

SCHOOL OF PSYCHOLOGY
THE UNIVERSITY OF AUCKLAND

Gender, Sexism & Social Activism

A Youth Workshop Resource

Octavia Calder-Dawe, April 2014
octavia.calder-dawe@auckland.ac.nz

First published in April 2014
(Revised May 2014)

by Sexual Politics Now, School of Psychology, The University of Auckland
Auckland, New Zealand

Email: octavia.calder-dawe@auckland.ac.nz

Website: sexualpoliticsnow.org.nz

ISBN: 978-0-473-28359-9

This document is available for download from the Sexual Politics Now website.
Alternatively, email Octavia at the address above for a digital copy.

Acknowledgements

The development of this resource was supported by the Marsden Fund Council from Government funding, administered by the Royal Society of New Zealand. Sincere thanks to Marsden for their support. I am also very grateful for the support I have received from The University of Auckland on this project, including a Doctoral Scholarship and research-related funding from the Postgraduate Research Student Support (PReSS) scheme. Thanks also to the School of Psychology at the University of Auckland, particularly to members of the Psychology and Social Issues Group for their support and feedback. Immense thanks to my primary supervisor Associate Professor Nicola Gavey, whose vision and encouragement brought this project into being. Many thanks also to my co-supervisor Associate Professor Virginia Braun for her input and enthusiasm. Special thanks to Will Pollard, Brendon Blue, Andrea Dawe, Paulette Benton-Greig and Helen Madden for invaluable technical and moral support; also to Ally Palmer, Rachel Liebert, Alex Calder and Sarah Shieff for help and inspiration. Finally, thank you to the young people who gave their time to participate in these workshops during 2013. You made this possible. You know who you are.



Contents

Preface	2
Introducing the Resource	3
Background to the Workshops	3
Theoretical Underpinnings	3
Resource Structure	5
Using Workshops, Session and Activities	6
Approaching Content	6
Workshops for Whom?	6
Activities for What?	6
My Workshops	7
Notes on Group Work	9
Notes on Setting Up	10
Notes on Facilitation	11
Notes on Content	13
Recommended Reading	14
Three-Day Workshop	15
Outline	15
Day 1 Workshop Schedule	16
Session-By-Session Guide: Day 1	17
Day 2 Workshop Schedule	22
Session-By-Session Guide: Day 2	23
Day 3 Workshop Schedule	28
Session-By-Session Guide: Day 3	29
Process Notes	34
Testimonials	35
One-Day Workshop	37
Outline	37
One-Day Workshop Schedule	38
Session-By-Session Guide	39
Process Notes	47
Testimonials	48
90-Minute Workshop	49
Outline	49
Session Guide	50
Activities	55
Activity Index	56
Activity Outlines	58
Resources	79
Resources Index	79
Resources Materials	80
References	111

Preface

This resource was produced in the context of my doctoral research in the School of Psychology at The University of Auckland. As part of my PhD, I facilitated collaborative workshops with secondary school students where we explored 'everyday sexism' and analysed gendered relations of power in media and in our daily lives. These workshops included a variety of activities and materials which I designed and/or collated.

This resource is a map of my workshop content: which activities I did, for what purpose, in what order and to what effect. To illustrate the versatility of the activities and materials outlined in this resource, I have produced three discrete workshop formats for the reader: a three-day workshop, a one-day workshop and a 90 minute workshop. I myself have facilitated the three-day and one-day workshops in the course of my research.

I have made this resource publically available in the hope that the workshops might prove useful to others: teachers, community educators, researchers and even health and support workers who are interested in alternative ways to elicit and explore personal narratives in their social context. Whatever your orientation to this material, I recommend reading through my introduction in full. Doing so will equip you with a map of the territory to follow and help you plot your journey through the workshops judiciously.

Finally, I would love to hear about how this material informs or intersects with your work. Please do get in touch. My email address is octavia.calder-dawe@auckland.ac.nz.

Unless otherwise attributed, the content of this resource is my original work and should be referenced accordingly. Please cite this resource as:

Calder-Dawe, O. (2014) *Gender, Sexism and Social Activism: A youth workshop resource*. Auckland: Sexual Politics Now, School of Psychology, University of Auckland

Introducing the Resource

Background to the Workshops

'...many of the things that are not taught, that are evaded, avoided and denied...contribute to a school climate that is inequitable and counterproductive not only for girls and young women but for boys and young men as well.' (Bailey, 1993, p. 328)

Young people in the contemporary west are growing up under (and into) a postfeminist 'commonsense' which teaches that gender equality has been achieved and, accordingly, that charges of sexism are unfounded and unfair. This representation of gender relations maintains what Deborah Tolman (2012) terms a 'missing discourse of gender inequity': sexism is a 'dirty word' (Gill, 2011, p. 62), and gender inequalities are hard to see, hard to speak about, and hard to challenge.

Of course, structural inequalities do not disappear simply because we lack the opportunity and the tools to pinpoint them. As well as the pervasive objectification or 'derivitization' (A. J. Cahill, 2011) of women's bodies in popular media, rape, street harassment and 'slut-shaming' are mundane experiences for many women and girls (Gavey, 2005; Holland & Cortina, 2013; McRobbie, 2004; The Everyday Sexism Project, 2014). A primary prevention approach to any of these issues must work to problematise 'commonsense' sexism and to catalyse conversations about how our personal investments, identities and practices intersect with gendered inequalities (see, for example, Coy, Thiara, & Kelly, 2011). Unless we forge opportunities for critical conversation, gendered inequalities will remain part of the 'evaded curriculum' of everyday life (Bailey, 1993).

