. „Theory of Sexual Politics“. In *Sexual politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 23–58.
- Morris, Pam. 2000. *Literature and Feminism. An Introduction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 1–36.
- Rich, Adrienne. [1980] 2003. „Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence“. *Journal of Women’s History* 15 (3): 11–48.
- Warner, Michael. 1999. „Politics of sexual shame“. In *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. Harvard University Press, pp. 1–40.
- Westbrook, Laurel, Kristen Schilt. 2014. „Transgender People, Gender Panics, and the Maintenance of the Sex/Gender/Sexuality System“. *Gender and Society* 28 (1): 32–57.

3. Discuss different feminist understandings and approaches (in various periods of feminist history, for example black feminism, postcolonial, socialist, liberal, queer, etc.) of what it means to be a “woman” and explain what the feminist goals of each feminist type/period were. How does the concept of intersectionality enrich theorizing about the category of “woman”? Why, by whom and in what contexts is the category “woman” approached critically and what are the theoretical and political consequences of those critiques?

Recommended Literature:

- Beauvoir, Simone de. [2009] 2011. „Introduction “ and „Myths“. In *The Second Sex: Vintage. Volume I: Facts and Myths*. Translated by Constance Borde & Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, pp. 3–17 and pp. 275 –284, pp. 737–741, pp. 765 – 768.
- Butler, Judith. 1988. „Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory“. *Theatre Journal* 40 (4): 519–531.
- Fetterley, Judith. 1978. „Introduction: On the Politics of Literature“. In *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. xi-xxvi.
- Halberstam, Judith. 1999. „Masculinity Without Men: Annamarie Jagose Interviews Judith Halberstam About Her Latest Book, *Female Masculinity*“. *Genders* 29 (1).
- Krell, Elías Cosenza. 2017. „Is Transmisogyny Killing Trans Women of Color?: Black Trans Feminisms and the Exigencies of White Femininity.“ *Transgender studies quarterly* 4 (2): 226–242.
- Moraga, Cherríe. 2002. „Preface, 1981“. In Cherríe Moraga, Gloria Anzaldúa, (eds.). *This Bridge Called My Back: writings by radical women of color*. Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.
- Rich, Adrienne. [1980] 2003. „Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence“. *Journal of Women’s History* 15 (3): 11–48.
- The Combahee River Collective: A black feminist statement. 1979. In Zillah R. Eisenstein (ed.). *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*. New York: Monthly Review Press, pp. 362–372.
- Wittig, Monique. 1992. „One is not born a woman“. In *The straight mind and other essays*. New York and London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 9–20.
- Wollstonecraft, M. 1995. „Dedication“ and „Observations on the state of degradation to which woman is reduced by various causes“.. In *A Vindication of the Rights of Men and a Vindication of the Rights of Woman and Hints*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 67–70 and pp. 126–132.

4. Explain how feminist sociology, philosophy and critical theory understand the gendered division of work and how it is organized in both the private and public spheres. How has the division of work been established in the context of imperial expansions and colonial dominations? Clarify, how various strands of feminist thought conceptualized work/labor and how were different conceptions of labor/work supposed to guarantee the emancipation of a woman and society in general? Discuss critiques of the possibility of the emancipation of women through paid work.

Recommended Literature:

