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Abstract

Departing from the assumption that especially female students’ academic careers are disadvantaged by canonical art history teaching, the project set as its chief end to launch strategies for the implementation of critical gender perspectives in all undergraduate courses at the department of art history, Lund University, 2004-2006.

These strategies included teaching practices derived from Lindberg (1988) and Wahl (1996), the arrangement of the annual Gender Marathon Day, and guiding principles such as teacher co-operation and student participation.

The project pinpoints the need for gender perspectives to be integrated in the general curriculum. It also illustrates the advantages of student involvement and a co-operation among teachers that includes examination.
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According to the official policy for Lund University on equality, affirmed in Jämställdhetspolicy för Lunds universitet 2006-2010, an even distribution of influence and power between the sexes is an important task. In keeping with this document, women and men should have access to the same educational conditions and to the same possibilities in developing personal ambitions, interests and talents. No doubt the support of the Lund University policy (in line with the Law of Higher Education chapter 1 § 5) to further better gender equality, pinpoints an important step towards democracy. This policy however does not turn into practice by itself.

In real life, statistics show serious discrepancies from these normative ideals. Along with a few other humanistic disciplines, art history has long recruited more female than male students. At Lund University, almost 70% who take art history on an undergraduate level are women. The reverse, though, is true in terms of academic carrier. Although the percentage of female students entering graduate studies increased lately to about 50 percent, no women advanced to professorial chairs during the same time span (to compare with 15% on the whole Lund university). Assuming that the problem is created already in undergraduate studies, one might ask: What happens to female talents and interests? Can the education offered be changed so that women feel more at home and invest in an academic carrier in the discipline? This was the project’s starting point in the bag and its basic rationale for change.

Affirmative action
One way of affirmative action to handle academic inequality at the universities was recently suggested by the government Komité for integreringstiltak – Kvinner i forskning (Kif) (The Committee for integration strategies – Women in research) in Oslo. It offers institutions a substantial reward of 500,000 NOK each time a woman is employed as professor or associate professor. In Norway, 83% of the professors are men. Today, the Norwegian universities receive funding for credits points as well as for publication of research articles. Why not support gender balance in the same manner, the committee suggests in its final report (www.nordforsk.org/ennyhet.cfm?id=605).

Our strategy could not rely on economic support of top positions. The idea was to start "up from under". By approaching the undergraduate students, we wanted to support especially the female students’ possibilities of gaining foothold in the academy. This in our eyes requires a critical rethinking of the discipline itself. A quick look at the contemporary art world reveals that traditional gender conventions are to a large extent investigated and transgressed in search of new aesthetic and existential strategies (Från modernism till samtidskonst 2003, Konstfeminism 2005, Lindberg 1995, 2002). Whether the approach is queer, male or female, the modern visual culture (as well as the previous art world) is seen not only as being defined by gender but actively contributing in producing gender ideology. Studying art history then requires new and appropriate tools and the awareness of a wider contextual understanding in a way that touches on everybody’s existence.

But, although gender theory has influenced the work of some of our doctoral students and an increasing number of such doctoral thesis during the last five years were published at Swedish art history departments, the acceptance of gender studies with a few exceptions did still in 2003 not include undergraduate courses. In our eyes, an interrelation between the paradigm in traditional art history that monopolises a male art world and female students’ possibilities of reaching advanced positions at the university seemed likely.
Given the above reasons for gender inequity at the university to be counteracted, our project was aimed at teaching how gender is articulated in the practice, theory and history of art/visual culture.

Undergraduate courses in 2003 before the project started

Three years ago, courses in the main were still dependent on mainstream art history, that is, the generally accepted picture of the canon of Western works of art and artists as male dominated. Art historian H.W. Janson’s book *The History of Art*, first published in 1962 and notoriously known for not having included one single woman artist in the first edition, has to be mentioned here. In Lund, *The History of Art* was still in 2003 the basis of course literature during the first student year. Claiming aesthetic quality to be the ”objective” ground for his method of selection, Janson’s initial, categorical rejection of the idea of including either women artists or their works, has been typical of how traditional art scholarship has promoted the idea of male hegemony. Janson has not necessarily been regarded as a good solution, but certainly as an economic one. The enormous sale of Janson’s book in the US and all over Europe guaranteed a price considered reasonable for the students. To compensate for the missing gender perspective, Whitney Chadwick’s *Women, Art and Society* (1990) was included in the list. However, according to course evaluations (spring 2004) by the students, at this point – at the start of the project – Chadwick’s book and the gender perspective was almost altogether neglected. Not only in teaching but in examinations as well.