My doctoral research responds to this call. Given the persistence of sexism in popular culture and everyday life, I hoped to create sorely needed opportunities to analyse how commonsense ideas about gender contour our identities, emotions and experiences. In the course of my PhD, I designed and facilitated collaborative workshops with secondary school students in which we explored 'everyday sexism' and analysed gendered relations of power in media and in our daily lives. The workshops I created arose in conversation with feminist analyses of gender and power, as well as critical pedagogy and action research scholarship. This resource documents my effort to design a workshop process which offers participants the space, the tools and the impetus to name 'everyday' sexism in their lives – and invites them to explore its consequences.

While these workshops are undoubtedly change-oriented, they are neither didactic nor are they guaranteed to secure particular 'objectives' or 'learning outcomes'. Instead, the workshops and activities detailed here are designed to pose potentially transformative questions and to invite participants to address them. In creating opportunities for critical dialogue, reflection and social action, the workshop process invites participants to see and 'do' gender differently.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The design and facilitation of these workshops springs from a particular philosophy of language, knowledge and pedagogy (the art of teaching). My approach here is broadly social constructionist. I work from the premise that language and knowledge are not neutral, transparent descriptors; rather, they constitute or build social reality. Through this process, reality is 'socially constructed' in a manner which makes certain ideas, practices and identities seem natural and appealing, and others unappealing – or even unthinkable (see Foucault, 1978; Tuffin, 2005). Thus, knowledge has transformative potential: new knowledge may offer fresh interpretations of the world, and fresh ways of acting in it. Many activities in this resource invite participants to explore how social knowledge confers power by prioritising certain ways of 'doing' gender over others. Other activities challenge participants to 'un-know' dominant ways of understanding the world (see Calder-Dawe, in progress for a fuller account of this concept).

The pedagogical theory I employ draws from feminist and critical pedagogy, most particularly the work of Paulo Freire (1989, 2000). While not strictly social constructionist, Freire's approach emphasises the enmeshment of reflection and action in a manner reminiscent of Foucault's (1978) *pouvoir-savoir* or power knowledge formulation¹. Both epistemologies articulate the workshops' fundamental premise: in finding new ways of seeing and talking about our experiences of the world, we open up new possibilities for being and doing: for action and transformation.

As well as Freirean critical pedagogy, the workshops build on activist scholarship and action research, particularly Critical Participatory Action Research (CPAR). To theorise my own change-oriented workshop praxis, I have distilled these rich bodies of scholarship into seven guiding principles. The content and contours of the workshops were designed with these principles in mind.

A useful, participatory and social justice-oriented workshop:

- Creates an interactional space in which participants are safe, supported and encouraged to interrogate the ethics of 'commonsense' arguments and positions.
- Employs a 'problem-posing' approach to interrogate participants' social worlds.
- Invites participants to reflect on their own relationships, experiences and behaviours in light of a critical analysis of power relations, without insisting on it.
- Works directly with the experiences and knowledge of participants to define and explore issues that resonate with them.
- Attends explicitly to our investments in the status quo and explores the barriers to individual and collective change *without* minimising the potential for transformation.
- Includes diverse catalysts for reflection and action, including discussions, embodied exercises, individual reflection time, practical skill acquisition and opportunities for creative expression.
- Attends to the affective weighting of the workshops by including playful and hopeful activities alongside serious or painful ones.

In what follows, I expand on these principles by outlining my ideas about design, content and facilitation style in more detail. I preface this with some general reflections on how this resource might be used, and a more in-depth account of my own experience with the workshops.

In providing this detailed and contextualised account, I hope to equip the reader with practical and theoretical tools to make creative use of the outlines and activities which follow. Far from advocating a blueprint approach, I have endeavoured to structure this resource in a manner that invites bricolage. To travel well into your own teaching, activism and research, some twisting and tweaking of my work will likely be required.

Good luck!

¹ Foucault's *pouvoir-savoir* formulation is taken up in various ways. Following Gavey (2005), I draw on Spivak's (1993) reading wherein the French *pouvoir* is doubly translated: as power *and* as the capacity to act. Thus, *pouvoir-savoir* suggests that one's capacity to act is tied to one's capacity to know or make sense of that act.

Resource Structure

A Freirean approach to group work is necessarily an open-ended one. Freire himself studiously resisted providing close descriptions of his work to discourage others from freezing his methods into one definitive configuration (see Souto-Manning, 2010). Thus, it goes against the philosophical spirit of the workshops I have designed to provide a rigid template for running them. Instead, I invite the reader to enter into conversation with the pedagogical approach and tools I present here. I hope this resource spurs others to re-imagine and reconfigure the workshops, tailoring them for different purposes and different contexts.

This resource contains outlines for three workshop formats: a three-day format, a one-day format and a 90-minute format. Each outline contains several discrete sessions which are each organised around a particular theme. For each session, I have provided a brief description of its purpose, along with a list of activities which make up the session. The details of the activities and their associated resources are located in the [Activity section](#) (p.55) and [Resource section](#) (p.79) respectively.

I have structured and formatted this resource so that you can approach it as you choose. You might decide to read it cover to cover; alternatively, you might focus in on a couple of sessions or simply browse this Introduction or the Activity Outlines. Accordingly, I have attempted to make the resource equally coherent whether approached as a whole or in a piecemeal fashion. The price for this decision is a degree of duplication. Where a session appears in both the three-day and the one-day outlines (such as the Gender and Choice sessions [p.24](#) and [p.43](#) for example), the 'Purpose' description for that session reads very similarly. For those readers making their way through both the three-day and one-day outlines, please forgive me my repetition.