- Ahmed, Sara. 2010. „Feminist Killjoys“. In *The Promise Of Happiness*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 50–87.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. [2009] 2011. „The Independent Woman“. In *The second sex: Vintage. Volume II: Lived Experience*. Translated by Constance Borde & Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, pp. 737–741 = /.../ „her fatigue are multiplied as a result“; pp. 765 – 768 = „Indeed, for one to“ /.../.
- Dow, Dawn, Katherine Mason. 2018. „Gendering Social Reproduction“. In Raka Ray, Jennifer Dawn Carlson, Abigail L. Andrews (eds.). *The Social Life of Gender*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, pp. 121–146.
- El Tayeb, Fatima. 2011. „Dimensions of Diaspora...“ In *European Others. Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe*. Minesotta University Press, pp. 43–80.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1999. „The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State“. In Robert C. Tucker (ed.). *Marx / Engels reader*. New York: Norton, pp. 734–759.
- Federici, Silvia. 2012. „Wages Against Housework“. In *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*. Oakland & New York & London: PM Press & Common Notions & Autonomedia, pp. 15–22.
- Friedan, Betty. [1963] 2010. „The Problem That Has No Name“ and „The Crisis In Women’s Identity“. In *Feminine mystique*. New York & London: Penguin Books, pp. 5–20 and pp. 51–59.
- Kollontai, Aleksandra M. 1977. „ Selected Writings of Alexandra Kollontai “. In Alix Holt (ed.). *Communism and the Family*. New York: Norton, pp. 250–260.
- McClintock, Anne. 1995. „Soft-Soaping Empire: Commodity Racism and Imperial Advertising“. In *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender And Sexuality In The Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, pp. 207–231.
- Mill, John S. 1992. „The Subjection of Women“. In John Stuart Mill, Stefan Collini (eds.). *‘On Liberty’ and other writings*. Cambridge & New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, pp. 163–165.

5. Explain the “normativity” of the concept of „culture“ and other related terms (such as, for example, canon, cultural heritage, cultural identity). How have feminist approaches enriched thinking about culture as a form of power and a way of creating hierarchies, and how have they contributed to the democratization, “popularization” and formulation of alternative definitions of “culture”? What criticism is heard from feminist positions towards the literary canon, concepts of high (and similarly low) culture and “women’s” genres?

Recommended Literature:

- El Tayeb, Fatima. 2011. „Dimensions of Diaspora...“ *European Others. Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe*. Minnesota University Press, pp. 43–80
- Fetterley, Judith. 1978. „Introduction: On the Politics of Literature“. In *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. xi-xxvi.
- Horkheimer, Max, Theodor Adorno. 1998. „The Culture Industry as Mass Deception“. In Julie Rivkin, Michael Ryan (eds.). *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 1037–1041.
- Kolářová, Kateřina. 2015. “Grandpa lives in paradise now’: Biological Precarity and Global Economy of Debility”. *Feminist Review*, 111 (1): 75–87.
- Morris, Pam. 2000. *Literature and Feminism. An Introduction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 37–90.
- Parvulescu, Anca. 2016. „European Racial Triangulation“. In Ponzanesi, Sandra, Colpani, Gianmaria. (eds.). *Postcolonial Transitions In Europe: Contexts, Practices And Politics*. London – New York: Rowman & Littlefield International, pp. 25–41.
- Radway, Janice A. [1984] 1991. „The act of Reading...“. In *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Showalter, Elaine. 1997. „Towards A Feminist Poetics“. In Ken M. Newton (ed.). *Twentieth Century Literary Theory. A Reader*. New York: Macmillan Education, pp. 216–220.
- Williams, Raymond. 1997. „Culture is Ordinary“. In Ann Gray, Jim McGuigan (eds.). *Studying Culture. An Introductory Reader*. London: Arnold, pp. 5–15.

6. Explain what role “the family” plays in the reproduction of the gendered order and its critique. Discuss what other social institutions and processes the family influences (for example gender socialization, labor market, sexuality and others). Compare various feminist critiques of the family and discuss the historical changes in families and kinship in the context of homoparentality, queer parenthood, migration or multicultural relationships. Discuss the influence of these changes on the workings of the gender order.