In 2003 the undergraduate students’ opportunities to come across gender theory were limited at our department. Introducing a gender perspective on the art world has since the 1980s mostly been dependant on one single teacher. During their first term, I had an introductory lecture of two hours on art & gender based on questions about what is art, how to read it and who was the artist, with quite a few examples taken from Chadwick’s *Women, Art and Society*. During the second term, I used to integrate a gender perspective in an 8 hours interim course called Art & Society. During the third term, on the level of 40-60 credits, there was an optional 5-credit course on ”Media, art & gender”. Otherwise, courses on the whole neglected the impact of gender.

This situation meant that female students were handicapped in terms of possibilities to identify with the academy and their chosen subject. Also, advancement to graduate level by means of gender research was not facilitated the way it should be. At the same time, a noticeable change in student demand to the advantage of gender issues appeared to be on its way. The awareness of what is going on in the art world interrelates with what is seen to be useful in future professional activity. These new strands of thought were lately underlined by signals from the director of the Museum of Modern Art in Stockholm. As a strategy to complement the collection with internationally influential but hitherto marginalised avantgarde women artists, its director in 2006 asked the government to invest 50 million for a new so called “Request Museum” (Önskemuseum).

What is new, and possibly specific, to our project was the overall intention to implement gender throughout the whole curriculum. This was done in combination with the earlier only options: the integration of gender in the Art & Society teaching and the non-compulsory gender course.

**Questions**

Would the introduction during three years of 1) a critical gender perspective regarding the current content in all undergraduate courses along with 2) strategies for gender conscious
teaching contribute to implement gender perspectives as part of theoretical and methodical practice throughout the whole department?

**Review of relevant literature**

The theoretical assumption that visual culture is not only defined by gender but actively contributes to producing gender ideology, has during the last 30 years guided gender research. The concept of gender, here defined as a culturally and socially constructed category as opposed to a biological one, refers to the ways in which sexual difference is ideologized, negotiated and expressed within cultural production. It does not stop then at dealing with marginalised women artists or the way femininity was represented in visual culture, nor at the interrogation of the discipline of art history for its patriarchal structures of knowledge (exemplified by notions like the male dominated canon or the genius). Today the expanded gender category encompasses research on male and female as well as queer agency. The previously unquestioned territory of for example masculinity is now being interrogated (Solomon-Godeau 1997, 2001, Steorn 2007) along with the workings of gender ideology itself.


Methodically, teaching was from the start influenced mainly by two sources. On one hand Lindberg, *Konstpedagogikens dilemma. Historiska rötter och moderna strategier* (The dilemma of art education. Historical roots and moderns strategies) diss, 1988 on how to apply the concept of the so called “shared image”. On the other hand an article by Wahl: “Molnet – att föreläsa om feministisk forskning” (“The cloud – to lecture on feminist research”) in *Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift* 1996:3-4. This article deals with preconceived misconceptions of the concept of “feminism” and introduces a pedagogic model for how to deal with them when teaching a gender perspective.

For strategic reasons and for discussions on development possibilities we were inspired by Bondestam: *Könsmedveten pedagogik för universitetslärare – en introduction och bibliografi* (Gender conscious pedagogy for university teachers – an introduction and bibliography), 2003. It was useful in introducing the gender project to teacher collegues at our department. Bondestam’s analysis of what gender consciousness is or what gender education should aim at along with definitions of such notions as feminism, gender, equality and so on were handy to refer to. It also helped our own continuous analysis of problems of implementing gender that appeared during the process we were part of.

**Importance of the project to me and why**

Once a young student from a non-academic home, I had difficulties in adjusting to the Swedish university environment which to me stood out as alien. As I remember it, all the teachers were male, the art history books I read were written by men and all the artists and architects mentioned in our books were male. Art history seemed to be of no concern to me. In short, I learnt the hard way that gender matters.
Another angle of self-chosen approach is the pedagogic one. As an art gallery amanuensis, I was engaged in educational ambitions to invite not only the well-informed art audience but new groups and children as well. This interest resulted in my Ph.D. thesis on the history and strategies of art education and its pedagogical dilemma. The dilemma was, as I saw it, caused by a contradiction between the idea of art for everyone (according to the goal of the Swedish cultural policy) and reality (saying that only 5% of the population actually attend art shows regularly). One result was that in order to become successful, the experiences of the participants themselves must be involved in the learning process. This two-way method of actively sharing experiences with others, here called “the shared image”, also influenced teaching within our present project.

