“If we want to change, we must be willing to teach”¹: Exploring the potential of intersectional feminist pedagogy to change oppressive behaviours and ease a conflict in a Catalan secondary school.

Nathalie Prévot

Supervisor: Professor Emerita Nina Lykke

Master’s programme in Gender Studies – Intersectionality and Change

Master’s Thesis 30 ECTS Credits

ISRN: LIU-TEMA G/GSIC2-A—18/014-SE

¹ bell hooks, 2003, p.76
Abstract

Whereas transformative pedagogy is a well researched subject, intersectional feminist pedagogy and specifically Transversal dialogue has not been used to ease conflict in Catalonia. This research examines the potential for intersectional feminist pedagogy to change oppressive behaviours in both students and teachers in a classroom conflict in a Catalan secondary school. Using ethnography, the thesis describes and analyses a five month research process, which involved participant observation, participatory action research and anti-oppressive sessions using Transversal dialogue. By concluding that changes in oppressive behaviours in both teacher and students can be empowering, the research challenges the idea put forward by Kevin Kumashiro about changes occurring through crisis. Rather, I argue that Edyta Just’s adaptation of Deleuzian philosophy to pedagogy offers a more flexible framework to understand these changes. This thesis aims to contribute to intersectional feminist pedagogy by first demonstrating that changes in oppressive behaviours can occur in empowering ways and second that theories of how to bring about those changes need to be flexible.
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1. INTRODUCTION

“There is no such thing as a single issue struggle because we do not live single issue lives.”

It started last year when an article in the Spanish press announced that thirty four women had already been killed by their heterosexual partners since the beginning of the year. We were in April. The article spoke about solutions to this type of violence and suggested that teachers should educate children towards a non-sexist society. Despite this simplistic solution to a deep rooted structural problem, I believe in education and was interested in the idea. Nonetheless, I thought that putting the responsibility of eradicating patriarchy solely on teachers felt rather unrealistic at best, and gratuitous at worst. It was not my first disidentification (Lykke 2014) with this kind of ‘miraculous’ solution, which was offered without any explanation of the ways it could materially be implemented.

My doubts in teachers’ miraculous powers also came from my own experience as a language teacher. Earlier that year, I had taught a class where most of my students were secondary school teachers. During the class, they made some racist comments and I did not know how to react. Me! A fifty-year-old, life-long anti-racist, pathetic! My ego collapsed. That experience made me realise that it was not enough to be against racism or sexism, that teachers needed some pedagogical tools to be able to successfully address these kinds of issues in their classrooms. Besides, I did not know how I could monitor my own unintended oppressive behaviours. Hadn’t I constructed myself as an open European who was against prejudices? After reading about how whiteness is invisible to, and reproduced by white people, I understood that I was not beyond reproach (Lewis, 2004, p.634). Hadn’t I asked benevolently where some people ‘really’ came from? Pointing to the fact that they did not belong here in privileged Europe was my way of showing any immigrant that I was open to immigration. I did not know that I was reproducing both my privileges and a micro-aggression. I am now aware that not only students’ but also teachers’ oppressive behaviours have to be addressed if changes in behaviour and mindsets are to occur. Unfortunately, in Spain, like in many European countries, there is no training offered by universities to teacher candidates to address their own or their students’ oppressive behaviours (GraciaTrujillo, 2015).
I thought that something had to be done. I knew that my willingness to change the status quo also came from the fact that I am both a teacher and a feminist activist. I thought that some help in the form of training had to be given to teachers in order to address both their own prejudices and those of their students. However, the idea felt daunting, and before I could consider proposing such courses, I needed to know more about Spanish/Catalan teachers’ (including myself) and students’ ways of reproducing oppression in schools. I also felt that I needed to acquire some experience of teaching in these types of schools. I do not work in the state system but have my own small community school in my village where I am the only teacher - not a typical setting. I decided to do my internship in a state school. I wanted to understand how and by whom oppression was reproduced.

Unsure of my ability to help teachers and students, I started my internship in IES Santa Eugenia, a state secondary school in a working-class neighbourhood of Girona, mainly populated by immigrants both from inside and outside the country. During my internship I met Emma, a young Catalan who started teaching English last September. She was having problems with a class of young male adults who are doing a vocational studies course to become electricians. The problems had escalated so much that the situation could be described as a classroom conflict. Some students made both sexist remarks to her and racist comments to other students. They also made remarks on the status of her job: being a teacher equals having a good salary, something they were lacking. Therefore, not only were gender and race entangled in this dilemma, but class too. I told Emma that I would come and observe her class and try to help her to ease the conflictive situation.

After studying the Master’s programme in Gender Studies, Intersectionality and Change I was eager to apply intersectional feminist pedagogy to an issue that demonstrated the complexity of multidimensional identities. In this classroom conflict, gender/sex, age, class, ‘race’/ethnicity and sexuality were entangled. I observed her class and then offered to teach some sessions with her to try to ease the conflict. Through the sessions, I thought I could investigate the potential of intersectional feminist pedagogy to change oppressive practices in both teachers and students. I would then base my thesis research on assessing changes in both the students and us, the teachers. Emma accepted with enthusiasm.
Terminology: why Intersectional Feminist Pedagogy?

The term intersectionality was first formulated by Kimberlé Crenshaw; she explains the concept of intersectionality as follows: “different aspects of one’s identity are multidimensional and entangled: sex/gender, class, ‘race’/ethinicity, sexuality, age and differences in abilities create power differentials that oppress or privilege individuals” (1989, p. 141). Since Crenshaw invented the concept, intersectionality has proven a useful theoretical and methodological tool to analyze how sociocultural categories interact and create inequalities (Lykke 2010, p. 50). Floya Anthias maintains that, in an educational context, intersectionality provides a more complex understanding of how social categories of difference and inequalities reinforce each other to produce exclusion in the classroom (2012, p.129). Therefore, in educational settings intersectionality is potentially a significant theoretical tool of transformation.

For Nina Lykke, intersectional gender pedagogy is used to raise consciousness about power relations, excluding norms and differences in the classroom (2013, p.14). In the situation described above, raising both pupils’ and teachers’ consciousness about the complexity of identities may help to ease the conflict. Understanding norms and differences may help the students understand oppressions that they do not suffer themselves.

Finally, I have chosen the term feminist instead of gender because, as Lykke explains, using the term feminist ‘operates a shift from the object to the political position of the subject’ (2010, p.12). Because I am a feminist activist, I regard intersectional feminist pedagogy as a form of activism aiming at changing society through education.
2: BACKGROUND: SITUATING THE RESEARCH

“White women don’t work on racism to do a favor for someone else, solely to benefit Third World Women. You have to comprehend how racism distorts and lessens your own lives as white women- that racism affects your chances for survival, too, and that it is very definitely your issue” (Barbara Smith 1982, p. 49).

Why IES Santa Eugenia?

I found my internship through Monica², a friend who teaches English and is head of the English department in Santa Eugenia. I was interested in doing an internship there because Monica had previously told me that she had problems with some sexist Moroccan students who did not recognise female teachers’ authority. Her comment had the characteristics of a complex issue that entangles different types of oppressions. Singling out Moroccans’ sexism invisibilises or negates that sexism also exists in Spain. Constructing Moroccan boys as more sexist is singling them out as ‘others’, a well known racist tactic. However, the sexism endured by female teachers – certainly not a Moroccan exclusivity – has to be taken into account too. I thought that in order to ease this type of conflict an intersectional theoretical framework was needed. How to react to the sexism of racialized subjects had been a problem I had often encountered in my life; I was eager to try to solve this type of conundrum. I therefore asked Monica if I could come to her school to do my internship. She did not have this type of problem anymore but told me that she would ask a teacher if I could observe her classes.

Situating the time of the research

I started to go to IES Santa Eugenia as part of my Master’s internship in December 2017. I started my internship by observing a young English teacher, Maria, who teaches a group which is considered to contain ‘problematic students’. Most of the problematic students are in fact immigrants who are learning Catalan. I was interested in helping Maria because she was reproducing whiteness. I also had some doubts; she had not

² All the names used in the thesis have been changed to anonymize the research participants.
asked me to come and tell her what to do. I thought I might be imposing my benevolence on her. However, when Emma heard that I was doing observations to understand the kind of oppressions that were reproduced in Santa Eugenia she asked Monica if I could come and speak to her. As Ghazala Bhatti rightly remarks, serendipity is often part of the ethnographic journey of the researcher (2012, p. 218). I had started my internship thinking I could research on how whiteness is reproduced by a committed and well-intentioned teacher. When I heard Emma’s problem I must admit that the type of conflict came closer to the type of research I had originally wanted to conduct.

I first met Emma outside the school. I then started to observe her class in December and January. We elaborated the four sessions in February and taught them in March 2018. In April Emma did another session on her own and I finished the research with an interview with Emma. Therefore I regard the research as a process – as it occurred over several months - rather than a snapshot of a particular reality.

Situating the place of the research

The first thing that struck me when I entered the school on the first day was that most students were of immigrant origin whereas the teachers were all white Catalans. I already knew that Santa Eugenia was not only a working class neighbourhood but also a segregated area; the immigrant population is prevented from renting flats in other parts of Girona. Whereas the housing segregation is organised by private owners, the schooling segregation is clearly due to a state system, which partly finances private schools and reproduces racial and class segregation. As bell hooks already condemned, “The old racial segregation in education is being re-inscribed, complete with schools deemed inferior that are composed of our nation’s non-white poor and working-class” (2003, p.67). The richest families in the neighbourhood often choose to send their children to these private schools where the level of education is considered to be higher. As the richest are usually not immigrant families, private education separates Spanish/Catalan from the immigrant children in a form of de facto ethnic segregation.

Apart from playing a significant role in reproducing inequalities by having two different education systems, the 2011 budget cuts in education have deepened the gap between rich and poor. The state does not provide school lunches any more, which has dramatic
consequences for the poorer students who do not eat anything during the seven hours they attend IES Santa Eugenia.

Santa Eugenia institute provides compulsory secondary education to pupils from twelve to sixteen years old, then two years of Batxillerat for the academically successful and two different levels of vocational training. From the beginning of the four years of compulsory education, pupils are already classified into two different groups. The first ones will do a two year Batxillerat course that will eventually allow them to go to university. The second group of students, who are not academically successful, can later choose a vocational course in business, electricity, tourism or graphic design, or drop out.

This early classification can have a negative impact on the performance of the students if they are in the lowest group, creating a self-fulfilling prophecy. However, the classification is not only based on academic performances; the lowest groups are the ones where immigrant and Roma students are found. This fact demonstrates that there are different factors for pupils’ classification; some are visible: academic achievement and some are hidden: racism. There are twice as many Spanish and Catalan students in the Batxillerat section than in vocational studies. Inequalities that are produced by the state are reflected in the functioning of IES Santa Eugenia.

The administration does not keep a record of what the students do after they finish their compulsory years so it is hard to assess. In Santa Eugenia more pupils go to vocational training than to the Batxillerat: the ratio is around sixty percent vocational to forty percent Batxillerat. There is no data about pupils who stop studying despite the fact that Spain has the highest dropout rate in Europe (Spain’s school dropout rate highest in Europe 2014). The Spanish education system is not famous for its achievements in Europe - quite the opposite. The country has systematically scored poorly when given European assessments. However, help is provided for students who are willing to succeed. There is a ‘pla educatiu d’entorn’ [a plan of education for the area (my translation)]. A community centre run by the council, which works in partnership with the school, provides tutors for students who are willing to be helped to do their homework after school. Whether this is a proof that the state system does not let down the poorest of its population is debatable. Apart from a strong taste of ‘if you want you

---

3 The equivalent of A level in the Uk.
can’t neoliberal ideology, this type of policy seems to mask the lack of much needed funding schools such as Santa Eugenía should be entitled to. Finally, there is a class for students who have just arrived in Spain/Catalonia were they can get extra language input.

**Situating the participants in the research**

*The teacher*

Emma is a young, white, Catalan teacher who started teaching in Santa Eugenía in September 2017. It is her first year of teaching. She is trained in history but the state needed English teachers so she had to comply if she wanted a job. Besides teaching, Emma is an active feminist who gives workshops to raise gender consciousness in schools and organisations. She defines herself as middle-class but comes from a working-class area of Barcelona. I knew her vaguely because she goes to the same Ateneu⁴ – where I meet with my feminist group. I think that we were glad to have something in common. She was certainly happy to speak to someone who was conscious of sexism. As a feminist who used intersectionality in her workshops, Emma was aware that her gender, age and physical appearance (she is twenty-eight but looks the same age as her younger students) did not help her students take her seriously.

*The students*

The students in Emma’s class have very diverse age, class and ethnic backgrounds. However, they have one thing in common, they are all male. Some of the students are 17 or 18 years old but some are in their twenties and there is a man who is forty. There are very diverse nationalities too: a few are Catalan/Spanish, some are of African origin and some are from Latin America. They are doing a vocational course to become electricians. If they take the superior level course in vocational studies, they can then go to university. Although most students in universities have the Batxillerat, it seems that the state gives another opportunity to those students who did not achieve academic

---

⁴ Ateneus are social centres typical in Catalonia, this particular space is a liberated/squatted space where social and political groups meet. There is a strong anti-capitalist self-governing philosophy attached to them.
excellence. In theory this reduces class determinism, where someone from a poor and working-class background is three or four times more likely to end up in vocational training while only middle-class students go to university. In the vocational training course Emma teaches, English is an important subject. Emma told me that her vocational students found English useful but do not understand why they have to study it in this course to become electricians. They prefer subjects linked to electronics.

The researcher

I consider myself part of the research as the researcher and a teacher. Therefore, I must reflect on my own location. I am a fifty-one year old white French woman who’s been an English teacher for eight years. I do not consider myself to be part of the middle-class; I would rather use an older terminology that does not blur classes so easily. The term middle-class is often misused; people think that it is the opposite of extremes such as the very rich or the very poor. I feel part of the white-collar working class and not part of the bourgeoisie – terms used before, which give a better sense of class antagonism and struggle (Marx, 1848). The fact of being white and French grants me extra privileges; France is regarded as more developed in its economy, culture and its democratic institutions than Spain. I therefore have to reflect on both Emma’s and my whiteness as they yield extra power in the situation. According to Ann Brewster, not only do affects and embodiment shape individuals’ subjectivities, but they also shape collective identifications (2014, p. 64). Therefore there is a relationship between Emma’s and my privileges and some of the students’ oppression. Brewster maintains that both feelings of the researcher and the individuals being researched have to be reflected upon. I should therefore reflect on how all the participants involved in the conflict and me have connected. According to Sara Ahmed: “The subject comes into being only through its encounters with others; its identity cannot be separated from its psychical and social interaction with them” (cited in Brewster 2014, p.71). Therefore, how affects, subjectivities and bodies interact has to be taken into consideration and analysed carefully.

I work in my own private community school because it is quite complicated for non-Catalans to get into the state education system. However, I am in favour of public education. I grew up in a French ghetto, a segregated neighbourhood similar to Santa
Eugenia. Some experiences in my life made me aware that some situations, which involved the sexism of racialized subjects, were not easy to solve. I am therefore interested in an intersectional framework to understand and try to solve this type of issue because I have often found myself in situations where in order not to be racist, I did not challenge sexism.

Situating the conflict

I met Emma on the 18th of December. I then tried, in my fieldwork notes, to give an account of her story and the classroom conflict that had evolved. I wrote:

“Yesterday I met Emma; she is a young teacher with little experience in teaching, but with an awareness of oppression/privileges and intersectionality. She is a feminist who has studied gender so she is aware of who she represents for her students. She explained that her students were sexist with her; they made a lot of remarks that they would not do with older women and men. Emma is aware that she represents a white middle-class teacher who is lucky to have what is regarded as a ‘good job’ by her students, who come from a working-class background and are often unemployed. Emma told me that she feels very uncomfortable with her students, she even cried once after a class. She does not know what to do with them, she feels so insecure that she is very nervous, which makes the problem even worse” (Appendix 1).

She had spoken to the department head at the beginning of the year, who understood the issue as being a gender one; she was the only female teacher the students had and the only one with discipline problems. He offered to expel the one student who was the most aggressive. However, the solution seemed too extreme to Emma who did not want to ban a young person from a much needed trade. She rejected it. Besides, expelling one boy may have had disastrous consequences with the rest of the class who may have hated Emma for it. Perhaps this is why Emma was happy to speak to another female teacher who was also a feminist activist.
3. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

“Changing the world requires first naming the world and making visible the problems that often go unseen” (Kevin Kumashiro 2015, p.XIX).

How oppression is reproduced in the classroom is a well investigated field. Transformative pedagogy has addressed the difficult task of changing unequal relationships. Paulo Freire and his seminal book *The Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) marked the start of a long tradition of critical thinkers in pedagogy. However, bell hooks takes issue with Freire’s work for not taking other oppressions such as sex/gender or sexuality into account. In many ways hooks, a Northern American Black feminist laid the ground for intersectional gender pedagogy. An admirer of Freire, hooks extended his work on class by problematizing gender/sex, race and sexuality in education. She interrogates biases which reproduce systems of domination such as racism and sexism. Her seminal work *Teaching to Transgress* (1994), followed by *Teaching Community* (2003) and *Teaching Critical Thinking* (2009), addresses how oppression can be reproduced in the classroom not only by teachers but also by students.

Building on feminist pedagogy, intersectionality and queer theory; Kevin Kumashiro believes in the possibility education offers to change students and society. He investigated how to address future teacher candidates’ privileges and how not to reproduce oppression in their future classrooms (2002). His research revealed that teacher candidates’ resistance to learning discomforting knowledge about their own privileges generated conflicts. The difficulties in accepting changes encouraged him to carry out research into the different ways teachers can address their own oppressive ways of teaching and oppression in the classroom in general (2015).

In Sweden, norm critical pedagogues have developed practical workshops based on Kumashiro’s research and queer theory. Central to norm critical pedagogy is the idea that different norms interact and produce power imbalances within different pedagogical practices. According to Ellsworth “It is impossible to hold a teaching position without admitting to holding a position of power” (cited in Bromseth and Sörensdotter 2013, p. 29). The teacher is always entangled and engaged in norm reproducing processes that
dictate the way individuals are supposed to be and exclude the ones who are ‘deviant’ to the norm (ibid). By deconstructing those norms, norm critical pedagogy raises teachers’ awareness and helps teachers change their practice.

Nina Lykke set up and taught a workshop, in the course ‘Career Paths and Professional Communication’ which is part of the Masters’ programme in Gender Studies: Intersectionality and Change at Linköping University, where she used an intersectional framework to resolve conflict in the classroom (2017, p.204-205). Through the techniques developed by Augusto Boal in *Theatre of the Oppressed* (1985), the aim of the workshop is to imagine how a conflictive situation in a future workplace can be changed. I participated in one of these workshops in 2017; apart from being very enjoyable, the workshop made me reflect on the different ways society could be changed. Resolving a conflict may not change the status quo but can be enough for a few individuals to live a better life.

**Intersectionality in Spain**

The Spanish context is quite different from the US, the UK or Sweden. First of all, intersectionality has been adopted as a framework by institutions quite recently. For example in 2009, María Bustelo contended that whereas Spanish institutions had shown dynamism in gender equality policies from the 1980s onwards, there has been little concern for multiple discriminations.<sup>5</sup>

In Spain, intersectionality is incorporated in Queer theory. Raquel/Lucas Platero Méndez may be the most active researcher and activist that has popularised the concept of intersectionality in Spain. Ze edited *Intersecciones, Cuerpos y Sexualidades en la En crucijada* (2012) [Intersections, Bodies and Sexualities at the Crossroad, (my translation)]; a book that explains the concept of intersectionality in various contexts. Platero Méndez (2014) has also produced useful research on the different ways to transmit intersectional concepts to students both at university and at secondary schools.

Neus Llop Rodríguez (2017) is a social educator who criticises contemporary pedagogy that perpetuates dominant/hegemonic heteronormative discourse. Instead she advocates an intersectional trans-feminist Queer-mutant pedagogy that functions on the margins -

---

<sup>5</sup> For a more detailed account of intersectionality in the Spanish context see De la Concha & Osborne 2004; Juliano 2012; Lombardo y Verloo, 2010; Platero, 2007; 2012; Stolcke, 2004.
an education that allows new realities such as LGTBI and hackers to confront norms which pathologise unsubordinated subjectivities.