Recommended Literature:

- Ahmed, Sara. 2010. „Feminist Killjoys“. In *The Promise Of Happiness*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 50–87.
- Beck, Ulrich. 1992. „'I am I': Gendered Space and Conflict Inside and Outside the Family“. In *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*. London, Newbury Park, New Delhi: SAGE Publications, pp. 103–119.
- Daly, Mary. 1978. „Prelude to the First Passage“. In *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 37–42.
- Dow, Dawn, Katherine Mason. 2018. „Gendering Social Reproduction“. In Raka Ray, Jennifer Dawn Carlson, Abigail L. Andrews (eds.). *The Social Life of Gender*. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, pp. 121–146.
- Engels, Friedrich. 1999. „The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State“. In Robert C. Tucker (ed.). *Marx / Engels reader*. New York: Norton, pp. 734–759.
- Millett, Kate. [1969] 2016. „Theory of sexual politics“. In *Sexual politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 23–58.
- Oakley, Marykate, Rachel Farr, David Scherer. 2017. „Same-Sex Parent Socialization: Understanding Gay and Lesbian Parenting Practices as Cultural Socialization“. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 13 (1): 56–75.
- Sørli, Anniken. 2017. „Governing (Trans)parenthood: the tenacious hold of biological connection and heterosexuality“. In *Queering International Law: Possibilities, Alliances, Complicities, Risks*. Routledge, pp. 171–190.
- Sokolová, Věra. 2021. „Images of Parenthood, Family Life and Reproductive Strategies among Gay Men in the Czech Republic“. In *Creative Families: Gender and Technologies of Everyday Life*. Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 67–94.
- Warner, Michael. 1999. „Politics of Sexual Shame“. In *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. Harvard University Press, pp. 1–40.
- Wittig, Monique. 1992. „One is not born a woman“. In *The straight mind and other essays*. New York and London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 9–20.

7. Describe in what ways society and culture participate in the definitions and shaping of health, illness, difference and “handicap” and explain how and in what ways have medicine and the medical discourse historically participated in the regulations of gender, sexuality, and bodily/intellectual/mental “normality”. Explain the problem of “the male as default” in medical research, diagnostics and cures. What does “the politics of difference” refer to in medical research, how does it work and what are its potentially problematic aspects? Explain the workings of heteronormativity in the medical discourse of sexuality.

Recommended Literature:

- Annandale, Ellen. 2010. „Gender Inequalities and Health Status“. In *The Sociology of Health and Medicine: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Polity Press. Selection, pp. 123–159.
- Conrad, Peter. 2007. „Medicalization: Context, Characteristics, and Changes“. In *The Medicalization of Society. On the Transformation of Human Conditions into Treatable Disorders*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 3–19.
- Epstein, Steven. 2007. „Health Research and the Remaking of Common Sense“ and „Sex Differences and the New Politics of Women’s Health“. In *Inclusion: The Politics of Difference in Medical Research*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 1–16 and pp. 233–257.
- Fausto-Sterling, Anne. 1997. „How To Build a Man“. In *Gender and Sexuality Reader*. Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel. 1978. „Right of Death and Power over Life“. In *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books, p. 133–159.
- Katz, Jonathan N. 2001. „The Invention of Heterosexuality“. In *Major Problems in the History of American Sexuality*. Houghton Mifflin, 349–356.
- Lupton, Deborah. 2012. „The Body in Medicine“ and „Feminisms and Medicine“. In *Medicine as Culture: Illness, Disease and the Body*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 20–50 and pp. 137–165.
- Marinucci, Mimi. 2010. „Unwelcome Interventions“ (Ch. 5). In *Feminism is Queer: The Intimate Connection between Queer and Feminist Theory*. London & NY: Zed Books.
- McGann, P. J. 2010. „Healing (disorderly) desire: medical-therapeutic regulation of sexuality“. In Steven Seidmann (ed.). *Introducing the New Sexuality Studies*. Routledge, pp. 365–376.
- Rose, Nikolas. 2007. „Beyond medicalisation“. *The Lancet* 369 (9562): 700–702.
- Westbrook, Laurel, Kristen Schilt. 2014. „Transgender People, Gender Panics, and the Maintenance of the Sex/Gender/Sexuality System“. *Gender and Society* 28 (1): 32–57.

8. In what ways is it possible to understand and capture the relationship between language and reality? How did the linguistic turn change the understanding of ideology and the relationship between language and representation? What consequences did the linguistic turn have on the conceptualizations of gender? How does psychoanalytic feminism understand language as a system of representation and what solutions for self-representation of (not only) women in the symbolic order does it suggest? What are the possibilities and limitations of *écriture féminine*?