Method
Regarding methods, the basic key was Student focused learning. It has been our ambition to involve students not only in managing the learning situation. We also invited student representatives into the project group. They were asked to participate in meetings about the planning and ongoing analyses of the project as such. The students’ personal experiences of the courses and of the literature, their views on the demand for gender discussions and on exams and their engagement in the Gender Marathon programmes, were indispensable.

Students’ participation & teachers (who)
As mentioned already, the project group involved three (by the time of 2003) doctorate students: Linda Fagerström, Katarina Wadstein McLeod and Johanna Rosenqvist as teachers. Their collaboration was decisive in two aspects. First, and the most important, they were all working on their Ph.D. thesis’ based on gender theory which means they had the necessary competence from the start. (According to our experience, this has to be mentioned as to underline that the competence needed doesn’t stop at being sympathetic towards equality.) The second, more speculative aspect, is that the relatively small gap in age of about ten years between these teachers in their early thirties and the undergraduates, was helpful for communication about notions of art in connection to lived experiences.

The recruitment of new undergraduate students representing all the current courses twice a year was a demanding task. Many have jobs and/or a family to care for and little time for extra activities. Relying on the students who were elected course representatives we were successful in recruiting 5-8 new students to join the project group each term. A good many of them wanted to stay for a whole year and the inevitable dropouts were few. Sometimes students who had heard about the project volunteered to join us. Many students who chose to become active in the project group were at the same time connected to the committee of the student gallery Pictura, arranging exhibitions. Those students who were already involved professionally in the art world, claimed more often than others awareness of the current impact of gender.

Students (who)
With some exceptions, the undergraduate students at our division of art history and visual studies are in their twenties. As mentioned already, the majority (about 70%) are women. Their backgrounds vary but most of them recently finished their upper secondary education. According to Johanna’s report from teaching e.g. the 47 students of the first term “Architecture and design” course (spring 2004): 36% were new at the university, for 53% this was their second course, 11% had some kind of practical experience of either design or architecture.
Innovation (what and how)

Our objective was to implement a critical gender discussion at all undergraduate levels of education, i.e. A-, B-, C- and D-levels, using lectures, seminars and written exams. It was not to reach the graduate students, although we included possibilities for this category to participate in our Gender Marathon symposiums once a year.

The overall aim to establish and integrate a basic understanding of how to study art history in a gender perspective and to mediate what new insights this may bring about, asked for new strategies. The original idea of our project was to avoid, as was done before, to isolate gender studies in separate courses. Instead, the innovation was to introduce a critical gender perspective into every undergraduate course. The content of each course and especially the course literature was problematized. Focus was thus not in fact mainly on literature including gender aspects. Analysis was instead encouraging the opposite, to handle the texts that don’t mention gender aspects. This focus rests on the assumption that sexual difference “is everywhere inscribed in both the objects it discusses and the terms in which they are discussed” (Tickner 1988).

Introductory lectures of two hours were aiming at all students of each course. Seminars – also two hours long – were intended for groups limited to no more than 15 students. If the basic course attracted say 90 students, six seminar groups were scheduled. Participation was voluntary. This was in line with the general demand that students attend at least 80 % of lectures and seminars of each course but may choose freely among them.

In lectures – as well as in seminars – interaction, co-operation and group discussions prevailed over traditional lecturing attitudes. Strategies analysed in recent art educational research and gender teaching practice were used.

In the introductory lecture, the students were introduced to a platform of basic gender understanding from which to investigate areas of high art, textile art, photography, performance, design, architecture, and so on. Terms like male/female versus masculinity/femininity were introduced and the gender transgressing queer concept used in order to enlighten views on representations as well as contemporary art events.

Seminars applied the insights derived from the lecturing situation in self-chosen practice. The students were asked to prepare for the seminars by studying texts from the pre-existing reading list. This strategy provided them with an extra opportunity to study and to discuss their chosen course, but now from a new angle.