Gracia Trujillo (2015) who teaches sociology in the education department of the University of La Mancha, bemoans the lack of education on differences – gender, sexual or ethnic. She uses an intersectional queer pedagogy to question sexism, racism and heterosexism with teacher candidates in her classrooms. The new law on education (introduced by the recently ousted right-wing government) no longer mentions diversity, and this does not help university teachers who want to implement courses on diverse, non-normative identities. Trujillo concludes that queer pedagogy helps individuals to unveil sexist, racist and heterosexist norms. She highlights the urgency of training future teachers because she maintains that education is one of the ways through which society can be changed (ibid).

GREDI is a feminist research group in intercultural education based at the University of Barcelona. Using feminist pedagogy, the group started to investigate intercultural issues within the Spanish context in 1992. Since then, the researchers have adopted an intersectional framework to create programmes and pedagogical tools for different educational contexts. The group then investigates the suitability of the pedagogical material they have developed. They also offer training in the form of collaborative investigations and conferences (GREDI, 2018). GREDI situates itself between research, education and activism to achieve a fairer society.

**Transversal Dialogue in Spain.**

I could not find any examples of intersectional pedagogy that used Transversal Dialogue to ease classroom conflict. Research into conflict resolution does not take identities into consideration (Blasco,C, Loranzo,P, Luna González, E, Mas, S & Panchón, C 2013) or solely addresses ‘cultural differences’ using an intercultural framework (Funes Laponi 2013, Leiva Olivencia 2008). The ways to approach sexism, racism or homophobia in the classroom are well researched (Sánchez 2009, Bartolomé Pina, M et al. 2002) but not the conflicts generated by them. Moreover, class is never mentioned as an oppression that can generate conflict.
Transversal dialogue was developed by the Italian feminist movement Women in Black to create alliances across divisions created by national conflicts. The Women in Black movement has worked with both Serbs and Croats as well as Palestinian and Israeli Jewish women (Yuval-Davis 1997, p.129). Their idea of transversal dialogue is based on ‘rooting’ and ‘shifting’. Starting from each individual’s intersecting identity, transversal dialogue works with the idea that by exchanging one’s identity with another woman who identifies with a different group, one can reach a better understanding of that person (ibid, p.130). Women in Black’s Transversal Dialogue model does not exist in Spain, which means that no research has been conducted using it.
4. AIMS OF MY RESEARCH

The purpose of this research is to contribute to intersectional feminist pedagogy. My principal aim is to investigate the possibilities intersectional feminist pedagogy offers regarding changes in ideas, behaviours and discourse. Here, change is regarded as a solution to a conflictive situation in the classroom. No research has been done on conflict resolution using Transversal dialogue in the Spanish context. This research intends to fill this gap.

In this research I investigate if and how intersectional feminist pedagogy has the potential to offer to change the behaviours of the different actors of a conflict. I reflect on and experiment with transversal dialogue in particular and feminist teaching methods in general to challenge oppressive behaviours in students from Emma’s classroom. I also investigate how the experiment in teaching method has changed Emma and myself. It would be unfair, as well as naive, to think that only the participants at the receiving end are the ones who have the possibility or the obligation to change. Conflicts are generated in special situations or assemblages where all the actors are participants (Deleuze & Guattari 2005). Therefore, everyone’s involvement should be analyzed; after all, the researcher is always entangled in the research (Barad in Lykke 2010, p. 151).

My principal aim of this research is to investigate the potential of intersectional feminist pedagogy in changing individuals’ oppressive behaviours in order to ease a classroom conflict.

The principal question of the research, related to this aim, is:

- **Can intersectional feminist pedagogy create tools to productively handle a classroom conflict and change individuals’ oppressive behaviour in a Catalan secondary school?**

As my second aim, apart from exploring intersectional feminist pedagogy, I would like to examine some pragmatic aspects of my research. I reflect on how Emma and I experiment with feminist teaching methods. The question, related to my second aim is:
- **How to experiment with feminist teaching methods, which are able to challenge oppression and change oppressive behaviours?**

My third aim is to examine how participants experience potential changes in their behaviours as well as in their perception of the conflict. The question related to the third aim is:

- **What is the participants’ process of change?**

The fourth aim relates to my participation in the research in the double role as teacher and researcher. The question of my third aim is:

- **How can the researcher’s self reflexivity contribute to the above mentioned processes of changes?**

The fifth and final aim is to understand how to theorise these changes in behaviours, so the fifth question is:

- **How can these changes be best theorized?**

With this research I hope to contribute to intersectional feminist pedagogy’s field of knowledge in different ways. First, by investigating the feasibility of easing conflict in the classroom through intersectional feminist pedagogy and transversal dialogue, I hope to show the significance of intersectional feminist pedagogy as a tool to help teachers and students to change their behaviours and overcome conflictive situations. Second, I would like to demonstrate that the process of change can be an empowering experience for the research participants. Third, I hope to contribute to the theoretical aspect of how to bring about those changes.

**Thesis outline**

In order to answer my research questions I have divided my thesis into eight parts. After the introduction, which explains why I want to focus on intersectional feminist pedagogy, I have situated the research in the background chapter. I have examined previous research and defined the gap I want to research. After stating my aims I review the different theories I use for my research. Then, I explain my choice of epistemology, methodology, ontology, methods and ethics. In the analysis chapter, I first review the
 internship and the anti-oppressive sessions and explain the teaching methods Emma and I experimented with during the sessions. I analyse how both Emma and I proceeded in the five sessions of the pedagogical experiment. In the second part of the analysis, I focus on changes in both the participants and Emma by analysing questionnaires answered by the students and three interviews with Emma. Then, I examine my own contribution to change using self-reflexivity. I also reflect on the way the process has changed me and which elements of my teaching and researching I should change in the future.

In the fourth part, I discuss which theory is most suitable to understand the results of my research. I argue that Kumashiro’s idea of changing oppressive behaviours through crisis is too prescriptive; that another, more flexible, theoretical framework is needed to understand change and empowerment. I argue that Edyta Just’s application of Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophy for pedagogical purpose not only offers a more open, flexible theoretical framework but also does not restrict change to a single emotion or affect. Finally, I answer the principal question of my research about the possibilities of intersectional feminist pedagogy for change.

In the last chapter, I summarise my findings and discuss both implications and limitations in my research. Then, I suggest that more research in intersectional feminist pedagogy is needed in order to understand how individuals can change oppressive behaviours.
5. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

Intersectionality

“[intersectionality is] a theoretical and methodological tool to analyse how historically specific kinds of power differentials and/or constraining normativities, based on discursively, institutionally and/or structurally constructed sociocultural categorizations such as gender, ethnicity, race, class, sexuality, age/generation, dis/ability, nationality, mother tongue and so on interact, and in so doing produce different kinds of societal inequalities and unjust social relations” (Lykke 2010, p.50).

The first theoretical framework I have chosen in order to analyse the conflict in Emma’s classroom is intersectionality because it provides a way of analyzing oppression in its social aspect in a complexity that anti-sexism, classism or anti-racism alone cannot achieve. Analyzing oppression using only one categorical framework limits and essentialises categories, and thereby over-simplifies the dilemma. To solely address sexism is to invisibilise racialised subjects, class, sexualities, age. An intersectional framework, on the other hand, recognizes that identities are multilayered (Lykke 2010, p.50). An intersectional framework enables the complexity of identities and their interactions to be exposed and reveals both teachers’ and students’ multiple locations. Identities are not fixed, but fluid; they change according to the situation and are relational. Braidotti maintains that:

“Identity is but a constant process of negotiation among diverse and potentially contradictory variables, which intersect and overlap incessantly. Any one of them can be the hegemonic one for some period of time, but their structure being relational, they constantly shift in relation to each other” (1997, p.34).

Braidotti understands intersections and identities as fluid and contingent to fluctuations of power according to time and situations. Therefore, oppressive dynamics and power relations have to be contextualized because an individual can be both the oppressor and the oppressed according to the situation.

Besides, the concept of intersectionality addresses narrow perceptions of identity. Individuals have the tendency to experience themselves as bearers of one fixed identity; some students in Emma’s class may only understand themselves as either members of the working-class or as racialized subjects. Emma’s suffering from sexist insults may render invisible the power position she occupies and her privileges as a white teacher. It
is the one aspect of identity that suffers oppression that individuals usually experience most consciously. Rosi Braidotti explains why oppressions are noticeable while privileges are not - “a great deal of our locations escape self-scrutiny in that they are so familiar, that one is not even aware of them” (2007, p. 243). As well as familiarity, there is also a conscious way of ignoring privileges which can help individuals assert their domination. Charles W. Mills explains in the Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance that, in the USA, that by refusing to recognise how structural discriminations have given advantages and resources to white people, they have tried to magically erase white privilege. Woody Doane (2003) explains:

“Color-blind” ideology plays an important role in the maintenance of white hegemony. . . . Because whites tend not to see themselves in racial terms and not to recognize the existence of the advantages that whites enjoy in American society, this promotes a worldview that emphasizes individualistic explanations for social and economic achievement, as if the individualism of white privilege was a universal attribute. Whites also exhibit a general inability to perceive the persistence of discrimination and the effects of more subtle forms of institutional discrimination. In the context of color-blind racial ideology, whites are more likely to see the opportunity structure as open and institutions as impartial or objective in their functioning. . . . this combination supports an interpretative framework in which whites’ explanations for inequality focus upon the cultural characteristics (e.g., motivation, values) of subordinate groups. . . . Politically, this blaming of subordinate groups for their lower economic position serves to neutralize demands for antidiscrimination initiatives or for a redistribution of resources” (cited in Mills, 2007, p.28).

Doane’s explanation shows the far reaching implications of ignorance of whiteness. Therefore, it is important for individuals to be able to situate both their privileges and their oppressions without falling into the (all too easy) epistemology of ignorance. Intersectionality offers such a tool.

Pedagogies critical of oppression

“The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways. The point, however, is to change it”. (Karl Marx 1845/1979)

Critical theory, based on neo-Marxist philosophy, was developed by the Frankfurt school from the 1930s onwards by Herbert Marcuse, Walter Benjamin, Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno (1947/2002). Critical theorists maintained that the dominant ideology was an obstacle to human liberation. Influenced by neo-Marxism, Critical Pedagogy started to apply some of the concepts of the field to education; teaching was then understood as a political act. In his seminal work The Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1970/2005), Paulo Freire challenged the idea of knowledge as
something neutral and instead advocated that emancipation from oppression would come from a rise in critical consciousness. Consciousness would stimulate individuals to change, through social critique and political action, the unjust world they were living in. Consequently, Freire questioned the relationship between students, teachers and society. He maintained that it was essential to create a learning process that challenged and changed power relations in the classroom to be able to change power relations in society. He proposed a new relationship between students and teachers. Freire promoted the learner’s active participation in the creation of knowledge and questioned the idea that learners were empty vessels that had to be filled. However, Freire has been criticized for only taking class into account, thereby invisibilising oppressions that stem from sex/gender, race, ethnicity, age, diverse abilities, and nationality, amongst others.

**Feminist Engaged Pedagogy**

Building on Freire’s work on class, bell hooks laid the ground for intersectional pedagogy, since, as well as taking class into account, she examines how sexism, racism and homophobia are reproduced in the classroom. In her book *Teaching to Transgress* hooks condemns an educational system that, instead of being the practice of freedom, ‘merely strives to reinforce domination’ (1994, p.4). hooks provides new ways of teaching diverse groups of students (ibid, p10). Influenced by Thich Nhat Hanh, hooks claims that pedagogy has to include mind, body and spirit to produce knowledge about how to live in the world (ibid, p.15). In order to empower students, teachers have to feel well in their bodies and their minds. They have to be happy; a process of self-actualization which is central to ‘engaged pedagogy’. The ‘engaged’ teacher uses a holistic approach to both empower hir students and hirself in the process (ibid, p.21). Furthermore teachers cannot ask students to reveal or share something about themselves that the teacher is not prepared to do. A teacher must be committed to self scrutiny and self actualisation, to accept hir own vulnerability in the classroom thereby accepting to reduce hierarchical relations amongst the classroom participants. Finally, teachers committed to self-actualization, through engaged pedagogy, can enhance students’ capacity to live fully and deeply (ibid, p.22). hooks gives a detailed account of how to avoid many oppressive situations she has encountered during her teaching years as a
university lecturer. hooks’ pieces of advice are precious for any teacher, like me, who wants to address oppressions that generate conflict in the classroom.

**Intersectional Gender Pedagogy and Transversal dialogue**

Whereas hooks problematises the role of the teacher in the classroom, Lykke (2013) suggests ways to deal positively with student and teacher differences. Lykke understands intersectional gender pedagogy as a tool to raise consciousness about ‘power relations, excluding norms and differences’ (2013, p.14). Intersectional Gender Pedagogy challenges the common sense idea that teachers should not make any differences amongst students, that every student should be treated in the same way; as the expression ‘I don’t see colour’ exemplifies. By contrast, Lykke maintains that homogeneity recreates the norm of the dominant group, and therefore, differences have first to be made visible. Differences should be treated in a constructive way that prevents exclusion (ibid, p.15). To create a classroom that is both inclusive and treats difference constructively is not an easy task. Lykke advocates Transversal dialogue, a tool that works through the boundaries that are created by differences in gender, class, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, nationality and ability. By understanding others’ social location in terms of oppressions and privileges, transversal dialogue helps the participants to understand what unites and what divides them. Therefore transversal dialogue treats difference constructively.

**Anti-Oppressive Pedagogy**

The idea of change is dear to Kevin Kumashiro, whose purpose is to change society through education. Kumashiro’s anti-oppressive pedagogy is influenced by feminism, intersectionality and queer theory. For Kumashiro, intersectionality is a much needed tool in pedagogy “The situated nature of oppression and the multiple and intersecting identities of students make difficult any anti-oppressive effort that revolves around one identity only” (2000, p.30).Kumashiro is influenced by Queer theory that questions normative systems of oppressions and rejects established norms regarding sexualities and gender (2002, p.10). Finally, feminist psychoanalysis helps to understand how people learn and especially the way the unconscious resists changes (2000, p. 43).
Furthermore, he borrows from post-structuralism the idea that oppression operates through discourse; inequality is produced when a certain discourse is privileged. While most theorists working against oppression agree that oppression is produced in situations where certain identities are privileged, there is a lot of disagreement about the way pedagogies can change the situation (2000, p.25). According to Kumashiro there are four different ways to address oppression in the classroom.

The first approach, *education for the other*, looks at stereotypes and how some students are treated as ‘others’. This approach is positive because it acknowledges the diversity amongst the student population. However, to conceptualize oppression in terms of marginalization instead of privileges and normalcy presupposes that the problem is the ‘other’, that there would be no problems if diversity did not exist (ibid, p.30).

The second approach, *education about the other*, questions partial knowledge that is based on stereotypes. Whereas this approach tries to normalize differences, it can essentialise the ‘other’ into a category such as the ‘Queer’ or the ‘Black’. The second approach does not disrupt existing knowledge. However, Kumashiro maintains that for students to change, the knowledge that is in place has to be disrupted (ibid, p.34).

The third approach, *education that is critical of privileging and othering*, interrogates the social structures that maintain the binary social construction of the normal and the deviant. Critical pedagogy advocates both a critique and a social transformation of structural oppression through consciousness raising. This approach is positive because it strives to change society, but it also has a number of weaknesses. First, it does not take the multiple aspects of identities into account and therefore downplays how oppression is experienced by individuals. Second, simply being aware may not be enough to lead to action (ibid, p.37-38). Third, consciousness raising can be criticized for its rationalism, which assumes that reason alone conveys understanding. Ellsworth (1992) disagrees with this idea; individuals’ identities are influenced by experiences, privileges and oppressions; the assumption that a rational detachment exists in fact perpetuates the norm (cited in Kumashiro 2000).

The last approach, *education that changes students and society*, is influenced by the poststructuralist idea of citation and supplementation used in feminist and queer readings of psychoanalysis (ibid, p.43). Central to poststructuralism is the idea that oppression operates through citing particular harmful discourses that influence the way
individuals think. However, the poststructuralist notion of citation and supplementation transcends the prohibition of stereotypes by altering citation practice itself, for example by reappropriating harmful words such as nigger or queer (ibid, p.42).

Some psychoanalytical theory suggests that the unconscious resists change. Kumashiro maintains that the most significant challenge anti-oppressive education faces is to overcome this resistance to change. According to Kumashiro ‘we unconsciously desire to learn only that which affirms our sense that we are good people and that we resist learning anything that reveals our complicity with racism, homophobia and other forms of oppressions’ (ibid, p.43). Against this desire to ignore, he proposes the construction of disruptive, different knowledges. Instead of affirming and repeating what students or teachers already know; ‘teaching must involve uncertainty, difference and change’ (ibid, p.44). However, changes cannot always be achieved in a rational way because unlearning, or re-learning, involves more than just reason. According to Felman (1995), you have to accept that your students may get upset when you tell them that their ways of doing things can be oppressive. Therefore, students have to work through crisis. Felman suggests that a constructive way to work through crisis is for the student to revisit the crisis by giving it new meanings or associations (cited in Kumashiro 2000, p.44).

Finally, Kumashiro warns that teaching is not an unproblematic transmission of knowledge. Teachers should not expect students to learn what they have been taught. Rather, teachers should work within the space between learning and teaching and explore the possibilities for change.

**Norm critical pedagogy**

Norm critical pedagogy started to develop in Sweden around 2010. Its principal aim is to challenge dominant power relations in the classroom and to create an inclusive learning environment (Bromseth and Sörendotter 2013, p.24). Feminists such as Ellworth had already pointed to the impossibility of holding a teaching position without understanding the power held in it (cited in Bromseth and Sörendotter 2013, p.24). Norm critical pedagogy builds first on feminist thinking which has developed pedagogies that reduce the hierarchy between teachers and students. It is also influenced
by queer theory that denounces how norms are based on dichotomous thinking that reproduces binaries of ‘us’ and ‘them’ in society (ibid, p.25). Reproducing norms in the classroom can harm students because they prescribe how students should be or behave. Furthermore, norm critical pedagogy has adopted an intersectional framework to oppose traditional scientific methods that understand male, western, middle-class and heteronormative norms as objective knowledge. Instead of building on the objective and the rational, norm critical pedagogy believes in experienced-based knowledge production. Knowledge becomes a process that makes people aware of their own experiences to render them visible (ibid, p.26). Another central idea of norm critical pedagogy is that norms discriminate against people whose identities differ from them. To be critical of norms can both be empowering, if the person is in a marginalized position, or resisted if the person is privileged.

By reflecting on identities in an intersectional way, it is easier to understand how some norms give privileges while others marginalize individuals. Louise Andersson, (2010) created the Teflon Test which helps to situate individuals according to their privileges and oppressions (cited in Bromseth & Sörensdotter 2013, p. 28). Andersson suggests that friction experienced in one aspect of identity means a deviance from the norm and therefore leads to some form of oppression. Conversely, to be ‘friction free’ when there is no resistance, or the person has not noticed that some form of oppression even existed, means compliance to a norm and privilege. The Teflon Test is a great tool to raise individuals’ consciousness of their own privileges. It is relevant to work on privileges because they are invisibilised; it is often easier to point out ‘the Other’s’ marginalisation than scrutinise our own cultural mechanisms which are responsible for disseminating oppression in the first place.

The social dimension of the resolution of conflict can be analyzed through intersectional anti-oppressive pedagogy. However, this framework does not address the materiality of the classroom, the embedded and embodied individuals and their affects. Emilia Åkesson, whose research explores embodiment, corporeality and bodies in pedagogies, challenged the idea of the teacher as a rational, neutral and universal knowledge producer. Instead, Åkesson claims that the body, affects and emotions are integral parts of classroom assemblages; to ignore the materiality of the body reproduces the dichotomous understanding of the body and the mind (2014, p.84). Building on Åkesson’s argument I intend to examine changes in the conflict and its participants
through assemblages, affects and becomings (Deleuze and Guattari’s, 2005). This theoretical framework can help to understand the complexity of the conflict in its materiality. For Rosi Braidotti theory is transitional, it moves and creates connections amongst theories that are not related one to another (2002, p.173-174). My aim here is to connect Kumashiro’s anti-oppressive pedagogy to Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophy in an attempt to analyse both the social and material aspects of the conflict.