Recommended Literature:

- Beauvoir, Simone de. [2009] 2011. „Myths“. In *The second sex: Vintage. Volume I: Facts and Myths*. Translated by Constance Borde & Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, pp. 275–284.
- Cixous, Hélène. 1976. „The Laugh of the Medusa“. *Signs* 1 (4): 875–893.
- Hall, Stuart. 1998. „The Rediscovery of Ideology“. In Julie Rivkin, Michael Ryan (eds.). *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. London: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 1050–1063.
- Irigaray, Luce. 1985. *This Sex Which Is Not One*. New York: Cornell University Press, pp. 23–33.
- Morris, Pam. 2000. *Literature and Feminism. An Introduction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 93–163.
- Pratt, Annis, Barbara White, Andrea Loewenstein, Mary Wyer. 1981. *Archetypal Patterns in Women's Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. pp. 3–12, 167–178.
- Showalter, Elaine. 1997. „Towards A Feminist Poetics“. In Ken M. Newton (ed.). *Twentieth Century Literary Theory. A Reader*. New York: Macmillan Education, pp. 216–220.

9. Discuss in what ways intersectionality, postcolonial theory and queer theory enrich and broaden theorizing about feminism and social justice.

Recommended Literature:

- Alexander, Jonathan. 1999. „Beyond Identity: Queer Values and Community“. *Journal of GLB Identity* 4 (4).
- Butler, Judith. 1988. „Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory“. *Theatre Journal* 40 (4): 519–531.
- Duggan, Lisa. 2003. „The Incredible Shrinking Public“. In *The Twilight Of Equality?: Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, And The Attack On Democracy*. Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 22–42.
- Halberstam, Judith. 1999. „Masculinity Without Men: Annamarie Jagose Interviews Judith Halberstam About Her Latest Book, *Female Masculinity*“. *Genders* 29 (1).
- hooks, bell. 2000. *Where We Stand: Class Matters*. New York, London: Routledge, any selected chapter.
- Loomba, Ania. 2005. „Situating Colonial and Postcolonial Studies“. In *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1–19.
- Marinucci, Mimi. 2010. „The Social History of Gay and Lesbian Identity“ (Ch. 2), „Queer Alternatives“ (Ch. 3) and „Notes towards a Queer Feminism“ (Ch. 8). In *Feminism is Queer: The Intimate Connection between Queer and Feminist Theory*. London & New York, Zed Books.
- May, Vivian M. 2015. „What is Intersectionality“. In *Pursuing Intersectionality, Unsettling Dominant Imaginaries*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. pp. 18–62.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1984. „Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses“. In *boundary 2 – On Humanism and the University I: The Discourse of Humanism* 12 (3): 333–358.
- Morris, Pam. 2000. *Literature and Feminism. An Introduction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 164–194.

10. Explain the term „politics of identity“ and place it in the context of the development of feminist thinking about gender, sexuality and other relevant categories. Explain what different theories of recognition and collective rights have in common and how they differ. Comparing texts by different authors, discuss under what conditions collective identities/entities/communities have the right to recognition. What is the difference between the politics of identity and the politics of values? How does the politics of identity cope with an intersectional understanding of identities?

Recommended Literature:

- Alexander, Jonathan. 1999. „Beyond Identity: Queer Values and Community“. *Journal of GLB Identity* 4 (4).
- Better, Allison, Brandy Simula. 2015. „How and for whom does gender matter? Rethinking the concept of sexual orientation“. *Sexualities* 18 (5–6): 665–680.
- Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Leslie McCall. 2013. „Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Application, and Praxis“. *Signs* 38 (4): 785–810. Intersectionality: Theorizing Power, Empowering Theory, Article DOI: 10.1086/669608.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1995. „From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of Justice in a ‘Post-Socialist’ Age“. *New Left Review*, 68–93.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1995. „Multiculturalism and the Liberal State“. *Stanford Law Review* 47 (5): 849–853.
- Marinucci, Mimi. 2010. „The Social History of Gay and Lesbian Identity“ (Ch. 2) and „Queer Alternatives“ (Ch. 3). In *Feminism is Queer: The Intimate Connection between Queer and Feminist Theory*. London & New York, Zed Books, Chapter 2.
- Moraga, Cherríe. 2002. „Preface, 1981“. In Cherríe Moraga, Gloria Anzaldúa, (eds.). *This Bridge Called My Back: writings by radical women of color*. Berkeley, CA: Third Woman Press.
- Taylor, Charles. 1994. „The Politics of Recognition“. In *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton University Press.
- The Combahee River Collective: A black feminist statement. 1979. In Zillah R. Eisenstein (ed.). *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*. New York: Monthly Review Press, pp. 362–372.