The “shared image”

The student involvement in the teaching and their learning was based on the two already mentioned methods, one named the “shared image” and the second one “the cloud”. The point of the first one, “the shared image” method, is simple enough. This educative imperative (Dewey 1938/1963) has been developed in literary and art education as the ”shared text” and the “shared image”, respectively (Sørensen 1981, Lindberg 1988). This concept means that there should be a meeting between the teacher’s specialist competence and the knowledge, interests and notions of the students. Students are encouraged to influence the choice of what literature on the course list to work with and which questions to bring into focus. The teacher then has to be sufficiently open-minded and confident to let go of her own preconceived structure of analysis and sufficiently skilful to be able to structure discussion according to the students’ contributions.
“The cloud”
Any learning situation which is to provide the participants with knowledge as well as insights of existential importance, must pay due respect to their pre-understanding. The core of our second pedagogic approach focused on how to tackle common misconceptions about feminism. Frequent examples are that feminism is outdated and that questions about gender concern women only. The connection between the two concepts of feminism and gender is often unclear. Both concepts had to be sorted out before entering discussions on phenomena in the art world, such as its gendered organisation, the artist’s role and the way art history has been structured – or on how to deconstruct conventional art interpretations.

By encouraging the students to bring their own notions of especially feminism (here seen as the driving force behind the rise of gender studies) into the open, this confusion could be discovered and if needed, taken care of. In practice the following procedure was used: All the associated words are written down on the blackboard. The teacher sorts them out in groups but not until the brain-storm is over are the three different headings revealed. Those notions that don’t fit in under Research (i.e. patriarchy) or Politics (i.e. women’s liberation) or Ideology (i.e. equality) probably belong to the “cloud of misunderstandings” on top of the staples, which gave this method its name (Wahl 1996). Thus, this model enables common beliefs and concrete problems to be articulated which otherwise might disturb the mediation of knowledge derived from gender studies. It also creates a frame of understanding of what feminism is, which is shared by the whole group.

Additional method last year
During our last year, one of the teachers (Johanna), inspired by ideas about quality learning at the university, adopted a way of letting the students realise what they actually learnt about gender. She still used our two above methods but complemented her seminars at the start by asking the students about what they were thinking of certain issues – and afterwords – about what changes in their thinking that had occurred (cf Biggs 2005). It’s always easy to second-guess but had this asset been used from the start it would probably have benefited the project.

Procedures (how)
One important part consisted of the student evaluations. Instead of taking over the department’s evaluation forms we made our own, which after two years was changed to focus on new questions. (Please see appendix 1, 2.) During the first year, student members in the project group suggested that in order to receive adequate responses, we should always use the last ten minutes of the seminars to fill in the evaluations, and this worked fine.

Another important basis for reflection were the teachers’ short reports after each course. From our continuous teacher’s meetings, meetings with the Director of Studies and project meetings with teachers and student representatives three or four times each term, I made notes which were included in my web diary. This was initiated early on, in order to follow the process of the project and to facilitate the handling of the administration. To this diary, mail of any importance was added.

Results
In this account for results, three different issues will be approached. First, the accomplishment of the gender lectures and seminars with examples of our practice and the response by the students, secondly the development of the programmes of The Gender Marathon Days and thirdly, unexpected insights about the lack of integration of gender studies in traditional
teaching and the importance of the pedagogical frames (Lindberg 1988), especially the construction of the schedule.

To start with, although on a optional basis, students’ did attend our lectures and seminars. To a large extent, the same number of students who followed the established course programmes chose also to come to the gender classes and to participate actively in discussions. (A few exceptions from this rule are discussed below.) As always, there were antagonists saying that inequity is done with, so why the gender perspective? But the fact that these sceptical students anyway chose to attend and that they also did answer our evaluations, was encouraging.

Although the gender perspective, thanks to their individualised studies programmes, has been possible to adopt by doctoral students, its implementation at the undergraduate level is different. It’s a question of the advancement from theory to method. The students’ response to our teaching by the two main methods, “the shared image” and “the cloud”, was positive in the main.

The practice

An account of our practice from the first year, autumn 2004, gives an impression of the content of lectures and seminars. Sources here are one of Linda’s teacher’s reports and the students evaluations. The course in question was “Mass images and art images in our time” (1-20 credits, i.e. first level) and the title of the sub-course: “The image from the middle of the 20th c until today”. The heading of the lecture and seminars was “Female Nudes”, alluding to a well-known theme of representations of reclining nude females in art history. This genre is frequently represented in paintings by the artists dealt with: Tom Wesselman, Eric Fischl, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner among others.