EMBODIED LOCATIONS

The classroom, an assemblage?

“Every assemblage is basically territorial. The first concrete rule for assemblages is to discover what territoriality they envelop, for there always is one” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2005, p.503).

To take the territoriality and assemblages into account emphasizes the physical location of the conflict. In this case, the classroom itself, the bodies which occupy it, along with teaching and learning which take place within this material space make up an assemblage. Using ‘assemblage’ as a theoretical tool allows for a more complex understanding of the conflict; participants operate in time and space but are also located within a social dynamic of power and culture. The conflict dealt with here is geographically located in an inner city school in Girona and its participants are local students and teachers in 2018. The same type of conflict may not have occurred twenty years before and may not occur in the future. Therefore, the territoriality of assemblages reveals the conflict in a variety of material dimensions that are worth exploring in order to approach a certain situated reality rather than exploring the conflict as a universal one.

According to Puar, assemblages can be considered as both arrangements and relations (2012, p. 57). These are not fixed but rather, to some extent, are renegotiated in each class. There is a relational continuity, however, it could be claimed that each class exists within its own time frame (I use the term time frame as it evokes spatial as well as temporal considerations). Some offensive comments or behavior may appear on a given day from one individual, but may not be repeated in the next class. Certain features of
conflict may be fluent and transient – they come and go. Elizabeth Grosz uses the term *provisional* when describing the bonds created through assemblage (1994, p. 167).

**Affective bodies**

“We are never neutral in our bodily encounters with other; we experience situations through affective responses. Ethics are always corporeally enacted” (Weiss 1999, cited in Brewster, 2014, p.76).

‘*Sticks and stones may break my bones but words can never harm me’.*

Anyone who has been hurt by verbal insults knows that this children’s adage is ineffective – human minds and bodies are vulnerable to negative words. Denying the impact of bodies further invisibilises body language, which can be at times more damaging than verbalized insults and comments. Therefore, the materiality of the body cannot be ignored if the different aspects of the conflict are to be taken into account.

The *robust porosity* which Nancy Tuana suggests acts to destabilize efforts ‘to finalise a nature/culture divide’ may well exist between embodied subjects and their affective responses within the complexities of the classroom assemblage. According to Deleuze (1992): “A body affects other bodies, or is affected by other bodies; it is this capacity for affecting and being affected that also defines a body in its individuality” (cited in Probyn 2004, p. 37). In teacher-student interactions, reciprocal affective relationships are built amongst all the participants. The need to work on these relationships is highlighted by Elspeth Probyn, who states that “Emotion refers to the social expression of affect; affect in turn is the biological and physiological experience of it” (ibid, p. 28). Probyn proposes a holistic approach to dealing with conflict. Nonetheless, dealing with conflict implies dealing with complexity because affective responses are the result of “an embodied history to which and with which the body reacts” (ibid, p. 29).
6. METHODS, METHODOLOGY, ONTOLOGY AND ETHICS

“I see the ethnographic project as humanly situated, always filtered through human eyes and human perceptions, and bearing both the limitations and the strengths of human feelings” (Richardson, 2000, p. 964)

Before I explain the methods and methodology employed in this research, I would like to reflect both on the type of knowledge being produced and how it has been produced.

Epistemology, methodology and ontology

How knowledge is produced has generated much debate amongst feminists. The vast majority of feminists have criticised positivism for its claims that knowledge is objectively produced. However, within feminism, there are various epistemological viewpoints on what constitutes knowledge. Whereas a standpoint feminist way of producing knowledge takes its point of departure in women’s experience and perspective, postmodernists have deconstructed categories - such as women – and the foundations of scientific knowledge production itself (Lykke 2010, p.131). To consider that all women suffer the same oppression, as standpoint feminism does, is to universalise the category women. Therefore, rather than using only one category such as women, Donna Haraway advocates an ‘epistemology of partial perspective’ (cited in Lykke 2010, p. 135). Haraway agrees with postmodernist’s criticism of meta-narratives and maintains that knowledge has to be built on a multiplicity of partial stories rather than an overarching one. However, she rejects postmodernism for its relativism. Rather, Haraway supports multiple and mobile standpoint epistemologies where the researcher should acknowledge hir responsibility in producing a partially objective knowledge (ibid). Both meta-narratives and relativism reproduce the ‘god-tricks’ according to Haraway, because they do not take the location, the materiality and the partial perspective into consideration (ibid, p.136). Therefore Haraway developed the concept of situated knowledge, where the researcher acknowledges hir partial objectivity.

Agential realism, a theory Karen Barad developed and influenced by Haraway’s work, rejects the idea that the object and the subject of the research are separate. She maintains that both the object and the subject are part of the same dynamic world and reality; they ‘intra-act’ (ibid, p.151). However, Barad warns that some momentary cuts or boundaries
have to be made to create distance between the researcher and the researched; both subject and object should be defined and contextualised (ibid). Finally, Charlotte Aull Davies considers that a significant part of the research has to be self reflexive because the researcher is affected by the research and in turn influences the process. Therefore, the subjective experience of the researcher has to be an inherent part of the work (2002, p. 3). Moreover Richardson (2000, p.962) maintains that the product and the producer cannot be separated and boundaries between objective and subjective knowledge are blurred. Therefore, rather than falling into the postmodernist relativist trap, I claim that the knowledge I am trying to produce in this thesis is partial. I think it is important to recognise my involvement in the research because, being a teacher myself, I feel a strong relation with the object of my research. I have the same job as the teacher I have observed, we see each other every week and continuously exchange practices and thoughts which in turn affect the way we are thinking and our teaching practices.

Barad’s agential realism is linked to Haraway’s idea that knowledges have to be situated. Both use the methodological principals of ‘siting’ and ‘sighting’. ‘Siting’ is when the researcher reflects on hir own situatedness in terms of time, space, body and history. The researcher also analyses hir relations of power within the research and define hirself in relation to the research object. The researcher has to take moral responsibility and accountability for the entire process of the research, including the results (Lykke, 2010, p.152). ‘Sighting’ refers to the idea that the researcher perceives reality in a certain way and uses certain technologies to do the research. For Barad and Haraway neither the material nor the discourse employed can be separated; their influence on the research’s perception should be examined (ibid). Furthermore, the world has agency, the researcher cannot control everything. Throughout this thesis, I want to render visible that knowledge is produced from my partial and situated perspective.

For Barad, epistemology and ontology are related. She developed the term onto-epistemology to emphasise the relation between both. Haraway’s idea that knowledge is produced from a partial perspective can both be understood as an ontological position and an epistemological one. By adopting a situated partial perspective as an ontological position, I am stating that this research only accounts for a specific location, at a certain time and with certain actors. According to Jennifer Mason:
“It is only once it is recognised that alternative ontological perspectives might tell different stories that a researcher can begin to see their own ontological view of the social world as a position which should be established and understood, rather than as an obvious and universal truth which can be taken for granted” (1996, p.11).

By stating my ontological position I hope not to fall into the trap of understanding knowledge production, as stated by Mason, as a transparent rational endeavour that claims some universal truths. This is why I described both the school where the conflict and the research took place, and the participants in the background chapter. In doing so, I wanted to present the research in its specificity.

**Ethnography and feminist qualitative educational research**

Ethnography studies individuals’ social worlds in everyday settings; participant observation or informal interviewing are among the methods used to collect data. Ethnography has been defined as the study of the way of life or the culture of a community, a nation or a small group of individuals (Redman, Silva & Watson 2002, p.47). For Robson, the intention of ethnography “is to provide a rich description which interprets experiences of people in the group from their own perspective” (1993, p.148). Ethnography has been traditionally used as an approach by feminists because it prioritises experiences, meanings, subjectivity, participation and context over rational thoughts (Allan 2012, p.94). After Mary Wollstonecraft (1792), second-wave feminist ethnography was the first to focus on education and raise awareness of the unequal treatment women and girls received (Ibid, p.95). In this piece of research, I have used ethnography for two reasons. Not only does it allow me to explore the participants’ experiences and subjectivities, but it is also a flexible approach that enables me to use different qualitative methods.

**Methods for collecting the material**

My desire to ease the conflict led me to use different qualitative methods. From the beginning of my internship I knew that I was on a mission; I wanted to help Emma to ease the classroom conflict. Participant observation felt like the right - and maybe only -
option to understand what was going on in the class. Billie De Walt and Kathleen De Walt Musante define participant observation as:

“a method in which a researcher takes part in the daily activities, rituals, interactions, and events of a group of people as one of the means of learning the explicit and tacit aspects of their life routines and their culture” (2010, p. 12).

Participant observation was first used by anthropologists. With the development of the functionalist theoretical perspective, Bronislaw Malinowski was a major contributor to anthropology. Participant observation is closely related to Malinowski’s functionalist theory and involves a number of elements. The researcher has to live with the subject of research for a long period of time, speak the local language, actively participate in daily routines, use everyday conversation in interviews and finally record observation in field notes (ibid p. 15). I followed a reduced version of this method during my internship as I did not live with the participants but only saw them in school settings. During my observations, I interacted with the students in Spanish mainly before and after class and spoke Catalan and English with Emma. I made some field notes during and after all my observations. Besides, throughout the process I did three semi-structured interviews with Emma. According to Steinar Kvale and Svend Brinkmann the purpose of qualitative research interviews is to “understand themes of the lived daily world from the subjects’ own perspective” (2009, p. 24). I wanted Emma to feel relaxed during the interview so I tried to apply Kvale and Malinowski’s recommendations about the structure of the interview being close to an everyday conversation (ibid).

Apart from using participant observation to understand what was going on in Emma’s classroom, I wanted to help Emma with the conflictive situation. Therefore, after the first observations, we used to meet to discuss how the class had gone. Then I gave Emma some pedagogical tools. I would come back to observe her class and then we would meet again to evaluate both tools and classroom dynamics. This is how participatory action research emerged during my internship. For Patricia Leavy and Sharlene Nagy Hesse-Biber emerging methods are:

“hybrid in the sense that they often borrow and adapt methods from their own disciplines or can cross disciplinary boundaries to create new tools and concepts or refashion tools or concepts that exist in order to answer complex and often novel questions” (2006, pXII).
I suppose participatory action research emerged from our positive interactions. We felt that our collaboration was working when Emma started to feel closer to her students. Both participant observation and participatory action research methods were adapted to answer the specificity of the situation. However, I only knew about participatory action research when my supervisor suggested using it, after my internship was over, when I was preparing the anti-oppressive sessions. Ironically, participatory action research functioned better when we did not know we were using this method. According to Stephen Kemmis and Robin McTaggart, in participatory action research, projects are shared amongst researchers and analysed by the community (2007, p. 273). The key features of participatory action research we tried to share, consciously during the sessions, were: planning change, acting and observing the process, re-planning, acting and observing again, reflecting again (Ibid, p.276). I immediately felt interested by classroom action research, where teachers collect data in the classroom in order to improve their practice, maybe because this was precisely what we had done during my internship. However, I thought it was not possible to share or have my research analysed by the participants/community. Nonetheless, the participants influenced the anti-oppressive sessions in a particular way. Before the first session I was not sure I could do straight forward anti-sexism with the audience. Apart from the first session, which was planned in advance, the second, third and fourth sessions were influenced by the participants’ reactions. After the positive reaction from the participants in the second session it was possible to plan a straight forward anti-sexist session. Even if the participants were not asked to analyse the research, they influenced the planning of the sessions and therefore participated in a peculiar way.

There were some positive outcomes of our idiosyncratic use of participatory action research. Emma, after her participation in the four anti-oppressive sessions, felt confident enough to do a fifth anti-oppressive session on her own on sexualities. So, even if participatory action research is about planning, this unplanned last anti-oppressive session was needed to complete our anti-oppressive work and for the participants to fully understand their multiple privileges and oppressions.
Materials

During the process of the research I have collected different materials: my fieldwork notes (Appendix 1), my diary (Appendix 13), three interviews with Emma (Appendices 2, 11 and 12) and 10 questionnaires from the participants (Appendix 14). On the one hand, I am aware that it would have been better to record the sessions, that my field notes cannot reproduce the sessions as accurately as having the transcripts. On the other hand, I feel that the recording could have inhibited students’ participation. This is why I chose not to record the sessions. Another choice I had to make was about the way to assess change in the participants. Rather than ask the participants to fill up a questionnaire, it may have been better to conduct individual interviews. An in-depth semi-structured interview may have given a better understanding of each participant’s process of change. I did not do it. I thought that I had already asked the students a lot and did not want to abuse their patience.

Methods for analysing the material

To analyse both questionnaires and Emma’s interviews I use discourse analysis. According to Foucault, discourse is certainly not neutral; it is embedded in any given culture - it produces knowledge that in turn can only be understood if it has meaning in that culture (Cited in Hall 1997, p.45). I analyse the respondents’ answers borrowing from discursive psychology the idea that the way individuals make sense of their world does not come from a human essence but rather is culturally and historically specific. Discursive psychology, a social constructionist approach to discourse analysis, is influenced by the way structuralists and post-structuralists understand language. Making sense of our social world, social relations and our identities are all influenced by the language we use (Marianne Jorgensen & Louise Phillips 2002, p.82). Whereas cognitivist psychology does not recognise the social origin of psychological states, a social constructionist approach such as discursive psychology maintains that psychological processes, such as our ways of understanding the world, are not universal but rather historically and socially specific and therefore contingent (ibid). Wittgenstein treated psychological states as social activities rather than essences (1953). In this research, I understand the different discourses as social activities that are historically and socially specific.
Furthermore, I use Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophy (2005) as a method to analyse the theoretical implications of the results of the research. For Rebecca Coleman and Jessica Ringrose, Deleuze’s ideas offer different ways of knowing the world because not only can different things be noticed but also things may happen differently. Through Deleuzian and Guattarian theory, methods are re-invented to adapt to the fluidity, multiplicity and vagueness of reality (2013, p.5). For John Law, methodologies which try to convert the mess of reality into something smooth, coherent and precise have the tendency to be counterproductive and confusing because reality’s complexity is not taken into account. Instead Law advocates for methods which acknowledge the indefinite, unstable and unrepeatable (2004, p.6). Therefore, understanding methods as assemblages is more flexible, it blurs boundaries and takes both multiple realities and material/spacial relations into account (Coleman & Ringrose 2013, p.5). The flexibility and fluidity of Deleuzian methodologies allows the researcher to work between spaces and lead to a better understanding of the multiple aspects of the material.

**Ethics**

I gained access to IES Santa Eugenia thanks to my friend Monica, who asked the head teacher for the permission to observe classes and conduct research for my Master’s thesis. My research was verbally accepted by the head of teachers. In Spain, to conduct research in a school, consent from the institution is enough. I did not have to ask for written permission from the parents of under-age students – a relief. Emma was fully informed from the beginning about my research and she gave me her verbal consent. However, to gain verbal consent from the students was a long process. Emma and agreed that we would say as much of the truth as could be disclosed to the students. In the first session Emma told her students that I was coming to the class for my internship as an English teacher. Not revealing the researcher’s identity is a common practice in participant observation. Abercrombie’s *Dictionary of Sociology* definition of participant observation states that “this refers to a research technique in which the sociologist observes a social collectivity of which he or she is also a member. Such participation allows the sociologist to observe covertly, without the collectivity being aware” (2006, p. 285). Observing students without disclosing the reason raises ethical issues. However, at the beginning, we did not want to disclose that I was coming to do research
into the conflict; we were both scared that some students would be even angrier than they already were with Emma. The fact that some of them were violent made us believe that we had to behave with caution. We both thought that once the tension decreased we would be able to reveal more. Using emerging methods we adapted from participatory action research and participant observation had an impact on the ethics of the research. I started the process covertly but, when the classroom conflict started to ease, it was possible to disclose my aims and gain consent from the participants. Therefore, ethics were also adapted and emerged during the process. Finally, I obtained verbal consent from the students in each anti-oppressive session; I informed them about my research and their option to participate or not in it before each session and I also explicitly asked their consent on the fourth session’s questionnaire.

I have changed the names of the questionnaire respondents to names in Catalan even if some of the respondents are immigrants or their parents were. The reason behind this choice is that I can underline ‘race’ when and only when I think it is relevant.

As I stated earlier, in this research the knowledge is not neutrally produced, rather, it is created from my partial situated position. According to Caroline Ramazanoglu and Janet Holland the power exercised by the researcher has to be ethically examined (2002, p.156). Furthermore, “reflexivity means attempting to make explicit the power relations and the exercise of power in the research process” (ibid, p. 118). I have to reflect on, and make explicit my position of power throughout the research. Braidotti refers to the ‘politics of location’ as a way individuals can become conscious of power (2007,p.243).

First of all, I think that my age, my race and my nationality played a role in getting informed and uninformed consent throughout the process. My friend Monica asked the school head if I could do my internship and my research because she is a friend of mine. Monica and I are exactly the same age but my nationality and the fact that I am studying in Sweden, which bestows enhanced status on my research, may have worked in my favour. I thought that my relationship with Emma was balanced, she needed my support and I needed her classroom conflict for my research. But the fact that I am twenty-five years older than Emma certainly granted me a position, if not of power, at least of authority. This authority may not be only negative as it also helped Emma empower herself. I definitely had authority over the participants not only thanks to my nationality, my race and my age but also physically. In comparison to Emma I am tall, I feel
confident and I have a loud voice; significant attributes when you want to be respected in a classroom.

However, power is not only negative; it is also linked to empowerment. According to Jürgen Habermas, feminist ethics can generate social criticism, which can produce resistance and empowerment (1971, pp. 301-317). For Clifford G. Christians:

“The dominant understanding of power is grounded in nonmutuality, it is interventionist power, exercised competitively and seeking control. In the communitarian alternative, power is relational, characterised by mutuality rather than sovereignty” (2000, p. 148).

For Christians feminist communitarianism “is a normative model that serves as an antidote to individualist utilitarianism. It presumes that the community is ontologically and axiologically prior to persons. Human identity is constituted through the social realm” (2000, p. 144). In this research I can just hope that some of the power I have exercised resembles Christians’s definition of feminist communitarianism.
7. ANALYSIS OF THE MATERIALS

“In the field one has to face a chaos of facts, some of which are so small that they seem insignificant; others loom so large that they are hard to encompass with one synthetic glance. But in this crude form they are not scientific facts at all; they are absolutely elusive, and can be fixed only by interpretation” (Bronislaw Malinowski 1916, p.378)

I agree with Malinowski that social scientists, when analysing their materials, are only giving one of many possible interpretations. In this section I analyse and interpret my findings, each section answers a question from my aims. In the first part of the analysis, ‘Feminist methods in the making’, I examine how Emma and I experimented with some feminist teaching methods before and during the sessions. In the second part of the analysis, ‘Intersectional feminist pedagogy and change’, I analyse the participant questionnaires and Emma’s interviews using discourse analysis. I assess the process of change in the participants – both the students and Emma. In the third part, ‘The researcher’s self reflexivity’, I examine how I contributed to changes in Emma and the conflict and how the research has changed me. In the fourth part, ‘Theory of change’, I challenge Kumashiro’s theory of crisis. Rather, I advocate a more flexible framework such as Just’s application of Deleuzian philosophy to pedagogy. In the final part, ‘Intersectional feminist pedagogy: potential for change’, I claim that intersectional pedagogy does offer a potential for changing individuals’ oppressive behaviours.

FEMINIST TEACHING METHODS IN THE MAKING

My internship: analysing the situation

After our first meeting, Emma and I both agreed for me to come and observe her class. We were both aware that my presence might influence the classroom dynamics and that the students might behave more respectfully when I came to observe, which of course they did. However, I could still observe what was going on. Emma was very tense, she had created a distance between her students and herself; she did not smile. Most students behaved correctly, some of them listened to Emma, they were willing to learn while a small group were disturbing the class because they were bored. During my observation I had noticed that her nervousness created a distance between her and the students. In my fieldwork I noted that:
“because some of her students see Emma as representing the institution, they see her as the enemy; they do not have empathy for her. If Emma was closer to her students, they may understand her better; they would feel compassion and understand that their attitude was oppressive”(appendix 1).