11. Explain how feminist literary theories problematize the relation between authorship, readership, and narration (consider the terms: voice, agency, and location). How is the public-private divide of the social sphere reflected in the realms of authorship, readership, and narration? How do feminist works that focus on the studies of so-called women's genres and women's spectatorship figure in these criticisms? In what ways do queer and other approaches (for example, critical theory or disability studies) challenge the established notions of narrative structures and modes? [ways] of reading literary works?

Recommended Literature:

- Barthes, Roland. 1997. „The Death of the Author“. In Ken M. Newton (ed.). *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory. A Reader*. New York: Macmillan Education, pp. 120–123.
- El Tayeb, Fatima. 2011. „Dimensions of Diaspora“. In *European Others. Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe*. Minnesota University Press, pp. 43–80.
- Fetterley, Judith. 1978. „Introduction: On the Politics of Literature“. In *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. xi-xxvi.
- Lanser, Susan S. 1991. „Toward a Feminist Narratology“. In Robyn R. Warhol, Diane Price Herndl (eds.). *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. pp. 611–629.
- Morris, Pam. 2000. *Literature and Feminism. An Introduction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Radway, Janice A. [1984] 1991. „The Act of Reading...“. In *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature*. University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill.
- Showalter, Elaine. 1997. „Towards A Feminist Poetics“. In Ken M. Newton (ed.). *Twentieth Century Literary Theory. A Reader*. New York: Macmillan Education, pp. 216–220.

12. Define the term “gender order” and explain how it is polarizing, hierarchical, and androcentric. Explain the concepts of the naturalization of social differences and symbolic violence and explain their relationship to heteronormativity and other power dimensions of the gender order. Discuss how the law, the legal system and court decision-making historically have contributed to the establishment of gender inequalities, the reification? [cementation] of heteronormativity and the reproduction of the social gender order. Discuss the assertion that gender inequality is primarily legal inequality and give examples of actual (or possible) changes in the legal position of various subjects.

Recommended Literature:

- Beauvoir, Simone de. [2009] 2011. In *The Second Sex: Vintage. Volume I: Facts and Myths*. Translated by Constance Borde & Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, pp. 3–17.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2001. *Masculine Domination*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. vii-ix, 1–4, 34–42.
- Francis, Leslie and Patricia Smith. 2021. „Feminist Philosophy of Law“. In Edward N. Zalta (ed.). *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2021 Edition). Available at: <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2021/entries/feminism-law/>>.
- Gouges, Olympe de. (1983). „Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen“. In Susan Groag Bell, Karen M. Offen (eds.). *Women, the Family and Freedom: The Debate in Documents: Volume 1, 1750–1880*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, pp. 104–109.
- Hunt, Lynn. [1789] 2007. „The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen“. In *Inventing Human Rights: A History*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., pp. 220–223.
- Mill, J. S. (1992). “The subjection of women”. In S. Collini (Ed.), *J. S. Mill : On Liberty and other writings*. Cambridge & New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1 (pp. 119 – 145).
- Morris, Pam. 2000. *Literature and Feminism. An Introduction*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, pp. 1–36.

13. How do feminist theories conceptualize “experience”? Relate the concept of experience to the feminist motto that “the personal is political”. How is the concept of experience differently conceptualized by various feminist schools of thought in relation to their historical contexts? In what ways does black or post-colonial feminism react, for example, to the practice of “consciousness-raising” and where does it see potential contributions of feminist “trouble-makers”?