Using Workshops, Session and Activities

Approaching Content

The content and sequencing of the three-day and one-day workshops are laid out here as I planned them for my own workshop praxis. In a Freirean spirit, consider this content (outlines, sessions and activities) as a loose template rather than a rigid blueprint. Many factors will influence your use of the material in this resource: your interests, the time you have available and the size of the group you are working with (see [Notes on Group Work](#) p.9 for a discussion of this). Depending on energy levels and the vibrancy of discussion, you may find yourself reworking your schedule on your feet in order to move with the group's interests. I have lingered over/run out of time for activities myself for this reason. Each session contains a list of activities presented in a sequence I find logical and productive. Decide for yourself whether to follow the sequencing I suggest, and which activities you will prioritise. For those interested in my opinion on the most 'fundamental' material, refer to the 90-minute format. This outline gives an idea of those activities I consider most useful and most fundamental to the workshop aims, based on my experience of running the three-day and one-day workshops.

A final note about content: I have used an asterisk [*] to indicate activities which do not explicitly address gendered power relations. Readers working in other contexts can lift out asterisked activities directly. Non-asterisked activities will require a little more tweaking to work in other contexts.

Workshops for Whom?

This resource was designed with senior high school students in mind: young people between 15 and 19 years old. While some activities in this resource could certainly be run with any school-age children (e.g. Activity 9: Gender ≠ Genitals), the content and pitch of activities will need to be adjusted with care. While my interest was to work with 15 to 19 year olds, this material has no upper age limit. I anticipate this material working well with adults, though you might like to update the popular culture references (for instance Activity 14: Sexism in the Streets and Activity 32: Choosing Against Feminism) with examples that resonate with your participants. When running these activities with older participants, do not shy away from the creative and embodied exercises. No matter who you are working with, these are integral to the workshop process.

Activities for What?

The sessions and activities outlined in this resource were designed as part of an extra-curricular, voluntary gender and sexism workshop. Nevertheless, I can envisage its broader utility both within and beyond the classroom. For instance, the sessions and activities I have devised could inform school curriculum development and might also be useful in classroom teaching across a range of subjects and age groups. The resource may also be of use in University-level teaching, particularly for tutorial design. Elements of the workshops could inform externally delivered school-based, workplace and/or community educational work, particularly anti-discrimination programmes.

Thinking beyond pedagogical contexts, I hope other researchers find my use of these workshops of value. It may hold particular interest for those researchers who, like myself, are interested in creative methodologies which weave together an academic project with social justice work (Calder-Dawe, in progress). Some activities may be of use for researchers (or, indeed, for health and support workers) who are looking for alternative routes to elicit and explore the political in personal narratives. As I suggest in the preface, I recommend reading through my introduction in full to guide your passage through this resource whatever your interest may be.

My Workshops

As indicated in the preface, I designed these workshops as part of my doctoral thesis. Naturally, this has shaped the workshop design, and my experience of running them. Without the expense of a thesis, I doubt I would have imagined my initial workshop process: three days of group discussion, reflection and action. After running two three-day workshops, I condensed much of the material from the three-day workshop into a less demanding one-day format.

My researcher position has been significant for recruiting participants. Whereas teachers or community workers may design and facilitate workshops with young people they already have contact with, I was unknown to the participants I recruited. This meant I relied on volunteers, rather than having a 'ready-made' (though potentially unenthused) participant pool. To find participants, I visited and/or contacted 8 central Auckland state-funded high schools to provide information about the workshops and invite participation. From this initial wave of contact, I connected with enough participants to run two three-day workshops (in July, 2013) and two one-day workshops (in December, 2013). Workshop participants were all aged between 16 and 18, and I deliberately secured participants from different schools for each workshop. My participant demographics are summarised below. I refer to the five Auckland secondary schools my participants attended as Schools V, W, X, Y and Z to preserve participant and school anonymity.

Workshop 1

Three-day format

8 participants

Participant Age		
16yrs	17yrs	18yrs
0	2	2

Participant Gender	
Male	Female
1	7

Workshop 1 included participants from four state-funded Auckland secondary schools: School W (Co-Ed), School X (single sex: girls), School Y (Co-Ed) and School Z (single sex: girls).

Participants described their ethnic identities as follows: NZ European (2), Chinese (1) Maori/European (1) Niuean/European (1) Armenian (1) Japanese (1) Israeli (1).

Workshop 2

Three-day format

9 participants

Participant Age		
16yrs	17yrs	18yrs
5	4	0

Participant Gender	
Male	Female
0	9

Workshop 2 included participants from three state-funded Auckland secondary schools: School X (single sex: girls), School Y (Co-Ed) and School Z (single sex: girls).

Participants described their ethnic identities as follows: NZ European (5), Chinese (1) Maori/European (1) South African (1) Korean (1).

Workshop 3

One-day format

2 participants

Participant Age		
16yrs	17yrs	18yrs
0	0	2

Participant Gender	
Male	Female
1	1

Workshop 3 included participants from two state-funded Auckland secondary schools: School W (Co-Ed) and School Y (Co-Ed).

Participants described their ethnic identities as follows: NZ European (1) and Polish (1).

Workshop 4

One-day format

4 participants

Participant Age		
16yrs	17yrs	18yrs
0	2	2

Participant Gender	
Male	Female
2	2

Workshop 4 included participants from two state-funded Auckland secondary schools: School V (single sex: boys) and School Y (Co-Ed).

Participants described their ethnic identities as follows: NZ European (3) and Chinese (1).