After my first observation of the conflictive classroom, I observed Emma teaching teenagers. I could see in Emma a different teacher. She was a lot more relaxed and the students showed enthusiasm towards the activity Emma was carrying out. In those two visits I had collected enough data to understand that Emma could do with some help. Rather than a standard response involving disciplinary measures, I felt that Emma needed emotional support. She needed to speak to someone who understood the issue, not only as a social/gendered one, but also taking into consideration how sexism deeply affects women’s lives and bodies. As we have already seen, “we experience situations through affective responses” (Weiss cited in Brewster 2017, p.76). During my observations I could feel how Emma was deeply affected by the situation; her body language was completely different in the two classes I had observed. Any teacher who has had a difficult time with some students understands that this type of situation can seriously damage self esteem and plunge any well meaning teacher into a deep personal crisis. I tried to be as supportive as I could. After the observation I told Emma that we could meet during the Christmas holiday and elaborate a ‘plan of action’ to try to ease the conflict.

I was wondering if easing the conflict in an empowering way for both Emma and her students was possible. By teaching both engaging and entertaining lessons, where students could feel that they were learning useful language for their future, I thought that the atmosphere could be more relaxed. Furthermore, by asking the students about their expectations from the course, Emma could show that her students’ opinion mattered and that she valued their achievements. Listening to individuals’ expectations helps students to develop a sense of self value that can later empower them. This may also help Emma to feel closer to her students. Bell hooks maintains that the best way for students to learn is when there is an interactive relationship between them and the teacher (1994, p.17).

Emma accepted my ideas and started using the pedagogical tools I had suggested (games, songs and other activities that tighten teacher/student relationships). In fact, Emma already knew about the tools but had some doubts that they would work; she
thought that she could not do games with adults. The next classes turned out to be a real success. This fact demonstrates that even if someone knows how to resolve a conflict, an external point of view and support can help to reveal the solution. During this part of the process, Emma and I met after each class I observed. We assessed the classroom dynamics in terms of incidents and whether the pedagogical tools worked; we also spoke about the way we felt and how to go forward. This is how participatory action research emerged as a method.

During the month of January and beginning of February I kept on observing and saw how Emma was regaining her self confidence. Her classes were more entertaining and, by disclosing a bit more about herself to her students during dynamic activities, Emma was reducing the distance between her students and herself. After a month of observation, some adult students started to discipline the disrespectful teenage group. Without drastic disciplinary measures, Emma had changed teaching style and affect and won the battle over disrespect. Some students valued and respected her well enough to discipline the ones who did not. Now, instead of being disturbed every five minutes, Emma could do entire activities without problems and engage her students in learning.

**Teaching anti oppressive sessions**

After helping Emma to restore her self confidence, changing some of her teaching practices and assessing changes in her approach to the class, it was time to research the possibilities of change within some of the students’ mindsets. I had suggested to Emma that we teach anti-oppressive sessions together. I wanted to include Emma in the sessions for two reasons. First, Emma was kind enough to let me teach in her class, I did not want to abuse her kindness and take over her class. It is sometimes easy for a different teacher to come and impress the audience, and, as a consequence, widen the distance between the class teacher and the students. I saw a dangerous trap there and did not want to fall into it. Second, Emma had broad experience in raising consciousness about gender issues; in fact she was more experienced than me; another good reason to give Emma the space she deserved in her classroom.
Preparing the sessions

Before the first session I went to Emma’s class and told the students about my studies and my research. I asked their consent to participate in the research of my Master’s thesis. Emma had already spoken about it so it did not come as a surprise. I had the students’ consent; however, I did not know if this came from a genuine interest or was perceived as a compulsory burden.

I had planned to use a lot of videos for the sessions for a number of reasons. I had noticed during my observations that the students concentrated more when they were watching videos. Therefore, I thought that using videos would be an efficient way to deliver messages or complex ideas. Some classroom dynamics make people move around and I am in favour of kinesthetic learning. However, during my observations I had noticed that some of the students had the tendency to change seats. They used their moves as a distraction and an excuse not to concentrate. Therefore, for the first part of each session, I wanted them to remain seated and focus on the videos and the tasks. Most young people have a solid audio-visual culture; I thought that working with videos would keep them focused on the task. It turned out to be correct. Each time I put on a video, the room was quiet as they watched it. Finally, I hoped that the anti-oppressive session would empower them and a change of attitude towards a better understanding of multiple oppressions and privileges would operate.

The four one-hour anti-oppressive sessions were influenced by Transversal dialogue and the idea of ‘rooting’ and ‘shifting’ (Yuval Davis, 2013). I planned to do the first session on ‘rooting’ (Appendix 3), the second session was not planned but I had the idea to do it on intersectional identities (Appendix 5) and the third session (Appendix 7) on ‘shifting’ – to understand gender oppression. For the fourth session (Appendix 9), I prepared a questionnaire to get some feedback (Appendix 10). When the first session plan was finished, I sent it to Emma for her to add anything she wanted. She told me that it was fine the way it was.

I had prepared answers to different scenarios or questions in my head before the sessions. I was terrified that the participants would ask some questions I would not be able to answer or that I would answer them in a stupid way. In my fieldwork notebook I wrote that:
“I was prepared for some reticence from the students. I thought that someone may ask me what it was all about; why I was doing this” (Appendix I).

I was also getting prepared for a very low turnout. Whereas twenty three students were registered in English, only 8 to 12 usually came, and different students in each class. I was aware that this type of setting did not work in favour of continuity in the research and that attendance could turn out to be a significant problem.

The first session: ‘Rooting’

Here I was, standing in front of the class, aware of the messy reality I had put myself in; trying to be open to a new experience. It was the first time I was going to teach using intersectional feminist pedagogy. I was pleased to see thirteen students. After explaining my research and their rights to withdraw from it, I thanked them for their presence. Then I explained that we were going to work on prejudices and stereotypes and how they affected our lives.

During the sessions, I tried to apply hooks’ advice about the self actualised teacher. I listened to each of the participants carefully and tried to reply to every question. Lykke maintains that homogeneity recreates the norm of the dominant group, and therefore, differences have first to be made visible. Differences should be treated in a constructive way that prevents exclusion (2013, p.15). I did not want to leave anyone unattended; I tried to give positive reinforcement whenever I could. I also gave many examples from my own experience, as hooks says, you cannot ask anything of students you are not prepared to do yourself (1994, p, 21). I also tried to have a relaxed atmosphere where participants were encouraged to ask questions and speak about their own experiences.

The first session was on rooting, I wanted the participants to work on oppressions they may have experienced themselves. According to Bromseth and Sörensdotter, In Norm-critical pedagogy “Teachers need to use both theoretical and experienced-based knowledge to be able to create good conditions for rewarding and challenging processes in teaching” (2013, p.26). Classism was the most obvious oppression the students may have experienced; however, it had been very difficult to find any videos related to class oppression. It was as if neoliberalism had won the ideological battle and class oppression did not exist anymore. In the end, the only video I found that was indirectly linked to class was a video showing how the way you dress can affect your life chances
After showing the video I spoke about my own experience: on more than one occasion I had been refused entry to a club because of the way I was dressed. This resonated with most students and they started telling their own stories. Showing how people get treated because of the way they dress was the easiest way for me to speak about class oppression. It was a reductionist way to understand class but I wanted to work on aspects that were easily understood as I did not know my audience very well.

Then we moved on to racism, another oppression the participants may suffer, as more than half of the class was composed of racialized individuals. The majority of students started to comment on the anti-racist video I had just put on. There was no indifference to racism, some replied that they felt anger and rage after seeing the video (Appendix 5). After the rooting exercise I asked them to reflect on a situation where they had been oppressed and make a one minute video about it. As an example, I showed them a video made on a mobile phone by a young man on everyday racism. I could see that making a video did not generate any enthusiasm, so I changed plan. I told them that in groups they should think about a situation where they had been oppressed and write about it on the worksheet. Then Emma and I went to see each group to answer any questions they had. Many of the racialized students had developed the same strategy towards everyday racism. They just ignored it as a way of coping with it: “[…] a defence mechanism against daily aggressions I suppose” I wrote in my fieldwork notebook (appendix 1). At the end of the session I thanked them for their participation.

**Assessing the first session**

I felt so relieved when the session finished that I had not noticed that Emma had not really participated in it. She had sat like the students and helped me when I needed her but intervened only at the end when we went to each group to answer their questions. I was so nervous that I had concentrated on the plan and forgotten about the rest. We both agreed that the session had been a success; we could see that there had not been any reticence from the students, quite the opposite, they had focused on the task all along; they had left the class happy. In my fieldwork notebook I wrote on Emma’s feedback:

> “Emma told me that I had shown the video too quickly, that we should have allowed more time to reflect on the issues we are presenting” (appendix 1).
I felt lucky to be doing this research with another teacher who was more experienced in doing this type of session. I definitely would incorporate her piece of advice for the next session. I changed the next worksheets to include more writing tasks. We agreed that Emma had to participate more in the second session, not because participatory action research says so, but because Emma has skills and experience in anti-oppressive sessions and I did not want her to feel strange or ostracized in her own classroom. (Appendix 13). I sent her the plan on the next day so she could correct, change or add anything she wanted. I wanted to be in charge of planning the session because I did not want to burden Emma, who already had a lot of work from teaching and studying at the same time. This is why we did not prepare the anti-oppressive sessions together; I usually sent them to Emma for her approval.

The second session: ‘Intersectionality’

After the enthusiastic participation of the students during the first session, the planning for the second session was rather easy. I planned to work on intersectional identities, because, as we have already seen, individuals often experience their oppression(s) vividly while they are not conscious of their privileges. Bell hooks (1994) noticed during her teaching years that Black male students often thought that they were the epitome of oppression; they were not conscious of what oppression must be for Black women for example. During this session I wanted the participants to broaden their vision and work on oppressions they did not suffer themselves. I felt that intersectionality provided the most complete theoretical framework to achieve this task. I also changed the tasks as I had noticed that they did not want to do videos, I introduced some writing tasks instead.

The day of the second session

There were eight students; five of whom had come to the previous session. The participants who had been there in the first session started to tell their stories of discrimination; they really opened up. One student even told an anecdote that made the class consensus on racist discrimination more complex. He explained that an African colleague, who worked as a door to door salesman, was doing better than any Catalan
Spanish colleague in the team. His story challenged the idea I may have conveyed that racism is a fate for any racialised subject. Both a warning and a lesson for me; I felt I may have been too categorical.

Starting from their experience of class and race oppressions, Emma elicited other identities markers that can generate oppression. Emma certainly had a different teaching style; I could see that she was used to speaking about intersectionality and that she felt confident. The participants recognised that gender was a significant factor of oppression. Then it was my turn. I used my experience as a privileged French person to explain how privileges are invisible. I asked the participants to fill in my Teflon test as an example where I could explain my type of oppression and privileges. I also explained the norms hiding behind each privilege. Then, the participants did their test. I noticed that most of them considered themselves middle-class. Mike Savage, who has done research on class consciousness in Britain, maintains that:

“Claiming a middle-class identity is an indirect way of refusing, or minimizing a class identity: by saying you are middle-class you may be describing yourself as a typical, ordinary person, neither particularly well off nor particularly poor [...] class identity is generally weak, even though people can think of themselves as belonging to a particular class” (2003, p. 64).

In Spain, some studies have shown that many more individuals feel middle-class than they actually are:

“When you ask people, they usually say they are middle class. It is for the same reason that people have the tendency to situate themselves in the centre when asked any question: they prefer situate themselves within ‘normality’” (LA VANGUARDIA 2016 (my translation)).

The participants made no exception to this tendency.

At one point, one of the participants asked me the question that had been worrying me. What was this all about? He thought that we were going to ignore him because his question was negative but I did precisely the opposite. I made a point in answering it. I told him that we were doing these sessions to help them to understand the society they are living in and the people around them. After this episode he was the most dedicated student, coming to the rest of the sessions, even if he usually only came to half of the classes. Was this episode about treating each individual difference constructively?

---

6 See page 29 for explanations of the Teflon test.
Due to the students’ high participation and interaction, we did not have time to reflect on how to approach our privileges. However, the students accepted, without entering into crisis or feeling guilty, that they had privileges over women. The students’ attitudes towards privileges made me question both Kumashiro’s theory and my own teaching style. Was the idea that students have to work through crisis an American or a middle-class idiosyncrasy? Was I too nice to the students? Did they feel that they had to agree with me because I was the teacher? Did the students’ positive attitude confirm the power relationships in place in these kinds of settings? Power differentials have been problematised by Diane Woolf, who maintains that they can create significant issues within research (1996, p.19). I thought that it was a difficult question that my research would probably not answer.

Assessing the second session

“We both agreed that we liked the way we shared the session today and that we would continue to share the sessions. For the next session, I will do a plan and send it to Emma, we will discuss how to share it on the phone. Emma has taught workshops about gender discrimination so she may have a lot of tools and ideas for the next session” (Appendix 1).

I think that Emma and I managed to really collaborate in this session, making participatory action research more effective. It was less stressful for me as I knew that there were two of us. We were both surprised that there was no crisis when we spoke about male privileges; we expected more reactions. Our surprise was going to continue during the next session.

The third session: ‘Shifting’

During the second session, the participants had really opened up and accepted their privileges over women, so I changed idea from a soft version of sexism and planned a clearly anti-sexist session instead. I wanted to show some videos on sexist micro-aggressions for this session because they are based on everyday experiences. We had already worked with everyday experiences with the participants’ own oppressions, so this type of video helped maintain a sense of continuity. However, I was questioning the micro-aggressions videos’ ability to convey the structural aspect of sexism. I knew that
I would have to ask some questions to the participants to elicit this aspect. I sent the plan to Emma who agreed with it.

**The day of the third session**

There were twelve students of whom only five had participated in the previous sessions. The lack of regularity in the participants’ attendance seriously preoccupied me. However, I could not do anything about it and just had to go with the flow.

I showed a video on sexist micro-aggressions and then asked the participants to explain the ones they had recognised. One participant spoke about the women cleaning the dishes, another about the babies’ changing facilities being in women’s toilets and the beer that is getting served to the man and the soft drink to the woman. However, the participants did not mention the micro-aggression in the film that could potentially represent a danger for women. I had to elicit the fact that some situations, such as being in the street alone at night, are potentially scary and dangerous for women. After another video of secondary school girls speaking about their experiences of sexism I asked the participants if they had learnt something new about girls’ experiences or if they already knew about them. There were no reactions from the participants so I put on the last video on everyday sexism. I asked the participants to speak in small groups about what they had just seen. They had to discuss the videos and evaluate if they had learnt something or if they already knew about girls and women’s everyday oppressions. I also asked them to reflect on the ways women should respond to these aggressions. I thought that by asking about a solution to these situations the participants had to think as if they themselves were women; they had to operate a shift in their identity in order to answer. All the groups focused intensely on the task, some participants explained some of their wives’, mothers’, sisters’ experiences of everyday sexism to me. We both felt overwhelmed by their willingness to participate in the task. Many participants started telling their anecdotes. Some spoke about the fact that they participated at home, and that generally young people are more aware and participate more at home than the older generations. Some admitted that it was not easy to be a woman. One student questioned the fact that there were no women in their class and that women could reproduce gender roles too if they did not start to study what is considered to be a typically male subject.
One student, who is always asking for attention, started to make sexist comments. Emma challenged him whereas I did not pay attention to him. I wanted to focus on the participants who were interested, not on the one who was trying to destabilise the session. Emma had to ask the student to go outside of the class. The other participants expressed their disapproval of his behaviour. We continued with the session; Emma was disturbed by the incident and stayed quiet until the end of the class. At the end all the groups had to come up with a solution for women in different situations. I could see that the participants admitted, without getting into a defensive mode, that women had many problems that men did not have.

Assessing the third session

We both finished convinced that the session had been successful even if one student had tried to disturb it. Emma told me about the incident with the student who started to make some sexist remarks. When Emma came near to his table to calm him, he pushed her and she fell on the floor. I felt really sorry for her; I did not want her to feel scared of her students again. The reaction of the boy who insulted women is rather difficult for me to interpret; I was not aware of the violence in it. Was the student getting into crisis because of the overtly anti-sexist aspect of the session? Were his sexist insults a way to express his resistance to new knowledge? Was he just calling for attention as he had done many times before? I must admit that I do not have the answer. If his insults were a manifestation of crisis, he was the only one to react this way. The other participants did not appear to experience any crisis when we explained male privileges. Apart from the incident, Emma was surprised how easy it had been to speak about sexism and gender oppression with her class. It had been a lot easier for them to accept their privileges than with the participants in other workshops she had done (Appendix 1). After the third session I was really concerned about the participants not getting into crisis. I wrote:

“going through crisis may depend on your ego, on how you value your own judgment [in my experience] some people go through crisis when you do not accept that their argument is right [...] more research is needed to investigate which subjects go through crisis and which don’t” (appendix 13).

I suppose I was expecting a fixed emotion or affect from the participants. They have to go through crisis to be able to change! An emotion I have learned not to expect
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anymore; changes in individuals may come in a variety of ways. I have also learned that looking for a single emotion or affect is counter-productive.

**The fourth Session**

I prepared some questions for the participants (appendix 10) to assess any change in attitudes due to the sessions. I also wanted to thank everyone for their participation so I prepared a quiz (appendix 9). I had planned to do this extra session for the feedback because I wanted to give some time to think to the participants. Frigga Haug claims that it is important to give some time for memory work to participants (2000, p.3).

**The day of the fourth session**

There were six students in the session, only three of them had come to every session. I reminded the participants that they did not have to answer all the questions and that they could tell Emma if, after some time of reflexion during the Easter holiday, they did not want their answers to be used in the research. On the questionnaire I had written in Spanish:

“This questionnaire is part of my Master’s research. You do not have to fill it in but I thank you if you do. If you do not want the information to be used for my research, you can tell your teacher, who will tell me. This survey is anonymous; I will never use your real name in the research. You can answer in all honesty and say if you did or did not like something” (Appendix 10) [my translation].

All of them filled the questionnaire without hesitation and gave it back to me. Then we did the quiz. At the end of the session I thanked them again for their patience. I felt relieved that it was finished but preoccupied that there were only a few students, some of them had come to one or two sessions and could not have grasped the meanings I wanted to convey and change their attitudes in the process. During the session Emma just helped me with the music, she did not intervene during the quiz.
Assessing the fourth session

After the fourth session, I had to speak to Emma about some concerns. I had not spoken enough about non normative sexualities, a mistakes often made by heterosexuals; she agreed. Then, I conducted my second semi-structured interview with Emma (Appendix 11). I wanted her to assess the sessions both to conclude the participatory action research method we had tried to use and to assess changes I had to incorporate in my teaching. Emma gave me constructive criticism:

“Participatory action research worked before the sessions when the lessons were not going well and you told me to do games, but I found them too childish but you gave me some ideas and I could see that they were working so I kept on using them. For me that was more of an experimental phase when you came to observe my classes and I was trying new things. Before you arrived I would open the book and we were doing exercises from the book, I was tired and then I started to experiment with things and we evaluated if they were working and I am still using these games” (Appendix 12).

Ironically, even if we did not know about participatory action research during my internship, it felt the right method for both of us. I think Emma is right that, how we proceeded: new pedagogical tools being discussed, Emma trying them in class, our assessment of the tools after the class, changes in Emma’s teaching style is quite close to a limited version of the participatory action research circle. Emma did not think that participatory action research worked during the sessions:

“I did not understand it very well. You asked me to do it (the planning) between us but sometimes I did not have time to really look at it so I told you that it was ok because I didn’t feel comfortable telling you anything about it. You were doing your Master’s and spent a lot of time thinking about everything and you were very clear how to do it and I didn’t know well, I did not feel legitimate or with tools, so I thought, I don’t know, it looks good.”(Appendix 12).