Linda’s lecture started with a discussion on what feminism is, based on the ”cloud method”. After this introduction, the focus changed over to feminist pictorial analysis and questions of gaze and power, again in dialogue between the teacher and her audience. Her analysis was based on Leena-Maija Rossis article on re-turning the gaze (in Lindberg 1995). Seminars were to apply insights derived from the lecture in practice. Regarding the concepts of gaze and power, Linda opened her seminar by asking the students for questions to start from and received suggestions like the following ones: “What is to be seen in the picture examples?” “How were women depicted and how about men?” “How is power represented?” “What is the meaning of the gaze?” “What about gazes in the pictures, the direction of the gazes, averted gazes?” “Who is the viewer?” And so on. The groups of 15 students were divided into even smaller groups and each got one picture of their own to discuss for about 45 minutes. The seminar ended with reunion and discussion of all the pictures.

According to Linda’s report, the students engaged themselves wholeheartedly. The students’ evaluations give the same impression. One comment was: “It was like turning the perspective upside down.” And another one: “Interesting! I like it when the teacher takes up questions regarding course literature and explains why. (It) does support an independent and critical attitude.”

During the first two years we concentrated the evaluations on the teaching. During the third year we entered a new question regarding the method of the “shared image”. (Please turn to appendix 1, 2.) We wanted to know whether the students thought it a good idea that their own experiences of gender and identity were allowed to influence the learning situation. Johanna received 53 evaluations from her new first term architects and designers in spring 2006. To our question, seven student answered “less good” and the rest of the answers were “good” or “excellent”. From the first category, one of the students was negative in want of more
discussion. Among those who were in the positive, one representative answer was this one:
“Very good. Obviously it’s always interesting to listen to other opinions, the more so as all
have different backgrounds with different views.”

The Gender Marathon Days once a year
Part of our practices was an annual one-day gender symposium for the whole department at
the start of the academic year each autumn. The intention was not only to reach the
undergraduate students, but all students and teachers, who wanted to broaden their knowledge
of gender studies. This ambition was supported in an important way by our Director of
Studies who blocked the master schedule throughout the day in question. No teaching
activities were supposed to enter into competition with the Gender Marathon programme.

The students growing involvement with the project is reflected in the programmes of our
Gender Marathon Days. But before commenting on what changes that occurred, I’ll first give
an account of our second programme from 2005 in some detail. (Cf appendix). This year, our
key note speaker was well-known art historian Marsha Meskimmon. Her lecture on
“Contemporary women artists and transnational art” was scheduled for everybody at the
department. About 50 came. The follow up-seminar was one of the few occasions for the
doctoral students and teachers to explicitly benefit from the project. They were invited to a
seminar with Meskimmon about theory and method of her book Women Making Art: history,
subjectivity, aesthetics. The doctoral students were also offered the opportunity to ask for
clinics. The term clinic here covers the option for the doctoral students to make a personal
appointment with the guest lecturer to discuss aspects of his/her PhD thesis.

For the undergraduate students, a Student Speaker’s Corner was arranged. This was an
opportunity to present recent papers written from a gender perspective. About ten students
responded to do this and many more came to listen. The intention was twofold, in both
cheering those students who shared an interest in gender to listen to and respond to each
other’s presentations and – not least – in encouraging especially those students who hadn’t
started on their papers yet. This seminar, chaired by Linda, was a success and the reactions
were sometimes moving. Like the guy who finally decided afterwards to write his paper from
a queer perspective.

After these events, Marsha Meskimmon came along to the next one, the crowded opening at
the students art gallery “Pictura”. On show was a Norwegian video artist Narve Hovdenakk
who brought forward questions on new masculinity under the title: “Neo Man”. Finally, at the end of the Marathon Day, the students were invited to join Marsha Meskimmon and the
project group members to a low budget place, to continue discussion with her.

For students already interested in gender issues, the Marathon programme worked
affirmatively: “To meet Marsha Meskimmon and to get the opportunity to listen and talk to
her was quite inspiring. It proved really that we – who are interested in gender issues – do
something of hyper importance, and necessary.” (From student mail.)

Focus on one key note speaker this second year was a change from the first, when three
Danish guest lecturers were invited to talk about their recent gender research on contemporary
art. However, during the third and last year 2006, the Marathon Day didn’t focus on scholars
but on two established artists, Elisabet Apelmo and Leif Holmstrand, to talk about their
gendered works. In the afternoon a Power Workshop was chaired by undergraduate student
Anna Norberg. Invited members to take part in this panel debate were five last year students
from the Malmö Art Academy. The engaged audience, enlarged by a few teachers, launched questions on what it is like today to enter the art world as an artist or art historian. This initiative from the students was followed up at the opening later on of this year’s gender exhibition “Neither Genius nor Minimalist” (Varken geni eller minimalist) at the student gallery Pictura, where the Art Academy artists had a group show.