My Facilitation

I facilitated these workshops as a mid-twenties Pakeha woman with no prior relationship with any of my participants. I ran the workshops at the University of Auckland, an unfamiliar space for high school students. All these elements contributed to the flavour of my workshops. Because of the workshop location and my particular position (an unfamiliar, relatively junior researcher), I was able to differentiate the workshops from a school space, to minimise my 'expert' position and to establish a dialogical tone relatively easily (see Notes on Setting Up p.10 for a discussion of participant-facilitator familiarity and running workshops in institutional settings).

It is worth noting that my success with these workshops must be in part due to the participants who elected to participate in them: high school students with a sense that gender matters. Had I been working with a captive audience, activities may have run rather differently – particularly those activities which require multiple willing interlocutors for critical dialogue and problem-posing inquiry. That said, I am very optimistic about the power of participatory approaches to draw group members, be they eager or disaffected, into a compelling collective examination of the 'evaded curricula' in their own lives. Addressing participants with respect and engaging in reciprocal questioning with curiosity and care prepares the way.

Notes on Group Work

Collective experiential sharing has a long history in critical pedagogy and social justice activism. Critical dialogue in small groups can re-politicise individual experience, surfacing the social patterns underlying apparently ‘individual’ accounts. Accordingly, the workshops were designed for small groups to harness the practical and pedagogical possibilities this format offers.

Why small groups?

Small groups are an ideal format for these workshops because they are especially conducive to critical reflection. They hit the pedagogical ‘sweet spot’ by diffusing the conversational and reflective work among just enough people to ease the compulsory or confessional qualities of one-on-one conversation without significantly reducing scope for participation and engagement. In small groups, people can step in and out of conversation as they choose. This, in turn, frees participants to experiment with ideas, tell stories and share difficult emotions. For these reasons, small group contexts may be more comfortable and more generative than one-on-one encounters, particularly when addressing embarrassing, personal or stigmatised issues (McClelland & Fine, 2008).

Small group work is also a strong format for these workshops because they can accommodate embodied and creative elements. A great deal of scholarship attests to the power of these techniques in catalysing critical reflection and illuminating the ‘evaded’ curriculum (Bailey, 1993; see Boal, 1979; Fox, 2007; Greene, 1995; McClelland & Fine, 2008). Including a range of activities provides different ways to experience and communicate ideas, and also caters to diverse skills within the group. Incorporating opportunities for drawing, writing and performance democratises the workshop process by playing to different participants’ strengths.

What group size should I use?

There is no absolute answer to this question. For the purposes of this resource, I consider a small group to be between 4 and 20 people. The ideal number of participants in these activities depends on the length of time you have available to work with participants. If you are considering running workshops similar to those outlined in this resource, the less time you have available, the smaller the ideal group size would be. A three-day workshop benefits from at least 6 participants, and could accommodate as many as 20. If you have a large group, I recommend substituting whole group discussions with smaller groups to ensure everyone has an opportunity to speak. A one-day workshop, in contrast, is at its best with between 2 and 6 participants, as this gives everyone a larger share in conversation and allows you to get through activities more quickly. Attending to group size in this manner will create fertile ground for problem-posing discussion.

That said, these are simply rough guidelines and you can run activities, sessions and/or workshops in any way you see fit. There is certainly still value in this approach when a more in-depth small group engagement is not possible. For instance, I have successfully incorporated activities from this resource into a 30-minute participatory presentation to 200 school students.

Notes on Setting Up

The physical space you choose for the workshops will shape the interactional space which springs from it. The success of the workshop hinges on setting an open, democratic and collaborative tone wherein participants pay close attention to others and are closely attended to in turn. The set-up of the space you work in should reflect and support this interactional register. This could mean, for instance, finding a seating arrangement where everyone can make eye contact to ensure that everyone in the group can be personally 'addressed' by whoever is speaking. Particularly if you are working with people from the same institutional context (e.g. a school, a workplace), it's important to establish the *difference* of the workshop space from the outset. The rationale here is to attempt to destabilise (or at least de-emphasise) institutional roles and existing relational patterns within the group by setting new, dialogical and egalitarian norms of interaction.

This poses a particular challenge when facilitator and participants are from the same institutional context – for instance, a teacher facilitating workshops with students. Where templates of teacher-student interaction are already established, it is unrealistic to expect to be able to generate a workshop space untouched by this relational history. This is especially so where teachers are directly responsible for disciplining, judging and punishing students. Nevertheless, there are a variety of ways to work with this situation. You may choose to find a non-classroom space for the activity, or to facilitate workshops with a class other than your own. In some instances, you may already be practicing a problem-posing pedagogy, in which case pre-established interactional templates (between you and your students and between students themselves) can be carried into the workshop.

Whatever your relation to participants happens to be, if the workshops are held in a space familiar to participants, you might consider bringing in cushions to sit on, changing the arrangement of furniture in the room or playing music softly to establish a fresh mood. Beginning the workshops with creative activities is also integral to setting a warm, informal and inviting tone.

There are also a few practical considerations regarding the workshop space. Because the workshops involve some drama-based activities, you will need to run the workshop in a space large enough for participants to move around freely. For the longer format workshops, you will need to make time for/ provide refreshments. Never underestimate the reviving effect of afternoon tea.

Notes on Facilitation

A Freirean Approach

These workshops adopt Paulo Freire's (2000) 'problem-posing' approach to critical pedagogy. This dialogue-based method grows from the premise that we carry the seeds for transformative reflection within us: we are each experts on the social rules, assumptions and practices which contour our lives. The purpose of critical pedagogy, therefore, is not to 'deposit' a critical social analysis into people, but to provide useful tools and a facilitating context for people to begin to excavate and critique dominant social knowledge themselves. Effective critical pedagogy invites participant-learners to tease out and interrogate their feelings and experiences using their own language and symbols. Instead of presenting content in a didactic manner, workshop facilitation should support participants' encounters with ideas, their exploration and reflection. This is done through 'problem-posing' dialogue. For the facilitator, this means continually querying and re-presenting participants' statements about the social world, posing commonsense assumptions, meaning categories and explanations of the world not as 'truth' but as *problems* to be investigated. This creates space for participants to encounter and analyse the 'thought-language' they use to interpret the world, catalysing a process of transformative reflection and action (Freire, 2000, p. 97).