I agree with Emma that we would have needed more time to be able to plan the anti-oppressive sessions together. Time seams a major issue in participatory action research. During my internship, Emma and I spent time together whereas the anti-oppressive sessions happened quickly, over two weeks. Nonetheless these sessions were enough to give Emma confidence to do a last session on her own.

Emma’s Fifth session

After the Easter holiday, I came back to Emma’s class to give some questionnaires to the students who had participated but were absent during the fourth session (appendix
10). When I got into the class all the students were very pleased to see me. Emma had already told me that the sessions had been a big success and that they wanted me to come back (Appendix 13). I collected another five questionnaires from students who were not in the fourth’s session. Then she gave me some excellent news. She had felt confident enough to do a fifth session on her own with the students.

Barad maintains that the researcher cannot control everything, that the world has agency (cited in Lykke 2010, p.151). I have to admit that my research went further than I had expected when Emma did the fifth session. She would not have had enough confidence just a few months earlier. Not only did she now have the courage but I think she also re-encountered herself as the person she was when giving workshops against sexism. This fifth session also proves that participatory action research worked in unexpected ways. I regard Emma’s fifth session as the outcome of using this method; it would not have happened without our previous collaboration. Emma’s session demonstrates that not only can methods work in unexpected ways but also that individuals’ agency can be empowering.

On the 19th of April 2018, four weeks after the fourth session, I went to Santa Eugenia for the last time. It had been five transformative months for me, for Emma and her students too, I suppose. I met a few of the students who had participated in the sessions when I arrived. They all expressed happiness seeing me, asking me when I was coming back. Then I met Emma and conducted the last semi-structured interview with her. Unlike with the other interviews, we went to a bar near the school and Emma spoke in Catalan. I wanted her to feel as comfortable as possible. I had noticed that we had spoken in English during the second interview and it had not felt really natural as we usually speak Catalan together (Appendix 12).

This is how Emma and I experimented with the feminist methods and theories we have tried to adapt to the situation. We were both very positive on the outcomes of the anti-oppressive sessions, even if some aspects succeeded more than others. I regard Transversal dialogue as a key pedagogical tool. I think the sessions helped the participants to understand how oppressions and privileges work because we started the sessions with ‘Rooting’. Starting with individuals’ own experiences of oppressions enabled the participants both to engage with a subject they may not be familiar with and also share experiences and ideas they may not usually share with others. The
introspection into their own experience of oppression gave the participants tools to reflect on oppressions experienced by others. Through intersectionality, the participants learned how oppressions and privileges interact. Then, when we spoke about oppressions the participants do not experience themselves, they were mentally ready to operate the shift. They recognized women’s particular oppressions and even gave solutions for women not to suffer these oppressions anymore. The ‘shifting’ element is also important because it is when participants learn to empathise with individuals whose oppressions they do not share. Understanding both their and others identities provided new knowledge and skills that have empowered the participants; they can now recognise and someone’s attitude is oppressive, including their own.

Participatory action research (PAR) functioned in its own peculiar way during the entire research. It worked best during my internship when we had time to meet. It did not always work well during the sessions. However, the fifth session can be considered as a positive outcome of our limited version of PAR. Methods, like theories, are fluid and changing; novice researchers have to learn to accept that applying a method is not a straightforward affair, rather methods have to be adapted to the context in which they are used.

INTERSECTIONAL FEMINIST PEDAGOGY AND CHANGE

In this section I answer the third question of my aims: What is the participants’ process of change? First, I use discourse analysis to examine the answers to the eleven questionnaires the students filled in. Then, I analyse Emma’s process of change using both discourse analysis and Deleuze’s theory of assemblages. The Deleuzian method gives a more complex analysis and better understanding of both the social and material aspects involved in the research.

Changes in the students

I asked seven questions in form of a questionnaire to assess changes in the participants’ mindset after the sessions (appendix 14). All the quotes in this section are from
Appendix 14, therefore I do not repeat the number of the appendix after each quote. In order to answer the third question of my research, I asked two questions in the questionnaire to specifically assess changes in participants’ mindsets.

Question 5: Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?

Question 7: Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

Six respondents answered yes to the fifth question and one respondent answered yes to the seventh question. I interpret the ‘yes’ answer as a proof of change in mindset in the respondent. I first analyse the different discourses which deny any change and then the discourses which accept changes. Before analysing the different discourses I consider some tendencies I have found in all the questionnaires.

**Tendencies in the answers of the questionnaires**

On the one hand most participants were affected positively by the sessions. In fact three of them expected the sessions to be boring and were surprised. In general the respondents found them:

‘good, really interesting, [they] make you think more deeply and not only about yourself’,

‘I quite liked them because it is something that happens every day and we do not realise’.

The participants’ positive evaluation demonstrates that it was possible to work on their privileges in an empowering way. As I have mentioned earlier, the fact that the participants felt empowered by their privileges contradicts Kumashiro’s experience with northern American university students, I will expand more on this finding later in this chapter (2002).

On the other hand, because the respondents liked the sessions they may have wanted to please me while answering the questionnaire. Not only does this demonstrate how power circulates, but also how I exercised power over the respondents because I was perceived as the authority (Foucault 1977). Another issue is raised by Carol Bacchi and Joan Eveline “discourse refers to relatively bound socially produced forms of knowledge that set limits upon what is possible to think, write or speak about an object
or a practice” (2010, p.5). I have to be aware that perhaps the respondents answered according to what they thought was possible and also that they may have felt compelled to answer.

Social desirability is another serious problem that often leads to error in the results of research. According to Robert Fisher social desirability bias refers to the fact that human beings have the tendency to present themselves in the best way they can: “Respondents are often unwilling or unable to report accurately on sensitive topics for ego-defensive or impression management reasons” (1993, p. 303). For example some respondents answered the first question (What did you expect of the session before your participation?) with what we actually did rather than with what they were expecting from it.

Alex: ‘I expected to see a lot of videos, and reflection from people’.

Jordi: ‘I suppose that I was waiting for what happened: sessions of consciousness raising about respecting the others, how racism is seen from different points of view, how everyday actions can turn out to be aggressive for other people’.

We can see here how social desirability bias operates; Jordi wants to make clear in his answer that he knew from the beginning what the sessions were about, that he is smart. Another respondent answered the question referring to the problems that existed between some students and Emma:

Ramon: ‘Cooperate with the teacher in the class to do class and finally and separately some sessions’.

Cooperating with the teacher means that he is not a trouble maker. These examples demonstrate that when a respondent answers a question, rather than reflecting simplicity answers are influenced by complex issues, emotions and affects. I have to admit that I did not know how to avoid either the power I have exercised nor the social desirability bias. Nonetheless, I have to acknowledge that they exist and take them into consideration in the results.
Denying learning new ideas

The participants who denied changes in mindset probably did it for two different reasons. The first reason was that they think they did not need the sessions because their attitude towards women or immigrants was already correct. Jordi is a married Catalan man in his late twenties. He answered to question 2: What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?

Jordi: ‘In my case, my opinion is the same, I have always tried to show respect to others, without gender or race being important’.

The fact that Jordi does not see any importance in gender or race is quite common to privileged people. According to Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2006) and Fatima El-Taheb (2011) colour blind racism is an ideology which maintains that race should be ignored because universalism transcends it. This new form of twenty-first century racism is a strategy of denial especially tenacious in Europe (El-Taheb 2011 p. Xvii). Not to see race and gender, or other identity markers that lead to oppression, reproduces white, heterosexual, middle-class male privileges. The reason Jordi gives for denying changes ‘I have always tried to show respect to others’ can be interpreted as that he did not need the sessions because he is a ‘good guy’ who respects people, and thereby the sessions were for others in the class.

When asked ‘Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?’

Jordi answered: ‘Luckily, being older than my classmates, I have already learnt the majority of the situations we have discussed’.

Jordi is not the only participant that denies the usefulness of the sessions for himself. Pau, a young Catalan, answered the same question:

‘Not me because I have the same way of thinking about the issues mentioned’.

By Saussurian omission, they both speak about what they are not: people that need to understand how their behaviours can be oppressive. These answers demonstrate that they want to distance themselves from the others in the class. The fact that they are both white, while the majority of the class is not, may be significant here. Invisibilising race is part of the strategy of its denial El-Taheb maintains (2011, p. XVII). It is certainly easier to speak about an age gap than to point out race when you claim that you do not see it.
The answers above could also be interpreted in terms of social desirability. In both respondents’ answers there is a willingness to show that they are the good guys who did not disturb the class and were respectful to Emma. Consequently, denying changes in mindset may or may not come from participants’ openness to change but rather how people situate themselves in comparison to others. Therefore, a variety of different factors have to be taken into account when examining participant answers and how changes may occur.

**Accepting learning new ideas**

Even if only one respondent answered that he had changed his opinion about women, six respondents said that they would think differently about ‘things’ we have been speaking about during the sessions (mainly classism, racism and sexism). Half of the participants filled in the questionnaire before the fifth session Emma did on sexualities, the other half after it. It is difficult to assess if the second group of respondents included Emma’s session in their answers.

In this part of the analysis I would like to consider change as a process where learning new ideas can trigger change. Freire uses such ideas in his consciousness raising approach to change (1970/2005). I would like to examine the answers to question three (Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?)

Changes which come from a learning experience may be slow but should not be underestimated; processes usually are. Of the ten respondents who answered that question, eight said they had learnt something.

Alberto: “one very important thing I have learnt with you is not to take certain things for granted and to try to put ourselves into the place of others before judging them”.

Pablo: “I cannot say that I did not learn anything because that would be a lie”, “there is a lot of racism”.

Alex: “Yes, the way girls think about men”.

Ramon: “Things that you know but not give importance to”.

Enric: “Yes, relationships with others”.

Max: “Yes, things that happen or we do every day that we do not care about but we should”.

Pep: “Yes, ways to think from other point of views”
Miquel: “I have learned not to be too quick in judging others”.

These answers show that respondents’ consciousness of oppression has risen. What struck me in their answers is that even if they are aware that they have learnt something; what they think they have learned is personal. None of the answers are the same. These differences demonstrate that each individual had distinct experiences during the sessions; Kumashiro speaks about the unique lenses participants use in order to make sense of their experiences: “The ways that students have already learned to make sense of and feel about themselves and their world influences what and how they learn the things taught in school” (2015, p.39). The answers above are examples of how the participants assimilated the sessions. The answers also demonstrate that what is being taught and what the students actually learn are different things. Nonetheless, I value the diversity of what the participants have learned in a positive way; most of them claimed that the sessions made them think.

Their change in mindset was assessed in question 5 (Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?) Five respondents out of ten answered yes to this question.

Max: “Yes, that everyone has rights”.

Enric: “Yes, I thought that people were less racist”.

Pablo: ”Yes, in many things”.

Alberto: “Yes, before having an opinion about someone for their appearance, but not a lot more because I have never had any problems with people about their race or religion, I live with them”.

Miquel: “Yes, maybe not acting too quickly on certain occasions”.

When asked specifically about their change in opinion about women in question 7 (Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?) Only one respondent said yes; Pep. His answer clearly demonstrates that his opinion about women has changed. Nonetheless, it is not clear if this change is positive or negative.

Pep: “Yes, it made me understand why some women act and think the way they sometimes do”.

All the other respondents said that their opinion about women had not changed. To conclude, it seems that the participants have learned to think differently about oppression and privileges even if they do not think that their opinion about women has
The answers to all the questionnaires show that the participants had to think about oppressions and privileges and have learned how to think differently about them. From the answers it is obvious that each individual has gone through a process of interpretation to make sense of their newly acquired knowledge and skills.

**Changes and Emma.**

To assess Emma’s experience and changes in the conflict during the four months that my intervention lasted, I will analyse three interviews. I conducted the first interview in December 2017 (Appendix 2), the second interview after the third session in March 2018 (Appendix 11) and the third interview one month after the sessions in April 2018 (Appendix 12). The first and the second interviews were conducted in English, the third interview in Catalan. Then, I translated and/or transcribed the interviews.

To analyse Emma’s experience of change I will use Deleuze and Guattari’s theory of assemblages and affects. Assemblages allow me to reveal the situation in its complexity regarding both social and physical aspects of relations. According to Deleuze and Guattari “the territory makes the assemblage” (2005, p.504). Understanding the process of change as different assemblages emphasises the location of the conflict, the materiality of the classroom, the bodies and the changes in them. For Jaspir Puar, assemblages are arrangements and relations (2012, p.57). To consider the process in different assemblages is to understand the connections between the space, the students, Emma and myself as being fluid and changing. Each session becomes a moment in time; unrepeateable. For Elizabeth Grosz assemblages are provisional linkages of elements (1994, p.167). Assemblages allow me to show that this research is transient and could have developed in many different ways. I have divided the process into four assemblages.

**Assemblage one: the conflict**

I conducted my first interview with Emma after observing her class (Appendix 2). I wanted to understand what was happening and if she had been getting any support from her colleagues or the institution. In the first interview Emma explains how it all started:
“From the beginning I was shocked by their comments, the first day of the class it was about the way they looked at me, like, really, are you going to be our teacher?... “How are you supposed to teach us electricity if you have no idea what electricity is?” After they realized that I didn’t have the knowledge of the other teacher but I know more than they thought (I did). [...] They also asked me things as if I was their friend, as if we were in a bar and I was just a girl they were hanging out with. So the second day I told them that this kind of behaviour was not welcome, that even if I looked the same age, or even younger than them I am still the teacher, so they have to respect that and they cannot treat me as if I am a friend. After that, for one or two weeks it was kind of ok, I could handle the class, but after...”

Considering Emma’s issue as an assemblage enables physical elements to be taken into account in the analysis. Emma’s explanation shows the social aspect of the conflict: her authority as the teacher is undermined because she is a woman. However, seen from a physical angle another dimension of the conflict emerges. Emma is small and slim - her students, on the whole, are tall; some of them are much taller and older than her. Emma does not have an assertive personality whereas some of her students have. Emma explains this fact by:

“[..] their masculinity, the way they occupy the class is very expressive, very invasive, it takes a lot of space” (Appendix 12).

From Emma’s perception of her students, it seems obvious that the materiality of the different bodies plays a significant role in the way she responds affectively to the class assemblage. When I observed Emma in a class of fourteen years old teenagers, she was totally relaxed; an assemblage that suited her better I suppose. Later, Emma tried to separate two boys who were fighting - they shouted at her, so she was scared when going to teach; five of her students were especially difficult. In her research on teacher’s body in the classroom Emilia Akessson maintains that the body of the teacher is not ‘neutral’ or ‘professional’, instead it can be perceived in negative ways: “bearing promises of anger, irritation, nervousness, shame and bad feelings”(2014,p.77). Emma’s fear may have been interpreted negatively by her students, who may have resented her for what they perceived as bad feeling. Deleuze maintains that a body affects other bodies, and that an individual body is defined by its capacity to affect and be affected (cited in Probyn 2004, p. 37). Emma’s body has been affected by her fear of this particular class. Affects being relational, the students were influenced and responded negatively to her fears.

Besides, I supposed she felt alone. When she explained the support she got from the institution, it seems that they did not find a positive solution:
Once I was in the car park crying and I saw the class tutor, he had already told me to talk to him if I had any problems, so I spoke to him. I said it’s getting worse I can’t handle it. So he said give me the names and we will speak with them. Then the Head of the school, the head of the teachers and the head of the tutors spoke to them and made them sign a paper that they should behave according to the rules. If they don’t they would be expelled. They said ok, they understood. And then the next thing they did (some students) was whispering she’s crazy because I had made a listening on electricity but it was too difficult for them."[...] then I thought that if I expelled them they would be out for the entire course so... I waited and the second week got calmer and then you came” (appendix 2).

The solution offered did not suit Emma. The support she got took neither Emma individuality nor her affective response to the class into consideration. The solution on offer failed to give her support or help.

Assemblage two: changes after observations and advices

When I observed Emma’s class, I was aware that my presence would change the students’ attitude towards Emma. Another assemblage was formed, where an older, taller, more confident woman was coming to watch the class. Some of the students must have understood why I was there, but nobody said anything (at least to Emma and me). After giving Emma some advice and pedagogical tools, she spoke about the changes my intervention brought about:

“The thing that changed their relation a lot with me was the fact that you came to class, you started to give me some feedback and I started to apply the feedback you were giving me in class... for example the ideas for the games, ideas on the motivation. My attitude changed with the motivation. The fact that I had new ideas, having new opinions on the conflict, being able to see it from outside gave me energy. I had more empathy with them and when they saw that I showed more empathy towards them, they changed their attitude with me, they are more receptive...” (Appendix 12).

This assemblage offers a new layout; new relations/linkages between Emma and her students. I did not think that I was doing much at the time but I later understood that for Emma speaking to another feminist activist was key. Not only did Emma change her attitude but she changed her way of teaching; I think both her emotions and affects were more positive. She said that she was more motivated, that she had more energy. Hooks maintains that “teachers must be actively committed to a process of self-actualisation that promotes their own well-being if they are to teach in a manner that empowers students” (1994, p.15). Hooks borrows from Thich Nhat Hanh the idea that “the practice of a healer, therapist, teacher or any helping professional should be directed toward his or herself first, because if the helper is unhappy, he or she cannot help many people”
The fact that Emma was feeling better emotionally after she got some support was perceptible in her body language. In my fieldwork notebook I wrote:

“I can see that Emma is more relaxed than in my first observation, the activity is working well” (Appendix I).

She understands that her change in attitude with the students was a key element in easing the conflict. To understand assemblages as provisional linkages of elements allows understanding how changes in affects in Emma changes linkages with her students; new linkages which changes students’ affective response (Grosz 1994, p.167).

**Assemblage three: changes after the sessions**

According to Elspeth Probyn teachers need to work on affective relationships which are built when teachers and students interact (2004, p. 37). The affective relationships created during the sessions were different from Emma’s class. During the sessions I was the main teacher. I am taller and a lot more confident than Emma is. During the sessions I noticed that the participants were listening to me when I spoke, whereas when Emma spoke, hardly anyone listened. I am older than all the students; some were thirty-five years younger than me. I also have a body that takes space and my voice is loud. I did not experience any of the problems Emma had with the students; my authority as the teacher was not challenged once. I even had a participant who came to me to speak about his personal problems. Therefore, I regard the sessions as another assemblage with a change in affective linkages between the participants and the teacher.

As I have already explained in the previous chapter, the sessions were designed to change sexist attitudes in students. To assess changes in the participants’ mindset I consider Emma’s opinion as essential in the research. She knows the students better than I do and can appreciate changes in them and in the conflict more efficiently; she sees them twice a week. Emma is positive regarding changes in students:

“I think that there’s been a change in attitude; I think that the sessions were useful and we have become closer to each other” (appendix 12).

Emma has seen some changes in her students even if most participants, when answering the questionnaire, did not recognise any change in themselves regarding sexism. To be self aware of changes is not always easy, even more so because the participants filled in
the questionnaire not long after the sessions. Emma uses the anti-oppressive sessions in class as a tool:

“I think that it is partly still there (sexism) but having done the sessions helped me. Sometimes they make comments but I don’t experience this as the class attitude towards me […] The sessions were useful to refer back to what we had spoken about in them. To say “Hey do you remember what we spoke about in the sessions? That’s why we did them.”, or maybe when someone is making comments…So yes, for them of course they made a change. Of course, you cannot change a person in a day but you put a seed in them, and yes there is this basis and in that sense there is a change” (Appendix12).

It is clear that the sessions have been useful for Emma as she has the possibility to use them as a reference when some sexist remarks are made. Whereas Emma has detected some changes in attitudes in her students, it is difficult to appreciate how deeply sexism has been challenged.

I also asked if the students identified more racism after the sessions:

“Yes, and problems of behaviour in the class too. I don’t remember a concrete example but when this type of oppression arose, they could identify it without me having to say that it was racism or classism, both issues arose. For examples with songs, before they were “Why is this song racist or sexist?” but now they identify it, “Here it is”. That just happened in class the other day.” (Appendix 12).

Emma’s answer demonstrates that the sessions managed to raise the participants’ consciousness; they can now identify racism and sexism. However, the ability to recognise oppression does not necessarily change individuals’ attitudes and mindsets. Kumashiro maintains that anti-oppressive education has to be disruptive to be successful; awareness is not enough because it does not promote action (2000, p. 37-38). Besides, the assumption that reason alone conveys understanding has been challenged by Elizabeth Ellsworth, who claims that individuals are not only influenced by their ability to reason but also by their experiences, privileges and oppressions; to assume that reason is detached from the latter perpetuates the norm (1989, p 304).