Recommended Literature:

- Ahmed, Sara. 2010. „Feminist Killjoys“. In *The Promise Of Happiness*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 50–87.
- Cixous, Hélène. 1976. „The Laugh of the Medusa“. *Signs* 1 (4): 875–893.
- Fetterley, Judith. 1978. „Introduction: On the Politics of Literature“. In *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. xi-xxvi.
- hooks, bell. 2000. *Where We Stand. Class Matters*. New York, London: Routledge, any selected chapter.
- Loomba, Ania. 2005. „Situating Colonial and Postcolonial Studies“. In *Colonialism/Postcolonialism*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1–19.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1984. „Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses“. In *boundary 2 – On Humanism and the University I: The Discourse of Humanism* 12 (3): 333–358.
- Rich, Adrienne. [1980] 2003. „Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence“. *Journal of Women’s History* 15 (3): 11–48.
- Scott, Joan W. 1991. „The Evidence of Experience“. *Critical Inquiry* 17 (4): 773–797.
- The Combahee River Collective: A black feminist statement. 1979. In Zillah R. Eisenstein (ed.). *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*. New York: Monthly Review Press, pp. 362–372.

B. Part – Intersectional Gender Analysis

14. In what ways can we understand the concept of “paradigm”? What is the basis for differentiating established paradigms that structure the production of knowledge according to Guba and Lincoln? Critically discuss the ways in which the authors listed below define and work with the concept of “methodology”.

Recommended Literature:

- Guba, Egon G., Yvonna S. Lincoln. 1994. „Competing paradigms in qualitative research“. In Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications, pp. 105–116.
- May, Vivian M. 2015. „What is Intersectionality“. In *Pursuing Intersectionality, Unsettling Dominant Imaginaries*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 18–62.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. „The Complexity of Intersectionality“. In The University of Chicago Press. *Signs* 30 (3): 1771–1800, <https://doi.org/10.1086/426800>.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1984. „Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses“. In *boundary 2 – On Humanism and the University I: The Discourse of Humanism* 12 (3): 333–358.
- Ramazanoglu, Caroline, Janet Holland. 2004. „Introduction“. In *Feminist methodology: challenges and choices*. London: SAGE, pp. 1–16.

15. In what ways do feminist epistemologies argue for the importance of the politics of location and researcher positionality? What does it mean to “account for” or “have responsibility for” one’s own positionality within the research design, the formulation of research questions, the use of methods, and the dynamics of research interactions? How can the positionality of a researcher and research subject be rendered visible in the research process and/or how can they influence the research findings? Illustrate your arguments by using examples. How does an intersectional approach reshape the position of the researcher and the position of persons participating in the research? Define “reflexivity” and explain how gender studies scholars enact reflexivity in practice.

Recommended Literature:

- hooks, bell. 2000. *Where We Stand: Class Matters*. New York, London: Routledge, any selected chapter.
- Kafer, Alison. 2013. „Accessible Futures, Future Coalitions“. In *Feminist, Queer, Crip*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Lorenz-Meyer, D. 2004. „Addressing the politics of location: Strategies in feminist epistemology and their relevance to research undertaken from a feminist perspective“. In Marcela Linková, Alice Červinková (eds.). *Thinking Borders. Gender Examinations of Rationality, Objectivity and the Knowing Subject*. Praha: Institute of Sociology, Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, pp. 75–94.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1984. „Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses“. In *boundary 2 – On Humanism and the University I: The Discourse of Humanism 12 (3)*: 333–358.

16. What does it mean to conduct “feminist research”? Please discuss key characteristics, choices and decisions a researcher has to make when carrying out a feminist research project. . Further, discuss one example of feminist research that you find inspirational.