This mode of facilitation unsettles expert-learner power relations by positioning participants and facilitator as 'fellow travellers' through social discourse, each learning from opinions and dilemmas of others. Thus, the facilitator's experiences and social knowledge is part of the group's collective resource. Accordingly, facilitators will contribute ideas, participate in exercises and engage in reciprocal questioning alongside participants (while taking care not to monopolise the conversation either literally or figuratively). Problem-posing facilitators invite participants to take the lead in introducing new material and posing their own questions to the group. Maintaining these openings for participants to take the lead helps to ensure the workshops are addressing meaningful issues in a useful manner.

What is Problem-posing?

Freire is deliberately (and delightfully!) open-ended in his writings, and he provides no 'blueprint' for problem-posing. To do so would be to go against his commitment to 'pedagogy in motion', wherein facilitators re-imagine and reconstitute pedagogical practice in response to local context. With this in mind, I have distilled a set of guiding principles for problem-posing facilitation, below. This is not a laundry list, and it does not more than sketch the outlines of problem-posing. I recommend reading Freire's (2000) work for a richer account.

- Be mindful of your positioning in relation to participants and work to minimise the impact of your power/expertise on the group. Answering questions, addressing participants with interest and respect, and displaying uncertainty are all ways to build reciprocity and 'turn down the volume' of your own voice. Retaining a degree of authority over the group is essential, however, for purposeful and care-taking facilitation.²
- Be mindful of participants' positioning in relation to each other, and encourage them to be mindful too. This could mean, for instance, discussing the dimensions of difference and/or privilege within the group (you could use [Activity 5: Living Likhert Scale*](#) p.60 for this purpose) and reflecting together on how this might shape group dynamics (who speaks most frequently, for instance, or who might more comfortably offer a critique of a particular topic). One way into this could be to use [Activity 36: Thinking about Privilege](#) as a springboard into a group discussion of intersectionality (the notion that multiple axes of privilege and dispossession intersect in individual lives, and that critical analyses ought to take this complexity into account).
- Problem-posing means querying statements and the assumptions which undergird them. This process is done gently, with curiosity and respect. Through this process of problem-posing dialogue, participants are supported to pull out and examine the social knowledge and logic they use to think with.

² In order to keep the group space safe for all present, you must be in a position to challenge aggressive and hostile behaviour. You will also want to be able to effectively challenge discriminatory discourses, should they surface.

- Pose all participants' opinions as 'problems' regardless of content. This helps participants to adjust quickly to the problem-posing approach and it also ensures no one appears to be singled out.
- Take particular care to resist group consensus by posing group assertions as problems to be interrogated. This keeps participants thinking and maintains conversational flow.
- Facilitate and role-model reflexive self-interrogation. Acknowledging your own uncertainties and dilemmas will help others to do the same. Contradictions and inconsistencies are ripe material for problem-posing
- When you're not running an exercise, participate in it.
- Handle dissent and disagreement sensitively. Where possible, you might consider posing the disagreement to the people involved as a problem: what assumptions and beliefs are underlying the disagreement?
- Ensure each person has time to speak and be listened to. When conversation runs between some participants and not others, work to draw the quieter people in by inviting them to contribute their expertise, opinion or insights.
- Don't be afraid of silence, and try not to fill it yourself. Sometimes people need time to reflect before speaking, especially with new, complex and/or politicised ideas.

Finally, I want to highlight that many activities in this resource offer scope to discuss personal experiences with gender and sexism. Facilitators must be mindful that this process of sharing and problem-posing could be disturbing or distressing for participants. An invitation to re-see our lives, beliefs and behaviours can be unwelcome or disorienting. It is important to discuss these possibilities at the outset with participants, as well as requesting (and role-modelling) a gentle problem-posing approach.

³ I use the term 'critical theory' to refer to theoretical approaches which build on poststructuralist or social constructionist ontology.

Notes on Content

The three workshop outlines offered in this resource vary considerably, largely because of their difference in scope: the depth and range of material analysed over three days of group work cannot be matched in a 90-minute format. Nevertheless, all three workshops are structured around growing a critical social analysis and providing participants with critical and practical building blocks to ‘speak back’ to dominant cultural assumptions which trouble them. The design and sequencing of activities in each workshop is intended to facilitate participants’ exploration of the four questions below:

- What have we learned from our social environment about gender, gender relations and sexuality?
- What are the personal, ethical and political consequences of sexism and prescriptive gender roles?
- What prevents individuals and groups from challenging injustice?
- How might we ‘speak back’ to cultural images and ideas we find troubling?

These four questions can be further reduced into two key workshop aims: to explore critical social theory in local context, and to explore possibilities for action. This dual emphasis creates what I term a ‘praxis of *un-knowing* one’s place’. The phrase ‘to know one’s place’ carries two meanings: first, it suggests familiarity with one’s social environment, and second, it implies an acceptance of one’s position in social hierarchy. A praxis of *un-knowing* one’s place, in contrast, is about questioning and destabilising our perception of the world and re-positioning ourselves in it through critical social analysis, problem-posing dialogue and transformative social action. For example, dominant commonsense assumptions about gender encourage men and women to know their (gendered) places and stick to them. The workshop process encourages participants to connect these assumptions to gendered relations of power, and invites them to ‘un-know’ and resist their places in gendered hierarchies (see Calder-Dawe, in progress).