The sessions have brought about some change in the conflict between Emma and her students. It seems that after the sessions Emma is not the centre of it anymore:

“They regulate their own behaviours amongst themselves, the ones who want to do class and the ones who don’t.”(appendix 12).

Students regulating their own behaviour is a well know disciplinary trick. The burden of discipline circulates amongst the students leaving the teacher freer. It is not the only
change, the anti-oppressive sessions have helped Emma to feel closer to her students. I asked her how she felt when she was teaching:

“Well, I feel more sure of myself but after the holidays, knowing that you would not come back gave me a bit of an anticlimax, now everything is in my hands and how do I apply and that... it feels like a heavy weight on my shoulders. I try to motivate myself with games but... it depends on who is coming to class, it may work, I sometimes feel demotivated and precisely today, I feel a bit like that. I cannot go to class demotivated, I have to try to find motivation, BUT, I feel a lot more comfortable than before, they trust me more, we know each other better, I suffer far less than before. Before doing the sessions, I would have given I don’t know what for them to be able to think about all the things they have been able to reflect during the sessions. I did not expect that and as a result I am closer to them maybe because I have recognised my own privileges to them.” (appendix 12).

A key element of change in the conflictive situation is that Emma feels that she knows her students better, she feels closer to them. Emma puts her new relationship with the students down to the fact that she has recognised her own privileges. Once again, Emma shows self-awareness; revealing some part of her individuality was a key element to ease the conflict. I suppose that the self actualised teacher behaves in such ways (hooks, 1994). On the one hand, the changes in the conflict with her students and changes in Emma herself motivate her; on the other hand, she also acknowledges that it is sometimes difficult for her to be left on her own to deal with the class. When Emma told me that, I thought that it was my fault, and that I had not succeeded in empowering Emma sufficiently for her to continue teaching her students. However, after my intervention, Emma had the courage to do another session on her own.

Assemblage four: the fifth session

Emma is teaching on her own just like it was before I arrived, but, because changes of affects have occurred, another assemblage is formed. When Emma told me that she had done one more session on different sexualities, I was thrilled. I immediately thought of Emma four months earlier, when we met; some changes in confidence had definitely occurred. I also thought about a previous conversation during the second interview where I told Emma my concerns about not having spoken enough about different sexualities; she agreed that I had only spoken about gender, race and class issues and had forgotten sexualities (appendix 11). When I asked Emma about the fifth session she explained:
“I improvised it because transexuality came out during the class... because one student saw me with a friend in the street. This friend is trans so I thought that we hadn’t worked on that in the other sessions so I introduced transexuality to them, I explained what was sexual and gender diversity. I asked them to do a graph: there were various axes of privileges and oppressions and they situated themselves (their oppressions) on a scale from one to ten. So they noticed that they were mainly privileged. Because it is very personal I did not ask them to show the graph to me [...] They saw that they had everything in the top part, they were thinking and saying: “I am not aware of all that because I am totally inside the privilege, I don’t slide because I am here”. And yes they were thinking about that a lot. Even if they were saying that they already knew, I think that it was very useful to them. They don’t only know that sexism and racism exist but also that they have privileges inside them. They told me that they were surprised to see themselves there (in the privileged part) and it was useful for them to be more conscious (about oppressions). To be more conscious that they have privileges helps them to be more attentive to someone who is generating an aggression towards them. When we spoke about transexuality, this group of students were very sensitive to transexuality, to some comments made by other students which can come across as transphobic or homophobic; they stopped them by saying what I explained to them, you can offend or hurt someone. So I thought that we had done the job.” (Appendix 12).

The wheel of intersectionality is a tool that shows individuals their situation in terms of oppressions and privileges. The privileges are situated on the top part whereas the oppressions are situated on the bottom part of the graph. Each person has to link the different axes of privileges/oppressions to situate themselves.

(National Career Development Association 2017)

The above graph is an example of the wheel, not the exact one Emma used during the session.
Example of the intersectionality wheel done by a white European heterosexual male.

Example of the intersectionality wheel done by a racialized non European heterosexual male.
After linking the different axes all the students expressed their surprise; even the racialized students were mainly in the privileged/domination part of the diagram. Emma said that the second session had helped the participants to understand what privileges were. During the fifth session some students were explaining to the others what words such as sexism, racism or homophobia were. Not only had some of the participants learned about different oppressions but they were confident enough to be able to explain them to others who had not participated as much; a real success!

I think that Emma’s last session was a stroke of genius, not only was it crucial for the students to assimilate but also to consolidate the knowledge developed in the other sessions. With the last session, I feel that the students have a better understanding of how oppressions and privileges work. However, once again, understanding their own privileges did not lead to a crisis in the students, quite the opposite. The students were surprised to have privileges but felt that the new knowledge was very useful. They even thought that they could use what they had learned if some aggressions against them occurred. So, they were empowered both by the process and their newly acquired knowledge about privileges.

“Engaged pedagogy does not seek simply to empower students. Any classroom that employs a holistic model of learning will also be a place where teachers grow, and are empowered by the process”(Hooks 1994, p.21).

Another very positive point about the fifth session was Emma’s recovered capacities for doing anti-oppressive work. This change in Emma’s attitude towards the students and the conflict shows that she has been empowered by the process too.

“The process was useful to empower me, so I don’t take things personally, I understand the context more and have more empathy... the fact that they spoke about their oppressions... the fact that I have put sexuality on the table as an axis of oppression has empowered me... because having spoken with them about that I feel more legitimate. I put things in their contexts, their attitude, and their answers. I feel more empowered to set limits... I have more tools to set those limits”(Appendix 12).

To conclude, the outcomes of the entire process for Emma are very positive. She has seen changes in the students, she has changed her teaching practice and the conflictive situation was reduced. After examining changes in the students, the conflict and Emma I also have to explore my contribution and how the process has changed me.
THE RESEARCHER’S SELF REFLEXIVITY

Charlotte Aull Davis considers reflexivity as an important part of research, since the product of the research is affected by both the personal and the process (2008, p. 3). She defines reflexivity as a “turning back on oneself, a process of self reference” (ibid, p.4). Here, I both reflect on my contribution to change and on how the process of the research changed me. I answer the question of my fourth aim: How can the researcher’s self reflexivity contribute to these changes?

My contribution to change

To reflect on my own contribution is not easy. I feel deeply involved in the research because of my position as a teacher in it. I have now to distance myself in order to understand what happened; to perform an agential cut Barad would claim (Cited in Lykke 2010, p.151). First of all, I have to acknowledge that at the beginning of my internship I did not know that the results of the sessions and the results of my contribution to Emma’s issue would be so positive. The participants were empowered during the process, including Emma, who was empowered enough to do an anti-oppressive session on her own. This success story makes it more difficult to reflect on my involvement without being complacent; nonetheless, I will try to give an honest account.

Thinking back to the beginning of the process, during my first observation of Emma’s class, I noticed one aspect of Emma’s teaching that has influenced both the ways I tried to ease the conflict and the entire research. In my fieldwork notes I wrote:

“Emma is asking a question to a student in an authoritative way. She is distant from her students, a distance she has created because she is the teacher”(Appendix 1).

I understood the distance Emma had created between herself and her students as her defense mechanism; to be able to deal with the conflictive situation. Unfortunately, that distance recreated power relationships and a hierarchy, which, instead of easing the conflictive situation, was making it worse. This is why Emma’s students saw her as a privileged, middle-class teacher. The distance between teachers and students is so important for me because of my own experience as a student. I hated school. I was a...
rebellious student who could not stand the way some teachers exercised their power; making us feeling useless in order to reassert their academic superiority over us. It took me twenty year to be able to appreciate studying again. I became a teacher in my forties and have always tried to break much hated power relationships between my students and myself, precisely what Edyta Just calls ego-politics:

“To flexibly acknowledge the singular and collective characteristic of the class assemblage is to abandon the ‘ego-politics’, the harmful hierarchical divisions and a priori drawn demarcation lines” (2012, p.177).

I interpret this quote from Just as a warning against the power teachers usually exercise when they think they are the centre of the class. To abandon ego politics is to acknowledge that any student is as important as the teacher, and therefore that individuals, however different they can be, are equal. As a teacher I deeply believe that education should be about closeness and horizontal exchanges. Both this deep conviction and my personal experience as a student have affected the kind of help I gave to Emma and the way I taught the anti-oppressive sessions. Bell hooks claims that “when education is the practice of freedom, students are not the only ones who are asked to share, to confess” (1994, p.21). From the beginning, I made it clear that I came from the same kind of working-class neighborhood as Santa Eugenia and also disclosed some information about myself. Knowing certain things about me built a relation of trust amongst us. This resulted in a relaxed atmosphere, where the participants felt free to share difficult or painful experiences. I suppose this is why the sessions worked. The students’ positive reactions and their willingness to participate also helped to change their mindset; even if these changes are difficult to measure.

Changes in me

“…we cannot prevent ourselves from making mistakes, or racism, sexism and homophobic situations to arrive in the classroom. However, learning from mistakes allows us to find a constructive context in which to both support and develop the individual teacher”( Bromseth & Sörensdotter 2013, p.31).

In this part I will examine what I have learned in the process of my research and how I can improve my teaching practice. I suppose that I have learned many skills that have certainly empowered me to continue working with anti-oppressive education in the future, including the fact that I now feel able to do workshops on intersectional feminist
pedagogy. However, at least a few skills have come across as significantly lacking from my repertoire, and I have to admit that I lack experience.

First of all, when I listened to the first interview with Emma I was in shock. What was my inquisitive tone all about? The interview sounded like I was a police officer asking about a crime. I felt ashamed of myself. Even if the second and third interviews were better, I kept on answering for Emma, especially in the second interview where I did not let her speak. Whereas I see myself as a teacher who tries to promote equality in the classroom, I have to admit that there were serious shortcomings in my interviewing skills. I think that I dominated Emma in the first and second interviews. I have learned that interviewing skills are not innate; they are an essential research tool which results depend on. I really need to learn how not to be too assertive with interviewees.

Secondly, Emma’s feedback on my teaching during the anti-oppressive sessions will certainly help me to improve in the future. According to Emma:

“I don’t use as many videos and I am in favour of doing things more dynamically, where they move more, but they valued the videos as something very positive, they didn’t think there were too many so I don’t know. I may have done it in a different way, let them speak more when they were asked about what they thought of a video. I am more inclined to stop and ask each of the participants what they think but we would not have the time to do all of it. So, it is not very clear for me,[...] I think it was good because when I intervened and got what the participants were saying, well, we did not have enough time afterwards, so you have to weigh things up - what is more worthwhile, give more space in each activity or try to do everything.” (appendix 12).

Emma points out the fact that I did not give the participants enough time to think about all the concepts we were working with. I agree with Emma that giving space and time to think is crucial in learning. I think that I might have being too obsessed with doing what I had planned and was not flexible enough. This shows a lack of experience in doing this type of anti-oppressive work. I should stop trying to dominate the participants when doing anti-oppressive sessions but also while collaborating with another teacher/educator when using participatory action research. I think that, if during the sessions and in the planning, Emma did not participate it is partly because I dominated both. Kemmis and McTaggart claim that there are a number of problems stemming from doing participatory action research (PAR). First of all, the role of the person who helps others to learn about how to conduct a research can be confusing. This leads to the issue of who the facilitator is. Finally, some users may think it is a neutral method (2007, p.284). In our experiment, I think every aspect of PAR felt confusing. Emma did
not understand very well what she had to do and I had to deal with so many things, in which I did not have any experience that I focused more on the anti-oppressive sessions’ planning and the participants than on anything else. Retrospectively, I think I was overwhelmed by PAR.

Thirdly, if I continue doing intersectional pedagogy I cannot skip non normative sexualities just because I am in the norm. It was so much easier for me to speak about classism, racism and sexism. Kumashiro claims that most educators don’t feel the need to address homophobia (2002, p.11). I definitely have to address my own biases in teaching. I also regret not having done a session on critical whiteness after a student’s answering that race did not matter.

Finally, in the second session, while working on racism I got a lesson from one of the participants. With his story of an African colleague who was a successful salesman, this participant showed the weaknesses in the way I had communicated experiences of daily racism. It felt as if I had essentialised the way racism is experienced and the participant’s story reminded me of this.

Nonetheless, I think that the biggest change in me is that I now feel capable of doing anti-oppressive work in schools in Catalonia or Spain. Not only have I been empowered by actively influencing the process of change in Emma, the students and the conflict, but also by its positive outcomes. I also feel more confident about writing academically in English.

THEORY OF CHANGE

Whereas some changes have definitely occurred, it is important to understand how they can be theorised. I will now answer the fourth question of the research: How can these changes be best theorized?

Crisis versus Empowerment

Kumashiro maintains that existing knowledge which supports the status quo can only be challenged through crisis (2015, p.32). However, the participants in this research accepted their privileges over women without crisis. One participant may have gone through crisis when making sexist remarks, but his attitude could also be interpreted as
a call for attention. Even if the participants knew about oppressions, understanding that they were privileged was new to them. Therefore, I have to challenge Kumashiro’s idea that changes can only operate through crisis.

The difference in my results could be due to the identities of the participants. In Kumashiro’s research, the participants were Northern American university students who were studying to be teachers; most of them were white and middle-class (2002, p.3-8). The participants of this research are working-class (even if they do not define themselves as such), most are racialized and they are studying a relatively low status vocational training course. To be on such a course means that you are somehow considered to be an academic failure. My findings differ quite substantially from Kumashiro’s: rather than entering crisis when they became aware of their privileges, the participants felt empowered by the process. Therefore, theorising changes in oppressive behaviours requires both situating the research in its spacial and temporal context, and taking the participant’s intersectional identities into account. It seems that, even if Kumashiro’s findings (2000) are both partial and spatially and temporally situated, he does not acknowledge this; thereby producing a universally applicable theory. Hence, everybody has to undergo crisis to change. However, my findings demonstrate that knowing about your own privileges can be empowering. Consequently, Kumashiro’s theory may not be the most adequate to explain and understand the type of changes that have occurred in the participants of this research. I claim that a more flexible theory that does not predict individuals’ affective responses is needed. I will now argue that Just (2016, 2017), who applies Deleuzian and Guattarian (2005) theoretical concepts of deterritorialisation and becomings to pedagogy, offers a more flexible theoretical framework to understand changes in mindsets in the participants of this situated research.

Just explains the kind of process students have to go through in order to change ideas and attitudes that anti-oppressive pedagogy seeks to encourage (2016, p.297). These shifts in mindsets can lead away from preconceptions which generate oppressive behaviours. ‘Deterritorialisation’ and ‘becoming’ are terms Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari developed in their critique of bourgeois psychoanalysis. Deterritorialisation happens when someone leaves the ‘territory’ to which they are accustomed. It is this ‘flight into the unknown’ that takes the subject to an unfamiliar space. This is the
moment when an individual changes and this may induce sensations of hesitation, surprise, wonder and lack of meaning (2016, p.297). This deterritorialisation leads to the generation of new meanings. For Just, these new meanings are the result of conceptual becomings, which can only take place if sensory becomings have occurred. Just explains that: “To launch sensory and conceptual becomings means to make students open for the new, unknown and unexpected; to have them being able to perceive and think differently” (2017, p. 25). Sensory becomings prepare the terrain for conceptual becomings whereby new meanings and senses can develop.

If we apply this theoretical framework to the sessions, we can find deterritorialisation in two sessions. In the second sessions when Emma explained intersectionality and I spoke about oppression and privileges, the participants were confused. Then, another deterritorialisation took place during the third session, when the participants were asked to find a solution to problems cis women have. These ‘flights in the unknown’ may have generated sensory becomings, because, for the first time in their lives, the participants had to shift their identities to one they may have never had thought about before. Moreover, they had to think about themselves in terms of privileges and oppressions. The sensory becomings generated during the sessions may have been positive. This would explain why the participants liked the sessions and later felt empowered by them. I described Emma’s session as a stroke of genius because I think it is when most participants understood their privileges and developed new conceptual becomings. For Just:

“It is, however not only a question of creating and simultaneously inviting the planes for an experimental interference, but also of ensuring that they will result in competences and knowledges charged with the potential of initiating necessary and vital changes and transformations on the personal, but also cultural, social and political levels”(2017,p.17).

The skills acquired during the fifth session have helped the students to understand that their multiple identities grant them mainly privileges. Apart from positive sensory becomings, the participants’ appraisal of the sessions may come from learning skills to understand when racist, sexist or homophobe behavior are produced, be it by themselves or others. Furthermore, this newly acquired knowledge may have transformed their understanding of their position in society, leading, in some cases, to empowering conceptual becomings.

“There is no one who stays the same, but constantly find themselves in a never-ending process of change leading to unknown outcomes”(Edyta Just 2012, p. 172).
Furthermore, by claiming that change leads to unknown outcomes, Just provides a more flexible framework; she does not predict that change occurs through a specific emotion or affect from students. Not only does this theoretical framework feel freer but also more creative for the educator, who does not need to work towards a single result. Just recognizes that educators should be aware that the outcomes may be totally unexpected (2016, p.298). I could not agree more, I did not expect the participants to feel empowered by the sessions.

INTERSECTIONAL FEMINIST PEDAGOGY POTENTIAL FOR CHANGE

I would like to go back to my first research question ‘Can intersectional feminist pedagogy create tools for productively handle a classroom conflict and change individuals’ oppressive behaviour in a Catalan secondary school?’ - to which I answer yes. Transversal dialogue has proven a key intersectional pedagogical tool to change individuals’ oppressive behaviour. Now, some of the participants are capable of explaining different oppressions to others and many are aware of their own oppressions and especially their own privileges. Furthermore, feminist pedagogy has helped Emma to change her teaching style. She even felt sufficiently empowered to successfully teach an anti-oppressive session on her own. Finally, during the process of the research, I have learned to use intersectional feminist pedagogy in an empowering way for everyone who participated in the research. Therefore, I claim that intersectional feminist pedagogy has the potential to create tools for productively handle a classroom conflict and change individuals’ oppressive behaviour; even if the theoretical framework has to be reassessed in the process.
7. CONCLUSION

“If you want to change, you must be willing to teach”

(hooks 2003, p76)

My findings

This research has been a long journey that lasted nine months. I wanted to investigate the potential of intersectional feminist pedagogy in creating tools to productively handle a classroom conflict and change individuals’ oppressive behaviours. I knew that hooks’ quote above was true for me. I had to experience it myself, be there in the classroom with some students to know if intersectional feminist pedagogy was just another neat theory or if it really worked. I have to admit that the research experiment gave amazing results. However, even if changes have appeared in many positive forms, some of them were rather unexpected.

First of all, I examine how Emma and I experimented with feminist teaching methods. We were both positive about the results of the anti-oppressive sessions. Transversal dialogue proved to be a key tool in making the participants understand oppressions and privileges. However, participatory action research did somehow function better during my internship rather than during the sessions themselves. Besides, the fact that Emma did a fifth session also comes from our collaboration and can be considered as the outcome of participatory action research. These facts demonstrate that when experimenting with methods, be they feminist or not, not everything can be controlled. Methods have agency and may work in unexpected ways. Once again, Karen Barad’s claim that the researcher cannot control everything is relevant here (cited in Lykke, 2010, p.151).

Secondly, processes of change have occurred in the participants who have learned to recognise both oppressions and privileges. Even if some students think that they did not need the sessions and deny changes, new knowledge and skills have been appropriated by students in ways that make sense to each individual.
During the process of the research Emma successfully managed to ease the conflictive situation between her students and herself. Knowing her students better and feeling closer to them helped Emma to regain self-confidence. She changed her attitude and felt empowered, the fifth anti-oppressive session being an outcome of that process. By analyzing Emma’s progress and change in terms of assemblages, the materiality of the classroom, the bodies and the ephemeral situations are exposed. Assemblages also reveal that positive and negative affects are relational and contingent on bodies, time and space.