**Lack of integration and pedagogical frames**

Neither the gender project’s methods, nor the Gender Marathon Days – although subject to changes during the process – caused any serious reconsiderations. However, we soon discovered a true problem, the lack of integration of the gender aspects. Students in the project group pointed this out early on. Answers to the evaluation question: “How did the teaching of ‘Gender aspects’ (both lecture and seminars) work in relation to the rest of the course?” showed this at the very start, in 2004.

One example is the outcome of the first introductory lectures on gender. This was held by Katarina for the second term students studying “Mass-produced images & art”. Her point of departure was to discuss the concepts of feminism and gender research. Her examples were about “modernism as male” and the students were encouraged to react and ask questions, which they did, enthusiastically. But then suddenly things went wrong. The lecture according to our programme was to be followed up by seminars. The students were invited to meet in small groups to analyse pictures by four artists (Klein, Mendieta, Hatoum and Bourgeois) from their course literature and from what they discussed in their lecture. However, after the lecture, about half of the students explained that they wanted to – but didn’t have the time – to follow the seminars. They had received their first exam the day before (neglecting gender issues) and they had to give priority to that. The students felt cheated and reacted strongly. One of the milder comments of the evaluations from this occasion is this one: "By not integrating /this/ lecture and seminar in the rest of the teaching it becomes evident that gender aspects /.../ are considered less important!”. Still, 12 students nevertheless chose to come to Katarina’s seminars. But this incident made us realise the risk that the gender project might be viewed as extra-curriculum and that the timetable was not to be taken for granted.

**Discussion**

**Analysis**

One important issue that has to be mentioned was the effect of the gender perspective to make the students discover what is missed out in traditional art history. According to the evaluations quite a few students wanted more lectures and seminars on gender, sometimes even the teaching on gender changed radically so as to involve all the teachers. To achieve integration on a full scale, we intensified negotiations for better integration of the gender project’s lectures and seminars into the schedule. We also launched a strategy designed to enter gender questions into exams. The key word was co-operation.

We initiated a meeting with the Director of Studies and the outcome was in the positive. First, the teachers from the project started to offer our colleagues to formulate and mark gender questions for their exams, an offer that was mostly received as helpful. Another positive result was the invitation to Katarina to take on the responsibility for integrating gender during an Examination Day for first term students, in autumn 2004.

**Implications**
Our teachers collaborated not only successfully on exams. Johanna also during the last year started to discuss her teaching with some of our colleagues outside the project. As for the content of the first term course literature list, this was still in 2006 based on Chadwick’s *Women, Art, and Society* acting hostage to Janson’s *History of Art* (cf discussion above). But new strategies to tackle this dilemma arose and spread. Johanna made a point of the dilemma of the course literature. She asked the first term students to look out for differences between the two authors in their respective texts on the Renaissance, regarding *genres*, to be discussed in her seminars. Another teacher, Fred, who was inspired by Johanna’s ideas, followed the same pattern to analyse traditional art history and gender studies in combination. He made a point of sending me his comments to the same first term students about their exercises. His question to both Chadwick and Janson was to find ideological patterns, described by Chadwick as traditional art history which are expressed by Janson. Important concepts to use were *class, ethnicity* and *gender*.

**Conclusions**

I am not claiming then, that trying to introduce a critical gender perspective on the whole was unproblematic. But it seems fair to close in the positive, with a quote from still another teacher colleague:

”When marking 65 first term exams, I notice that the seminars that Johanna and also Fred carried out really triggered the students ability to think independently. They seem to have had their eyes opened to gender – and that in our discipline, this is not just about adding women artists into an already defined canon. I’m glad to find that the ability to reflect critically at this stage is a lot better than before.”

By the end of the project in 2006, all four, “permanent” members have for different reasons stopped teaching art history at Lund University. And, it has to be stressed: Because of all the dramatic changes at Swedish universities lately, it is difficult to sort out for sure what influence the gender project might have generated and what the future looks like. I’m thinking of predicaments during the project period like heavy cut downs caused by shrinking interest by students to enrol in academic studies, fewer teachers, again caused by the bad economy and the changeover to the Bologna system, which has added to the teachers’ heavy workload. All this has necessitated new work forms for everybody as well as reconsiderations about the content of the new courses to start in the autumn of 2007. Nevertheless this project has been the first art historical one to test methods for the integration of gender perspectives in practice.
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