Recommended Literature:

- Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Leslie McCall. 2013. „Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Application, and Praxis“. *Signs 38 (4)*: 785–810. Intersectionality: Theorizing Power, Empowering Theory, Article DOI: 10.1086/669608.
- May, Vivian M. 2015. „What is Intersectionality“. In *Pursuing Intersectionality, Unsettling Dominant Imaginaries*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 18–62.
- Ramazanoglu, Caroline, Janet Holland. 2004. „Choices and decisions: doing a feminist research project“. In *Feminist methodology: challenges and choices*. London: SAGE, pp. 145–164.
- Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. „Conclusion“. In *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 240–269.
- Scott, Joan W. 1999. „Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis“. In *Gender and the politics of history: revised edition*. Columbia University Press, pp. 28–52.

17. Discuss the concept of gender as an analytical category within the social sciences and humanities. What definitions of gender as an analytical category exist and how is gender conceptualized by various authors? How do these authors relate to the claim that gender is the main and most important category in analyses of social power structures and oppression?

Recommended Literature:

- Acker, Joan. 2006. „Inequality Regimes: Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations“. *Gender & Society* 20 (4): 441–464.
- Bilge Sirma. 2013. „Intersectionality Undone“. *Du Bois Review* 10 (2): 405–424.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 2001. *Masculine Domination*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. vii-ix, 1-4, 34–42.
- May, Vivian M. 2015. „What is Intersectionality“. In *Pursuing Intersectionality, Unsettling Dominant Imaginaries*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 18–62.
- Scott, Joan W. 1999. „Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis“. In *Gender and the politics of history: revised edition*. Columbia University Press, pp. 28–52.

18. Discuss the theoretical assumptions and practical issues pertaining to methodologies using interviews. What is characteristic and specific on using interviews within feminist research? Compare interview research with surveys [questionnaire research]. Further, discuss an example of feminist research that uses interviews , or questionnaires that you find inspirational to address the questions above.

Recommended Literature:

- Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. „Feminist interview research“. In *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 18–45.
- Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. „Feminist survey research and other statistical research formats“. In *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 76–94.

19. Discuss the characteristics of methods employed in research based on existing materials and sources (such as literary and journalistic texts, institutional documents, archival materials, artifacts, video or audio recordings). What are the methodological and research challenges pertaining to new media? Please illustrate by providing examples.

Recommended Literature:

- Carah, Nicholas, Amy Dobson. 2016. „Algorithmic Hotness: Young Women’s “Promotion” and “Reconnaissance” Work via Social Media Body Images“. *Social Media + Society*. doi:[10.1177/2056305116672885](https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305116672885)
- Fetterley, Judith. 1978. „Introduction: On the Politics of Literature“. In *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. xi-xxvi.
- Reinharz, Shulamit. 1992. „Feminist content analysis“. In *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 145–163.

20. How does intersectional research conceptualize social inequalities? What types of methods of/in intersectional research have you encountered/read about/studied? Please discuss the problems pertaining to the application of intersectional approaches when conducting research.

Recommended Literature:

- Bilge, Sirma. 2013. „Intersectionality Undone“. *Du Bois Review* 10 (2): 405–424.
- Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Leslie McCall. 2013. „Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Application, and Praxis“. *Signs* 38 (4): 785–810. Intersectionality: Theorizing Power, Empowering Theory, Article DOI: [10.1086/669608](https://doi.org/10.1086/669608).
- Keeling, Kara. 2005. „„Joining the Lesbians“: Cinematic Regimes of Black Lesbian Visibility“. In E. Patrick Johnson, Mae G. Henderson (eds.). *Black Queer Studies*. New York, USA: Duke University Press, pp. 213–227.
- May, Vivian M. 2015. „What is Intersectionality“. In *Pursuing Intersectionality, Unsettling Dominant Imaginaries*. New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, pp. 18–62.
- Ruberg, Bonnie, Spencer Ruelos. 2020. „Data for Queer Lives: How LGBTQ gender and sexuality identities challenge norms of demographics“. *Big Data & Society* 7 (1).
- Thomas, Jerry. 2017. „Queer sensibilities: notes on method“. *Politics, Groups, & Identities* 5 (1): 172–181.