Self-reflexivity has contributed to changes in me in three different ways. First, self-reflexivity has helped me to understand how my own experience of school and being a student has helped me to ease the conflict between Emma and her students. Second, through self-reflexivity and Emma’s feedback I am more aware of some negative aspects of my teaching. I have understood my mistakes and how to improve both my interviewing and teaching skills. Third, I feel empowered by the process. These changes will certainly help me to improve in the future.

During the process I had to reassess my theoretical framework in order to adequately analyse my findings. I had expected the participants to change through crisis, as claimed by Kumashiro. But, to both Emma’s and my surprise, they felt empowered by their changes. This may be due to the fact that the participants were from working-class backgrounds and racialized, whereas Kumashiro’s participants were mostly white university teacher candidates. With this first experience in intersectional feminist pedagogy I learned that a variety of emotions and affects may trigger changes in individuals. Therefore, I claim that Just’s application of Deleuze and Guattari’s theory of deterritorialisation and becomings offers a more flexible theoretical framework that does not predict the emotions and affects individuals have to go through in order to change their oppressive behaviours. Furthermore Just’s theoretical framework allows educators to be more creative as they do not have to work towards a single outcome, emotion and/or affect.
My contribution to knowledge

I hope that I have contributed to intersectional feminist field of knowledge in a number of ways. First, by experimenting with transversal dialogue and feminist methods in a working-class Catalan secondary school, I have demonstrated that it is possible to change individuals’ oppressive behaviours without a crisis in the sense given by Kumashiro (2002). Second, my results show that participants can be empowered by the process of change. I understand this research as situated in space and time and conducted with specific individuals. Therefore, I do not claim that the same results could be found in another similar experiment. However, by questioning Kumashiro’s theory of change through crisis, I do hope that my findings have contributed to broaden the theoretical aspect of how to bring about those changes. My findings imply that, when doing intersectional feminist pedagogy, educators/teachers should feel freer to explore with creative tools (Just 2016, p.298).

Limitations of the research

I consider this research as an assemblage situated in Catalonia, in 2018, in a specific school and with specific individuals and affects; therefore, no blueprint can be made from the research. It is limited in scope and, because of its specificity, may not be useful for other educators/feminists, who have to be aware that in different settings this type of experiment would almost certainly give different results. The second limitation comes from the duration of the research. It is difficult to change individuals’ mindset in five one-hour sessions. Rather, some weekly sessions during a semester may be more efficient in order to consolidate new knowledge. The research is also limited in its ability to assess changes in participants. Interviewing the participants after the sessions could have been a way to get significantly more interesting material. This might have given richer detail of each individual’s process of change. Recording the sessions could also have been useful to analyse the experiment. Regarding intersectional feminist pedagogy, I have to thank Emma for developing my rather narrow version of intersectionality (gender-class-race) with sexualities. Finally, I suppose that more resources are needed to change life-long oppressive attitudes in individuals.
**Moving forward, future research**

In the future, more pedagogical tools should be developed in order to explore the potential intersectional feminist pedagogy offers for changing oppressive behaviours. Furthermore, more research on the way changes occur in individuals may be useful for pedagogues to create such tools. However, the task does not lack complexity, it is difficult to determine how changes occur as so many factors have to be taken into account. It is impossible for any researcher to make a blueprint of how individuals change. Accepting that change in individuals is contingent to assemblages, further underlines the located nature of any pedagogy. This does not mean that educators or teachers should not try to change individuals’ oppressive attitudes. Rather it means that anyone doing intersectional feminist pedagogy should explore the multiple ways to change oppressive behaviours and be aware that changes occur in unexpected ways in everyone including themselves. Changes are subject to a never ending process.

By the end of July 2018, 23 women had been killed by their husbands in Spain since the beginning of the year (‘23 women dead because of gendered violence in 2018’ 2018). Five gang rapists were released after two years in jail, while a woman who took her children away from their abusive father was given a five year sentence for kidnapping. Changes are urgently needed; let’s believe in feminism’s potential to bring about those changes. After all, this year’s feminist strike proved that many women, lesbians, Trans and non-binary people are ready to make those changes happen.
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APPENDICES

I translated all the appendices from Spanish or Catalan into English. I have reduced my field notes and my diary to the quotes I used in the thesis not to overload the appendices with too much material.

APPENDIX 1 FIELDWORK NOTES

Quote 1: “Yesterday I met Emma; she is a young teacher with little experience in teaching, but with an awareness of oppression/privileges and intersectionality. She is a feminist who has studied gender so she is aware of who she represents for her students. She explained that her students were sexist with her; they made a lot of remarks that they would not do with older women and men. Emma is aware that she represents a white middle-class teacher who is lucky to have what is regarded as a ‘good job’ by her students, who come from a working-class background and are often unemployed. Emma told me that she feels very uncomfortable with her students, she even cried once after a class. She does not know what to do with them, she feels so insecure that she is very nervous, which makes the problem even worse”.

Quote 2: “because some of her students see Emma as representing the institution, they see her as the enemy; they do not have empathy for her. If Emma was closer to her students, they may understand her better; they would feel compassion and understand that their attitude was oppressive”.

Quote 3: “I was prepared for some reticence from the students. I thought that someone may ask me what it was all about; why I was doing this”.

Quote 4: “Emma told me that I had shown the video too quickly, that we should have allowed more time to reflect on the issues we are presenting”.
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Quote 5: “We both agreed that we liked the way we shared the session today and that we would continue to share the sessions. For the next session, I will do a plan and send it to Emma, we will discuss how to share it on the phone. Emma has taught workshops about gender discrimination so she may have a lot of tools and ideas for the next session”.

Quote 6: “I can see that Emma is more relaxed than in my first observation, the activity is working well”.

Quote 7: “Emma is asking a question to a student in an authoritative way. She is distant from her students, a distance she has created because she is the teacher”.

Quote 8: “[...] a defence mechanism against daily aggressions I suppose.

APPENDIX 2 FIRST INTERVIEW WITH EMMA

Nathalie: As I understand you have problem with the group, could you describe me…may you could tell me the age

Emma: The group from yesterday?

N: How old are they for example?

E: The age goes from, the youngest is 15 the oldest is 45 but the average is 16, 17. They are suppose to be 23 so the last day when you came there were half of the class.

N: Yes, there were eleven. Is it normal? A lot of them are always missing?

E: yes

N: Are they always the same missing?

E: No, because it’s compulsory for them to come to class so each time they try. Few of them come always.

N: there’s a big turnover.. so what kind of course they do?

E: Electricity, some of them also work; the older ones. So they do it part time.

N: As I understand you had problems with that group, especially at the beginning? In September? Or when you started with them or when the problems started…?

E: From the beginning I was shocked by their comments, the first day of the class it was about the way they looked at me, like, really, are you going to be our teacher… “how
are you supposed to teach us electricity if you have no idea what electricity is”. After they realized that I didn’t have the knowledge of the other teacher but I know it, about tools also, I know more than what they thought. The first day they had this attitude. They also asked me things as if I was their friend, as if we were in a bar and I was just a girl they were hanging out with. So the second day I told them that this kind of behavior is not welcomed, that even if I looked the same age, or even younger than them I am still the teacher, so they have to respect that and they cannot treat me as if I am a friend. After that for one or 2 weeks it was kind of ok, I could handle the class, but after…

N: what happened, there is especially one person that has been nasty to you?

E: Two boys, I think it happened before but I just didn’t realize that it was happening. Two boys were fighting and I tried to separate them and they shout at me. I felt this was not ok. I went to speak to the Cap d’estudi (head of vocational training courses) They took them and they spoke to them and they expelled them. I felt weird about that because to prevent the students from coming to class is… at the beginning I said no,no,no I don’t want anyone out of my class, I can handle this. After, I had to assume that ok, no I can’t. Ok, so this was the first time, and then the way they spoke or shout at me…

N: can you tell me what things?

E: You are crazy, you’re bipolar or just the way they answered me. For example, if I asked one of them “Can you go to the board”, “why? Why me?” And things like that.

N: Did any insult referred to anything sexual? Or…to the fact that you are a woman?

E: No

N: Did you get particularly sexist remarks?

E: No, no, but even if they didn’t say it I am the only woman teacher they have and they don’t behave like that with the other teachers.

N: Did you speak to the other teachers?

E: Yeah, and they don’t do that with them. I was trying to be very strict because I spoke to my colleague and they told me to do that. It didn’t work. I tried to put limits but they
were pushing, pushing. For example, I told them that I don’t want telephones in class but the other teachers let them have it. They said, they are not that young, you can let them but I don’t want because they use their phone and can put videos of the class on Instagram.

N: So do you think you get any support? Because obviously there’s a gender issue there. Do you think you get any support from the institution?

E: Yes they said it was a gender issue

N: how did they offered some help to you?

E: once I was in the car park crying and I saw the class tutor, he had already told me to talk to him if I had any problems, so I spoke to him. I said it’s getting worse I can’t handle it. So he said give me the names and we will speak with them. Then the Head of the school, the head of the teachers and the head of the tutors spoke to them and made them sign a paper that they should behave according to the rules. If they don’t they would be expelled. They said ok, they understood. And then the next thing they did was whispering she’s crazy because I had made a listening on electricity but it was too difficult for them.

N: The same five student? Did the others listen to them?

E: yes, and then I thought that if I expelled them they would be out for the entire course so… I waited and the second week got calmer and then you came. Last week one of them was hanging from the window, the classroom is on the third floor.

N: What do you think is the problem? Do you think they don’t want to be told by women?

E: I think there is an age problem here intersecting, and also social class for example they asked how much do you earn teacher? Or you’ve got a good job a good bike. Well but I made it. When I asked where their book was they answered, we don’t have money, will you pay us the book?

I wasn’t trained to teach English

N But they didn’t challenge your English? Your is far better than theirs
E: no but I have ideas how to teach social sciences but English is very difficult for me, to make it funny and interesting and if the class is not interesting they don’t want to learn.

N: year, you’ve got lots more tools to teach social sciences than English, don’t worry I’ll give you some things.

APPENDIX 3 FIRST SESSION PLAN

SESSION 1: ROOTING/OPPRESSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | 5 mins | All Class | Thank the participants  
Explain the participants research ethics  
Introduce the sessions and this session plan  
Answer questions |
| 2     | 5 mins | All class | **The Point of View** video [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_SscRkLLzU](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_SscRkLLzU) |
| 3     | 5 mins | All Class | Discussion question 1: *What are received ideas and stereotypes?* |
| 4     | 5 mins | All class | **Esperimento social Prejuicios y Estereotipos** Video: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IHvJFEXZkGA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IHvJFEXZkGA) |
| 5     | 5 mins | All class | Discussion question 2: *What happened in the video?*  
Discussion question 3: *Have you ever experienced discrimination because of the way you dress?*  
*Could you help me here by writing on the board what the students are replying?*  
*You suggested it yesterday and I thought that it was a great idea.*  
Give some examples about myself about classism. Refused entrance in bars and discos. |
| 6     | 5 mins | Tzafar | [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rrLc9ygTaiE](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rrLc9ygTaiE) |
| 7     | 5 mins | All class | Discussion question 4: *What is happening in this video?*  
*Does the video remind you of an experience you had?* |
APPENDIX 4 FIRST SESSION WORKSHEET

SESSION 1: OUR EXPERIENCES

THE POINT OF VIEW VIDEO (The Guardian 1986)

An event seen from one point of view gives one impression ...seen from another point of view, it gives quite a different impression ... but it’s only when you get the whole picture you can fully understand what’s going on.

Un evento visto desde un punto de vista da una impresión… visto desde otro ángulo, da una impresión bastante diferente… pero solamente cuando se ve por completo uno puede entender de verdad lo que está pasando.

ESPERIMENTO SOCIAL PREJUICIOS Y ESTEREOTIPOS

Which received ideas and stereotypes can we find in this video? ¿Qué ideas preconcebidas y estereotipos encontramos en este video?

_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________
_________________________________________
_________________________

8 5mins All class Lo haces y lo sabes. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TD5UGBlrvBM

9 5 mins Small group In small groups, the students will have to think of their own experiences of racism, classism or discrimination for being Spanish or Catalan.

2 mins All class Explain that the students will have to make their own video. As an example I will show a video of me explaining about classism.

My video

10 10 mins Small groups Task: We will tell the students that they can write a text or just speak. If they produce a video, they can speak in front of the camera or enact a scene like in the video Lo haces y lo sabes.

At the end of the session the students will be invited to send their videos to me by whatsapp.

I will ask questions to evaluate the session with them, What worked? What did not work? What was difficult to understand? If something need to be changed?
TZAFAR

What is happening in this video? Does the video remind you of an experience you had?
¿Qué acontece en este video? ¿Te recuerda a alguna experiencia que has vivido tu?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

LO HACES Y LO SABES

What is happening in the film?
Have you ever experienced discrimination because of the way you dress?
¿Qué acontece en esta película? ¿Te han discriminado por tu forma de vestir alguna vez?
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________

Something that happened to me or a friend or a member of my family

Algo que me ocurrió a mí, a un amigo o a mi familia.
APPENDIX 5  SECOND LESSON PLAN

SESSION 2: MULTIPLE INDENTITIES/ INTERSECTIONALITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11    | 5 mins| All class | Thank the participants  
Remind them of research ethics  
Introduce the session  
“We are going to speak about our identities. We saw in the last session that we could be oppressed for the way we dress or the colour of our skin. What else can oppress a person?” |
| 12    | 5 mins| All class | Why are some people oppressed for the way they dress?  
Why are some people oppressed for the colour of their skin?  
What else can oppress a person? |
| 13    | 7 mins| All class | Video: Afrofeminas. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SUP_9TicOXk](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SUP_9TicOXk) |
| 14    | 5 mins| All class | What do you think about this video? Who is oppressed? Why? |
| 15    | 5 mins| All class | What are the prejudices Afro-Spanish women encounter in Spain? |
| 16    | 5 mins| All class | What other prejudices are there? |
| 17    | 5 mins| All class | Is something missing. (Drawing of different oppressions) |
| 18    | 5 min | All class | The Teflon test:  
Working on oppressions and privileges. Explain the different categories and what makes someone oppressed and privileged. |
| 19    | 5 mins| All class | Slide explain privileges: Privilege is when you think something is not a problem because it is not a problem to you personally. |
| 20    | 5 mins| All class | Video: No te ha pasado que… [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WVRKdakH6fw](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WVRKdakH6fw)  
In this video, men are speaking about micro-aggressions women encounter in their daily lives. The men ask the viewers if a situation where the women were not respected has happened to them. |
This video shows that privileges are invisible; it is something that you do not have to think about.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 21 mins | **Students will have to fill the test for me:**
I will explain the test and have the participants illicit how to fill it up for me. I will then use my example to speak about my own oppressions and privileges.
I may tell an anecdote on how I have used my privileges without understanding them. This anecdote can exemplify the invisibility of privileges.
The student will have a photocopy where they will have to do the test themselves to reflect on their own oppressions and privileges.
**Students fill the grid for them.** |
| 22 mins | Discussion question ‘What should we do with our privilege?’
I will give an example of how my attitude has changed now that I am aware of my privileges. I’ll tell them about some the things I try to avoid doing because I am now more conscious of the oppressions other people may suffer. |
| 23 mins | **Video: Too quick to judge**
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fzn_AKN670l
Stop the video at the beginning and make the student illicit the identities of each character. |

**APPENDIX 6 **

SECOND SESSION WORKSHEET

![Second Session Worksheet](image-url)
## APPENDIX 7  THIRD LESSON PLAN ‘SHIFTING’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5mins</td>
<td>All class</td>
<td>Welcome to the third session, introduce today’s session. Remind the participants what we have done in earlier sessions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>5mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion question ‘What should we do with our privilege?’ I will give an example of how my attitude has changed now that I am aware of my privileges. I’ll tell them about some the things I try to avoid doing because I am now more conscious of the oppressions other people may suffer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Video: Too quick to judge <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fzn_AKN67oI">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fzn_AKN67oI</a> Stop the video at the beginning and make the student think about the different identities each character has. What do you think about each character? What are they like?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion questions: What do you think about this video? What does this video teaches us about privileges and stereotypes? You can had questions here and the next parts if you want</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>10min</td>
<td></td>
<td>First we show the videos on micro aggressions What’s up Bin Laden? <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-zAvGkIMWvc&amp;list=PLhDDMRkwIvfr2yj_0lBMyfhMpLe523u5EQ&amp;index=5">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-zAvGkIMWvc&amp;list=PLhDDMRkwIvfr2yj_0lBMyfhMpLe523u5EQ&amp;index=5</a> You’re pretty for a dark girl <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gA5eujzeVkJ&amp;list=PLhDDMRkwIvfr2yj_0lBMyfhMpLe523u5EQ&amp;index">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gA5eujzeVkJ&amp;list=PLhDDMRkwIvfr2yj_0lBMyfhMpLe523u5EQ&amp;index</a> Then we ask what are micro aggressions and the differences between micro and macro aggressions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>5mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>After showing micro aggression that relate to race, we will ask about micro aggression related to gender. Discussion questions: What kind of micro aggression can happen specifically to women? Can you give examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-machismo filmed by secondary school girls with mobile phones. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T1Y6sC0tNPE">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T1Y6sC0tNPE</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>What is happening in the video? What do you think about the girls’ experiences?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
<td></td>
<td>Video: Micro machismos: están ahí, aunque a veces no queramos verlos <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Co_z_GbjbHY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Co_z_GbjbHY</a> We could watch the video once entirely and then stop at each micro aggression and ask what is happening. One of us make a list on the board of the different micro aggressions so the participants can choose one and try to find a solution. Here I would do a brainstorm after the video, and write the micro aggressions on the board, then choose one and find the solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
<td>In groups</td>
<td>The participants have to try to find solutions to sexist micro aggressions we have seen in the last video. Question: What would you do if you were a woman in one of these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 8      THIRD SESSION WORKSHEET

SESSION 3: ‘SHIFTING’

Thinking about an oppression that you do not experience

1. What is a micro-aggression?
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

2. What is a macro-aggression?
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

3. Choose a micro-aggression suffered by a woman in the video. Elije un micro machismo sufrido por una mujer en el video.
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

4. What would you do if you were a woman in one of these situations? According to you what is the solution? ¿Qué harías si fueras una mujer en una de esas situaciones? Según tu ¿Cuál es la solución?
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________

32 mins All class

Some recommendations on how to react to micro aggressions, be them sexist, racist or classist.

End of the session
Life happens for everyone, but not in the same way – The effects of poverty

(my translation)

APPENDIX 9  FOURTH LESSON PLAN

SESSION 4: TELL ME HOW IT WAS FOR YOU

Part One - Who are these famous people and where are they from and what do they do?
Part Two – car logos


1. ______________________
2. ______________________
3. ______________________
4. ______________________
5. ______________________
6. ______________________
7. ______________________
8. ______________________
9. ______________________
10. ______________________
11. ______________________
12. ______________________
13. ______________________
Name the song and the singers

1. ________________
   ________________

2. ________________
   ________________
Este cuestionario hace parte de mi recerca de Máster. No estás obligado a rellenarlo pero te agradecido si lo haces. Si no quieres que la información sea utilizada para mi recerca, basta decirlo a tu profesora que me lo comunicara. Esta encuesta es anónima, nunca estará utilizado tu verdadero nombre en la recerca. Puedes responder a las preguntas en toda honestidad y decir si algo te ha gustado u no.

1. ¿Qué esperabas de las sesiones antes de participar en ellas?
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________

2. ¿Qué piensas de las sesiones ahora que has participado?
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
   _______________________________________________________
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3. ¿Te parece que has aprendido algo? ¿Qué te parece haber aprendido?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

4. ¿Te han hecho pensar en algo? ¿En qué te han hecho pensar?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

5. ¿Pensarías diferente en ciertas cosas ahora? ¿Cuáles cosas?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________

6. ¿En qué te ha hecho pensar los videos sobre los micro-machismos?
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________
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APPENDIX 11    SECOND INTERVIEW WITH EMMA

Nathalie: In the third session I think I produced heterosexism, none of the oppressions we spoke about in the sessions were about different sexualities. What do you think about that?