There are two reasons for this dual un-knowing. The first is theoretical: reflection and action are intertwined and mutually reinforcing. Change-oriented pedagogy is at its strongest when it creates feedback loops of reflection, dialogue and action. Fostering these messy, generative and (we hope) individually and socially transformative circuits is what makes critical pedagogy, feminist pedagogy and action research paradigms such powerful catalysts (Moane, 2010; Stoudt, Fox, & Fine, 2012). The second reason for this two-pronged approach is a methodological concern for the affective charge of the workshops. There’s a clear potential for discussions of sexism and misogyny to leave people feeling angry, guilty, defensive and depressed. For this reason, it is important to juxtapose mapping the contours of contemporary sexism with energising and uplifting discussion of the possibilities for ‘speaking back’.

A Workshop Praxis: Un-knowing One’s Place

As outlined above, a pedagogy of un-knowing one’s place supports participants to re-politicise commonsense and everyday experience through critical reflection and action. In practical terms, this means running activities and discussions which invite participants to trace connections between their mundane gendered experiences (often accepted as ‘just the way things are’) and broader social power relations. Rather than speaking and talking in the abstract, the workshops are an opportunity for participants to fold critical theory³ into their lives, experiences and identities. Accordingly, the activities I have designed and / or collated in this resource have a deliberate focus on the local, the everyday and the personal.

The particular issues and topics covered were selected because of their intersections with everyday sexism, either in media or in daily life. I have chosen to focus on rape jokes, political correctness, choice and feminism because I believe a critical analysis of these issues will equip participants with the analytic tools to resist and challenge sexism in their own lives, should they choose to. Workshop activities also invite participants to reflect on their own responses to sexism and feminism, and to share experiences of the social policing of gender. The examples of activism discussed in the workshops were chosen because they explicitly address gendered power relations in different ways, from large-scale campaigns to small acts which inspire, amuse and prod.

Finally, note that I do not explicitly fold formalised written reflection time into any of my workshops. This can be a very useful tool, however, (see C. Cahill, 2007a) and I would recommend interspersing the longer workshops with time for individual writing and reflection as you see fit.

Recommended Reading

The Introduction section provided a brief overview of three strands of academic literature which have informed the development of this document: critical and feminist pedagogies; activism and activist research/pedagogy; and critical analysis of feminism and postfeminism. Below are a few key texts from each of these three domains to guide your further reading. Full details of these texts can be found in the References section.

Critical and Feminist Pedagogies

Copp and Kleinman (2008)

Fahs (2011)

Freire (2000)

Giroux (2000)

Greene (1995)

Kleinman, Copp and Sandstrom (2006)

Moane (2006, 2010)

Parrotta and Rusche (2011)

Souto-Manning (2010)

Activisms and Activist Research

Appadurai (2006)

Boal (1979)

Cahill (2007a, 2007b)

Fine and Torre (2004)

Fox (2007)

Stoudt, Fox and Fine (2012)

Critical Analysis of Feminism and Postfeminism

Ahmed (2010)

Baker (2010)

Coy and Horvath (2011)

Gill (2007a, 2008, 2011)

McRobbie (2004, 2009)

Mooney (2008)

Three-Day Workshop

Outline

Purpose Statement

As outlined in the Introduction to this resource, the bulk of the activities and resources were designed with a three-day workshop format in mind. This version of the workshop runs for approximately 7 hours per day across three days: a total of 21 hours. When I ran these workshops, I spaced them out over one week on non-consecutive days: Monday, Wednesday and Friday. Spacing the contact days apart in this way allows time for facilitator and participants to sit with new material, reflect on its intersections with everyday experiences and reflect on the workshop process to date. To make the most of the in-between days, I suggest setting an online forum for participants to connect with each other between meetings. The forum also allowed us to continue our conversations after the workshop itself has ended.

The generous three-day format has considerable scope for open, problem-posing discussion and ample space for participants to bring their own ideas, interests and concerns to the group. The activities detailed here have been carefully sequenced to provide progressive opportunities for participants to critically interrogate and grow their knowledge and skill bases. As well as opportunities for 'un-knowing their place' (see [Notes on Facilitation](#), p.11), participants learn about creative activism from local experts and have time to plan an original social intervention which 'speaks back' to dominant cultural assumptions they want to challenge.

Day 1 Workshop Schedule

DAY 1

9.45-11.15	Welcome and Orientation
11.15-11.30	Morning Tea Break
11.30-1.00	Critical Social Analysis
1.00-1.30	Lunch
1.30-3.00	Everyday Sexism
3.00-3.15	Afternoon Tea
3.15-4.15	Activism
4.15-4.30	Wrap-Up

Session-By-Session Guide: Day 1

Welcome and Orientation

approx. 90 minutes

The first session of Day 1 welcomes participants to the workshop, builds rapport and community and establishes an open, reciprocal dialogical space (see Freire, 2000; Souto-Manning, 2010). Setting a collaborative, inquiring tone from the outset is fundamental to the workshop's success. All 5 activities in this section help to achieve this.

It is a good idea to begin by pointing out important features of the workspace you're in, if participants are not familiar with it: where to find the toilets and drinking water, for example. You may also wish to run through the contours of the three days in brief, or give participants a printed outline. Depending on the requirements of your project, you may want to use this time to provide some background on the sessions/workshops and complete any necessary administrative tasks (questionnaires, consent forms, demographic information etc.). You may also want to unpack the 'problem-posing' philosophy of the workshops by explaining that discussions are a forum for sharing the group's diverse expertise and working together to inquire into everyday experiences (see Notes on Facilitation for more detail).

Any group discussion of issues relating to sexism, gender and sexuality has the potential to raise sensitive issues for group members, lead to a serious personal disclosure and/or generate discomfort. As a facilitator, you must be prepared for these eventualities. Providing detailed information about local, accessible support services and identifying a procedure for participants to leave the discussion space, should they need to, is an essential part of care-taking facilitation. I recommend covering these points early in the first session.

Activity List:

Activity 1: [Blind Assassins/Wink Murder*](#) p.58

Activity 2: [Name-and-Role Memory Game*](#) p.58

Activity 3: [Ground Rules*](#) p.59

Activity 4: [Identity Mapping*](#) p.59

Activity 5: [Living Likhert Scale*](#) p.60

Critical Social Analysis

approx. 90 minutes

After welcoming participants to the workshop and establishing a collaborative interactive space in the first session of the day, the second session introduces the fundamental theoretical foundation of the workshops: a critical social analysis. The activities in this session are designed and sequenced to present critical theory in an accessible, meaningful and lively manner. First, the facilitator takes the lead, talking through the relationship between power and knowledge (see Foucault, 1978) in an interactive, semi-nar-style presentation. This is one of the only occasions during workshop process where the facilitator takes up a 'teacherly' role. Even so, it is possible to do this in an open manner, offering rather than mandating the critical social analysis you present. You may like to emphasise that the workshops are about holding theory and experience side by side and analysing points of connection and contradiction. As a facilitator, keep in mind that an uncritical use of theory to re-narrate experience is antithetical to the workshop process and purpose. You can also provide opportunities for participants to contribute ideas and expertise within the presentation in order to moderate the monological format of this activity (for a sample presentation see [Resource 4](#), p. 83). Take time to build this scaffold clearly, as participants will draw on it throughout the rest of the workshop process.

Moving forward, Activity 7 takes an embodied approach to critical social analysis and Activity 8 introduces a critical 'deconstruction' approach which will reappear across the workshop.

Activity List

Activity 6: [Power / Knowledge Presentation*](#) p.60

Activity 7: [Master and Servant*](#) p.61

Activity 8: [The Social Iceberg*](#) p.61

Everyday Sexism

approx. 90 minutes

The third session of the day moves from the generalised critical social analysis introduced in the second session to the workshop's particular focus: gender and sexism in popular media and everyday life. Accordingly, many of the activities from this session onwards explicitly address these interests. The session includes a mixture of role play, small group work and whole group discussion to maintain momentum. These diverse activities also offer multiple avenues for participants to explore connections between a feminist social analysis and their own everyday experiences of gender and gendered power relations.

Activity List:

Activity 9: [Gender ≠ Genitals](#) p.62

Activity 10: [Men-Ups](#) p.62

Activity 11: [Sexism Quick-Association](#) p.62

Activity 12: [Media Men and Women on the Wall](#) p.63

Activity 13: [Intimate Relationships](#) p.63

Activity 14: [Sexism in the Streets](#) p.64

Activism

approx. 60 minutes

The fourth session of the day introduces social activism, a focus which we will revisit across the workshop process. This session provides an opportunity to discuss the range of possibilities open to us to challenge commonsense ideas we find troubling. This shift in focus from analysing social relations in previous sessions to exploring ways to transforming them in this session provides an infusion of positive, mood-lightening energy after 6 hours of intense group work examining weighty social issues.

The session moves from a general discussion of activism in Activity 15 into an examination of specific examples of feminist activism in Activities 16 and 17 which 'speak back' to problematic social assumptions.

Activity List:

Activity 15: [Activism Brainstorm*](#) p.64

Activity 16: [Feminist Social Activism](#) p.65

Activity 17: [If Men Could Menstruate](#) p.65

Wrap-Up

approx. 15 minutes

Begin the final 15 minutes of the day with group reflection on the day's activities. Group stretching, Activity 18, is an excellent technique for reconnecting with the body, and reconnecting the group as a whole. Activities 19 and 20 assume that you are using an online forum. Omit or modify these activities if you are not using one.

After running through Activities 18, and 19, move into the final activity of the day, Activity 20, which introduces the online forum and outlines the "homework" task. Finish the session by inviting participants to feed back any questions and comments they have about the day: what they liked best, what kinds of things they would like to focus on more in coming sessions. This is a good chance to find out if anyone would like more information on something touched on. As participants leave, remind them about the support available from organisations and, if you are willing to be contacted with questions or comments, provide your contact details.

Activity List:

Activity 18: [Group Stretching*](#) p.65

Activity 19: [Introducing the Online Forum*](#) p.66

Activity 20: [Sexism Scan 1](#) p.66

Day 2 Workshop Schedule

DAY 2

9.45-11.15	Welcome and Catching up
11.15-11.30	Morning Tea Break
11.30-1.00	Gender and Choice
1.00-1.30	Lunch
1.30-3.00	Activism Skills
3.00-3.15	Afternoon Tea
3.15-4.15	Obscuring Sexism
4.15-4.30	Wrap-Up

Session-By-Session Guide: Day 2

Welcome and Catching Up

approx 90 minutes

The first session of Day 2 welcomes participants back to the group and re-establishes the dialogical space set up on Day 1. It is a relaxed and open start to the day which provides an opportunity for participants to steer conversation and critical analysis towards their own concerns and interests.