E: Yes I agree. I heard you during the session, but I think it was very difficult to speak about this. I didn’t want to put myself in a situation where I disclose my sexuality.

N: no, no , I think it would have been a bad idea as well

E: This is why I didn’t want to put my example, lately I think that they all know..
N: No, no that has to be respected (your privacy) I didn’t mean about you but I am an heterosexual and it is something you do unintentionally. (invisibilising different sexualities) or when you are white. And I wanted to ask you if you felt we didn’t speak enough …

E: yes, we didn’t speak enough, because then they were feeling the form (the Teflon test) they asked what sexuality was about because we didn’t explain enough about it.

N: Something else, I thought the participants were not disturbed enough, you know when you speak about something that disturb you, (privileges) you get into crisis, or you are not keen on speaking about these things, and what I found in the sessions is that everybody was very keen on speaking, they were really open, there were no problems, how did you feel about that?

E: Also they were really good to talk about their privileges and recognize them. They weren’t defensive about anything. When we said you have privilege but you don’t know because you don’t feel anything, I think it made them think. I think they really liked it.

N: I wanted to know what you think about the four sessions, if they gave you something personally or professionally… What do you think? …Is it positive? Is it negative? …Why is it positive or negative?

E: I think it is positive, we will see but I think it makes them think. I can use the sessions, Hey do you remember what we’ve spoken about in the sessions? Whenever I identify a [critical] situation.

N: Is there something you would change in these sessions because there is a lot of things I would. Because it’s the first time that I am teaching or we did it, but I know you were not as involved because you had other things to do.

E: Yes, I think I would make them write more because it makes them think. But it’s also a good point because they were talking a lot, when they talk they also think and learn but also with the video I would make them write, you see now they were writing a lot with some activities. Also I would put them less videos and more activities with images, or moving around. I know we talk about not to do this before because they are already hyperactive. But I think they were quite concentrating but they can also concentrate, it depends how you make them move.
N: Yes I agree with what you say, it’s a very good criticism, very constructive, yeah. Maybe you want to add something that I am not asking but you would like to speak about.

E: I feel that I am more connected to them now, I understand them more.

N: Can you give me an evaluation of what you liked .. what you didn’t. How do you feel? You were telling me how you were going to use it, which is very interesting for me, it makes me feel like, oh, I’ve done something, I’ve done or we’ve done something important or interesting or…at least it’s gonna help you. I don’t know if you think about other things positive or … for you.

E: I think I would have changed the activities, I also think it was very positive, that they understood very well the message. I think it was very good putting examples about experiences of oppressions and privileges and also that you were really close to them. You were putting yourself at the same level as them.

N: Is that an example for you? … that I had a very close relationship with them. Is that something you are going to use after?

E: Yes,

N: I mean everybody got their own teaching style…

E: Humhum.

N: Do you want to add anything?... well I know when it’s recording...

APPENDIX 12 THIRD INTERVIEW WITH EMMA

N: Have your students changed attitude towards you?

I think that there’s been a change in attitude; I think that the sessions were useful and we have become closer to each other. I also think that if I had participated more actively it would have been useful in order to get closer (to the students). There were some sessions were I stayed in the background. I feel that you were very close to them, I was a bit closer than before but it could have been more so if I had participated even more.
N: Do you think there were more changes from January until the sessions than after (the sessions)?

E: The thing that changed their relation a lot with me was the fact that you came to class, you started to give me some feedback and started to apply the feedback you were giving me in class… for example the ideas for the games, ideas on the motivation. My attitude changed with the motivation. The fact that I had new ideas, having new opinions on the conflict, being able to see it from outside gave me energy. I had more empathy with them and when they saw that I showed more empathy towards them, they changed their attitude with me, they are more receptive…

N: and with sexism, have you seen more changes before or after the sessions or do you think it’s still there?

E: I think that it is partly still there but having done the sessions helped me. Sometimes they make comments but I don’t experience this as the class attitude towards me - like, ‘you’re a girl, you’re young, and I am not going to give you authority’ but I see it in specific comments they sometimes make. The sessions were useful to refer back to what we had spoken about in them. To say “Hey do you remember what we spoke about in the sessions? That’s why we did them.”, or maybe when someone is making comments…So yes, for them of course they made a change. Of course, you cannot change a person in a day but you put a seed in them, and yes there is this basis and in that sense there is a change.

N: Do you think it has changed amongst them? The racism…

E: Yes, I wanted to say that their masculinity, the way they occupy the class is still very expressive, very invasive, it takes a lot of space, but they give me more authority than before. They listen more when I speak; I feel that I have more credibility. I feel safer after having spoken about the conflict. I feel safer and they are more receptive, we know each other better and there is more trust. Amongst themselves, speaking about racism… because most of them are racialized individuals, racism is not that present but they are conscious that it happens when some comments are made, now they identify it: “this is racism”.

N: Do they identify it more after the sessions?

E: Yes, and problems of behaviour in the class too. I don’t remember a concrete example but when this type of oppression arose, they could identify it without me having to say that it was racism or classism, both issues arose. For examples with songs, before they were “Why is this song racist or sexist?” but now they identify it, “Here it is”. That just happened in class the other day. The aggressive attitude of some students is still there, one got stroppy and another one still occupies a lot of space, but it is precisely what you cannot change in a day. And then the students who always listen and do what you say, these students are a lot more conscious. Then we did the star of privileges, they saw the drawing... Emma is drawing. Can I draw here? They saw the drawing from the centre to the top there were privileges and from here to the bottom oppressions. They saw that they had everything in the top part, they were thinking and saying: “I am not aware of all that because I am totally inside the privileged (part) I don’t slide because I am here. And yes they were thinking about that a lot. Even if they were saying that they already knew, I think that that it was very useful to them. They don’t only know that sexism and racism exist but also that they have privileges inside
them. They told me that they were surprised to see themselves there (in the privileged part) and it was useful for them to be more conscious (about oppressions). To be more conscious that they have privileges helps them to be more attentive to someone who is generating an aggression towards them. When we spoke about transexuality, this group of students were very sensitive to transexuality, to some comments made by other students which can come across as transphobic or homophobic; they stopped them by saying what I explained to them, you can offend or hurt someone. So I thought that we had done the job.

*Emma took the drawing again*

They had everything in the upper part but racialisation was doing that (*a small pointed area in oppressions*)

**N:** All of them said that they were middle class when they filled in the graph?

**E:** I don’t remember what they put, I can ask if they have it. I would say that they put middle class.

**N:** Well if their graph is all in privileges it means that they all think that they are middle class, no? How do you feel when you are teaching them?

**E:** They regulate their own behaviours amongst themselves, the ones who want to do class and the ones who don’t, amongst the ones who have common cultural codes such as always speaking and interrupting the class and the ones who have cultural codes such as I listen - western codes. But they regulate their conduct amongst themselves. How do you feel when you are teaching them? Well, I feel more sure of myself but after the holidays, knowing that you would not come back gave me a bit of an anticlimax, now everything is in my hands and how do I apply and that, it feels like a heavy weight on my shoulders. I try to motivate myself with games but... it depends on who is coming to class or not, it may work, I sometimes feel demotivated and precisely today, I feel a bit like that. I cannot go to class demotivated, I have to try to find motivation, BUT, I feel a lot more comfortable than before, they trust me more, we know each other better, I suffer far less than before. Before doing the sessions, I would have given I don’t know what for them to be able to think about all the things they have been able to reflect during the sessions. I did not expect that and as a result I am closer to them maybe because I have recognised my own privileges to them.

**N:** You too have changed your attitude towards them ...

**E:** Yes, Yes. I have a problem bringing both groups together. That has got to do with privileges. The ones I have more difficulties with are racialized, the ones that listen more are all white. The racialized ones are younger, the white ones older. It is difficult to bring everyone together and not teach only for one group.

**N:** What other changes have you perceived?

**E:** I don’t know.

**N:** How do you evaluate my help?

**E:** I evaluate it positively of course. If you had not come I cannot imagine how I would be now. It was such a big change. I feel that you have helped me a lot, I would not have been able to arrive to this point on my own. The fact that someone from outside came
and was able to observe the class, give an objective opinion and ideas, this gives you tools and doing the classes on intersectionality has helped group cohesion and between the students and the teacher because you get closer, you care and speak about things that really affect you... this is what they have valued from the sessions... to speak about things that really affect them. So all that is very positive, yes.

**N:** How were affected by my teaching? teaching the sessions. You said that it was a pity that you did not participate more... which is something that we have to think about, for me, for another time.

E: Well, I didn’t feel comfortable; I didn’t feel ready to work with certain issues. It seemed right to me that you spoke about them but they exceeded what I could do. For example the issue of sexism, with the comments that were made I did not see myself strong enough to be able to work in a constructive way with what was being said. What I really liked is that you did not judge anyone, I was judging more than you and when some of them made comments I said no straight away. How you interacted also gave me ideas and can be used as a reference. The way you didn’t reject any opinion, and listened to everyone even if one is saying things that are out of place or offensive, you did not react.

**N:** and something negative...

E: About your teaching? I’ve already told you, I think, well I don’t know. I don’t use as many videos and I am in favour of doing things more dynamically, where they move more, but they valued the videos as something very positive, they didn’t think there were too many so I don’t know. I may have done it in a different way, let them speak more when they were asked about what they thought of a video. I am more inclined to stop and ask each of the participants what they think but we would not have the time to do all of it. So, it is not very clear for me, I think that it was good. There is nothing that I would say that has to be done in another way. I think it was good because when I intervened and got what the participants were saying, well, we did not have enough time afterwards, so you have to weigh things up - what is more worthwhile, give more space in each activity or try to do everything.

**N:** Yes I think it is the experience I don’t have, as it is the first time, you have more experience than me.

E: but I thought it was good, they felt they could express themselves, there were no complaints like : “ I wanted to say something and you did not listen to me” I think it was good.

**N:** Did you change your way of thinking about the conflict and the students?

E: I experience the conflict differently because I have more empathy towards them, I feel closer to them. The process was useful to empower me, so I don’t take things personally, I understand the context more and have more empathy... the fact that they spoke about their oppressions... the fact that I have put sexuality on the table as an axis of oppression has empowered me... because having spoken with them about that I feel more legitimate. I put things in their contexts, their attitude, and their answers. I feel more empowered to set limits... I have more tools to set those limits. Days like today when I don’t feel like teaching, I forget... Can I go to the next one? **Yes**
Do you feel more equipped now to apprehend conflictive situations in classroom? Which element of our collaboration would you use?

E: Yes I feel more equipped because I have all the things we talked about like intersectionality that I can use when there are conflictive moments of gender, or racism in class. I also have a lot more pedagogical tools with the ideas you gave me. Also observing how you taught, the fact that you listen to the others without making too many problems for the ones who don’t want to be in class. I was also prejudiced because most of them are kids from the street, so I thought that there were some things I could not do because they would sound childish to them and then I saw that NO, they liked it and even have fun and the class is much better.

N: What do you think about participatory action research as a method?

E: That we did a class, we checked it and planned the next one, is that right?

N: I think that, so as not to disturb you I planned things not to give you lots of work ... because you have a lot of work, but after... well I don’t know how you felt so this is why I am asking you.

E: Yes, I did not understand it very well. You asked me to do it (the planning) between us but sometimes I did not have time to really look at it so I told you that it was ok because I didn’t feel comfortable telling you anything about it. You were doing your Master’s and spent a lot of time thinking about everything and you were very clear how to do it and I didn’t know well, I did not feel legitimate or with tools, so I thought, I don’t know, it looks good.

N: you did not feel able to do this but you are very capable...

E: Yes but with all you had with the Master’s, I thought ‘well…

N: Yes but you have a lot more experience than I do

E: I think that the fact that it was so specific with precisely those students made me go backward, I didn’t feel safe, sometimes. If I proposed something, I may have had to do it myself and I didn’t feel safe to do it, you know.

N: So it was good for you that I spoke about sexism as you said before

E: Yes, I was scared to change the sessions a lot and then have to justify why we had done it this way and that it wouldn’t have been good for your research or for them and I would have had an ever bigger conflict with them. I situated myself a bit as a spectator to see what was going on and later to see what I could get from this. Usually when I don’t feel safe in real life I have the tendency to stay behind and look. Like with the games, until you arrived and told me to try them, I felt legitimate because you told me to do them, I would not have been able to do them before. I don’t know if we have done participatory action research.

N: Well, we have to accept that some things work and others don’t... I think ... If you try something, it is not always going to succeed... there are things that I know far less than you, workshops... Other things you would like to speak about?

E: Participatory action research worked before the sessions when the lessons were not going well and you told me to do games, but I found them too childish but you gave me
some ideas and I could see that they were working so I kept on using them. For me that was more of an experimental phase when you came to observe my classes and I was trying new things. Before you arrived I would open the book and we were doing exercises from the book, I was tired and then I started to experiment with things and we evaluated if they were working and I am still using these games, you did the intersectional sessions more than me.

N: Can you give me more information on before the session, my research is on the whole process of helping you in this conflict, not only the sessions.

E: Well (you helped me) with tips, with the way I speak to them, the games, the different dynamics, that in each class there is a playful part, the prizes, but with the prize it is difficult for me to think about which prize. And from the session on intersectionality I will use something: to speak about things that are close to them. Now it is more difficult because I have a programme to follow. Linking the programme with things that can interest them and finding material is difficult, but the idea is there. I spend many hours looking for material, videos and things that I can speak about with them, issues that are close to them.

N: So for conflict resolution, before the session was more helpful, no? In fact before the session was to help you and the sessions were more to help them, No?

E: Yes, it helped me to change as a teacher before; the sessions have helped me as well but I think they have changed them more. They helped me for empathy, to be closer too and also the way you spoke to them but the big change was before the sessions.

N: You improvised the fifth session …

E: I improvised it because a transexuality came out during the class… because one student saw me with a friend in the street. This friend is trans so I thought that we hadn’t worked on that in the other sessions so I introduced transexuality to them, I explained what it was, sexual and gender diversity. I asked them to do a graph: there were various axes of privileges and oppressions and they situated themselves (their oppressions) on a scale from one to ten. So they noticed that they were mainly privileged. Because it is very personal I did not ask them to show the graph to me, because it is quite intimate.

N: How did they react then?

E: They were surprised that they were so much in the privileged area. Some saw that because they were black so they were a bit in the oppressed part. It’s a very visual way to see (privileges and oppressions)… and they related that to the previous sessions, (with the Teflon test) “yes, it is because it slides off you, it slides off because you are privileged” (Emma reporting her students’ conversation between them).
APPENDIX 13     DIARY

Quote 1: “going through crisis may depend on your ego, on how you value your own judgment [in my experience] some people go through crisis when you do not accept that their argument is right [...] more research is needed to investigate which subjects go through crisis and which don’t”.

APPENDIX 14     PARTICIPANTS’ ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Questions

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?

4. Have the session made you think about something? What?

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?

6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?

7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

Answers from the eleven respondents, I have translated their answers while transcribing them.

ALBERTO:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?

   Sincerely, at the beginning I thought that the sessions would be boring, this is why I missed the first one.

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?

   I have to admit that the sessions surprised me because they were really interesting, by choosing subject of the harsh reality that we do not usually speak about nowadays. (You should have stay more time).

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?
I don’t know if I have learnt a lot, but one very important thing I have learnt with you it to take certain things into account and try to put ourselves into the place of others before judging them.

4. Have the session made you think about something? What?

That many times we judge people without knowing about their past or even their present.

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?

Yes, before having an opinion about someone for its appearance, but not a lot more because I ‘ve never had any problems with people about their race or religion, I live with them.

6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?

That something has to be done urgently to change this situation. I did ot think that there was so much sexism, and that so many people was reproducing it.

7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

Nothing has changed for me because I am still thinking that we have to be in favor of them (women) and never undermine, discriminate, aggress or be disrespectful to them.

JORDI:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?

I suppose that I was waiting for what happened: sessions of consciousness raising about respecting the others, how racism is seen from different points of view, how everyday actions can turn out to be aggressive for other people.

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?

In my case, my opinion is the same, I have always tried to show respect to others, without gender or race being important.

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?
Luckily, being older than my classmate, I have already learnt the majority of the situations (we have discussed).

4. Have the session made you think about something? What? No answer

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?

As I have already said, my way of thinking has always been respectful with everyone.

6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?

I my case no, but see in my classmate that there are some situations that they don’t understand as sexist micro-aggressions.

7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

Nowadays no, But before I would not have seen a problem in a situation where you can only change a baby in women’s toilets. Now that I am a father the fact that there is no baby changing facilities in men’s toilet or in collective areas disturbs me.

PABLO:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?

I thought we were going to do English classes.

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?

First, that they have nothing to do with electricity. Second that the session were good and make you think, and I cannot say that I did not learn anything because that would be a lie.

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?

For example, that there are a lot of different racisms.

4. Have the session made you think about something? What?

No

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?
Yes, in many things

6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?

In many thing on sexism

7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

I am sorry but I have not seen that parte.

ALEX:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?

I expected to see a lot of videos, and reflection from people (the way they think).

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?

What I was waiting for at the beginning (the same idea).

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?

Yes, the way girls think about men.

4. Have the session made you think about something? What?

Yes, in the idea that some men treat women badly.

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?

No

6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?

That we have to be equal (men or women) and that things that discriminate against should not be done.

7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

No, I already had the idea of women clear because we must treat women equally.
ESTEBAN:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?

4. Have the session made you think about something? What?

No.

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?

No.

6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?

That women suffer more than men.

7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

No.

RAMON:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?

Cooperate with the teacher in the class to do classes and finally and separately some sessions.

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?

The sessions I participated in were good, they make you reflect and think more deeply [and] not only about yourself.

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?

Things that you know but you do not give importance to have been learnt and remembered.
4. Have the session made you think about something? What?
Yes, in what happens around us in one way or another.

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?
6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?
7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

ENRIC:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?
In reality, I did not think anything, I had an open mind.

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?
A good sensation

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?
Yes, relationship with others

4. Have the session made you think about something? What?
Yes, there is more racism than I thought

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?
Yes, I thought that people were less racist.

6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?
Society has stereotypes which are very sexist.

7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?
No.
PAU:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?
   
   Well, the truth is that I did not know what we were going to do but we have spoken about issues that we usually do not speak about in class.

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?
   
   The way the focus was put on certain issues was good. It helps to see issues from another point of view.

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?
   
   Not me because my way of thinking about the issues mentioned, I have the same [way of thinking]

4. Have the session made you think about something? What?
   
   No.

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?
   
   Not at all, my way of seeing thing is the same.

6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?
   
   That people judge everybody in a generalized way.

7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

   In the situation in the bar with the beer, I had never seen someone discriminate against a woman for having a beer instead of a Cocal-cola.

MAX:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?

   Some boring sessions
2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?
To tell the truth I quite liked them because it is something that happens every day and we do not realize.

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?
Yes, things that happen or we do every day that we do not care about but we should.

4. Have the session made you think about something? What?
Yes, in the fact that there is a lot of discrimination in our society today and there is a lot of inequalities.

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?
Yes that everyone has rights.

6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?
They are very frequent but people do not give importance to them.

7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

PEP:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?
I expected the sessions to be more boring and normal, but they have been interesting.

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?
They have been useful, they have made us reflect and think before we act.

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?
Yes, a lot, ways to think from other point of views.

4. Have the session made you think about something? What?
Yes, in films and things I have lived.
5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?

No, I still think the same.

6. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?

That people hurt others without noticing.

7. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?

Yes, it made me understand why some women act and think the way they sometimes do.

MIQUEL:

1. What did you expect of the sessions before you participation?

The truth is that I have always thought in a positive way and the best is to wait for one that gives you that sensation.

2. What do you think of the session now that you have participated in them?

They may not be the best but they motivate to keep on participating and improve sensations.

3. Do you think that you have learnt something? What have you learnt?

To tell the truth I have learnt not to be too quick in judging others.

4. Have the session made you think about something? What?

5. Would you think differently about different things now? Which things?

Yes, maybe not acting too quickly on certain occasions.

7. What did the videos on sexist micro-aggressions make you think about?

About the way some people get discriminated.

8. Was there a situation that you had never thought about in the videos which has made you change your opinion about women?
No.
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