Activities 21 and 22 playfully reconnect the group, and Activity 21 also introduces a central theme of the day: critical analysis of 'choice' rhetoric. Activity 23 opens up group space to share any ideas and experiences participants have had since the last meeting. Activity 24 connects this discussion with the take-home exercise from Day 1 (Sexism Scan 1) and provides participants with a chance to analyse and 'repair' the material they brought along.

Activity List:

Activity 21: [Name and Role Refresher*](#) p.66

Activity 22: [Quick Association Game*](#) p.67

Activity 23: [Open Discussion](#) p.67

Activity 24: [Sexism Scan 2 & Repair the Resource](#) p.67

Gender and Choice

approx. 105 minutes

The activities in this session are designed to open up critical perspectives on 'choice' and choice-based rhetoric. Theorising choice is an important scaffold for negotiating the 'postfeminist sensibility' which characterises popular media, advertising and idealised western femininities (see Gill, 2007b), as well as opening up a critical window on neoliberal subjectivities⁴ more generally. This session includes both embodied and dialogical approaches to maintain energy and stimulate critical reflection.

These activities shift between a consideration of choice and choosing in the abstract (Activities 25, 26, 28) and opportunities to contextualise choices in relation to gendered bodily practices (Activities 27, 29 and 30). If time allows, finish the session with a problem-posing discussion about the politics of personal choices: why do we choose to present ourselves in gendered ways? What are the personal, social and political consequences of these choices?

Activity List:

Activity 25: [Defining Choice*](#) p.68

Activity 26: [What Can We Choose?*](#) p.68

Activity 27: [Close-Up: Female Genital Cutting](#) p.69

Activity 28: [Conscience Alley](#) p.69

Activity 29: [Choice in Context: Sushi for Lunch*](#) p.70

Activity 30: [Choice and Body Hair](#) p.70

Activity 31: [Reflection / Discussion Statements](#) p.71

⁴ Subjectivity is a poststructuralist term used to refer to a person's sense of self. Unlike the essentialist term 'identity', subjectivity suggests fluidity and instability. Neoliberal subjectivity refers to the ways of understanding and narrating the self which proliferate under neoliberalism

Activism Skills

approx. 90 minutes

The purpose of this session is to provide participants with a forum to learn practical skills they can utilise for the social action planning element of the workshops – and, potentially, beyond the workshop. The session should focus on techniques or skills which are relatively simple and which are a powerful vector for ‘speaking back’ to dominant assumptions and stereotypes. Be sure to choose something that makes use of materials and technology all participants have access to. Depending on the expertise available to you, this could cover the basics of amateur film production, photography, graphic design and poster-making, or any other relevant creative skill.

Unless you have particular skills in one of these areas, you will need to find someone outside the group to facilitate this session. Where possible, ask the presenter to draw on material which connects to the workshop’s focus (i.e. social justice activism, sexism). A template Guest Presenter Brief for film-making skills is included in the Resources section (see [Resource 20](#) p.102).

As well as introducing practical skills, this session is about providing participants with some time to begin to think about a focus for the social action plan they will be developing during Day 3. Either you or your guest presenter will need to facilitate this flow from skill-acquisition seminar to idea development.

Obscuring Sexism

approx. 60 minutes

The fourth session of the day builds on the complex theorisation of choice the group worked up in session two. This session connects a critical analysis of choice to sexism and feminism, focussing particularly on the choice to see sexism, and the choice to challenge it.

Activities 32 and 35 invite participants to discuss the complexities of these choices and to consider these choices in their own lives. Activities 33 and 34 focus particularly on feminism and direct participants' analysis towards the affective loading of a 'feminist' identity. These activities create an occasion for participants to reassess negative social assumptions they may have about feminism, if they choose to. The session ends with Activity 36, which introduces an intersectional analysis of privilege in an accessible manner. You may wish to round off the session with a group discussion about the implication of privilege for someone's choices and responsibilities.

Activity List:

Activity 32: [Choosing Against Feminism](#) p.71

Activity 33: [Straw Feminists](#) p.72

Activity 34: [Seeing & Challenging Sexism](#) p.72

Activity 35: [Street Harassment: Sexism?](#) p.73

Activity 36: [Thinking about Privilege*](#) p.73

Wrap Up

approx. 15 minutes

Day 2 ends with an open discussion about the day: what participants have found useful and what they might like to know more about. If you are using an online forum to keep the group connected between sessions, you can use it as a platform for supplying any additional information participants ask for. Run through Activities 18 and 37.

Activity 37 introduces a focus for reflection and for online forum activity between now and your next meeting. It also introduces a theme of Day 3: humour and social justice. Before participants leave, you may wish to remind them that Day 3 hinges on the planning and presentation of an original idea for social action. Invite participants to use the online forum to plan and discuss possibilities with each other if they choose.

Activity List:

Activity 18: [Group Stretching*](#) p.65

Activity 37: [Humour Hunt 1](#) p.73

Day 3 Workshop Schedule

DAY 3

9.45-11.15	Welcome and Catching up
11.15-11.30	Morning Tea Break
11.30-1.00	Humour and Social Justice
1.00-1.30	Lunch
1.30-3.00	Guest Presentation and Social Activism Idea Development
3.00-3.15	Afternoon Tea
3.15-4.15	Presentation of Social Action Plans
4.15-4.30	Wrap-Up and Farewell

Session-By-Session Guide: Day 3

Welcome and Catching Up

Begin Day 3 by welcoming participants back to the group and re-establishing the dialogical space created across the previous two workshop days. This session follows a similar trajectory to the Welcome and Catching Up session in Day 2.

Activities 21 and 38 playfully reconnect the group and rebuild a collaborative interactional space. Activity 23 turns over the agenda to participants, opening up group space to share any ideas and experiences participants have had since the last meeting. Activity 39 asks the group to look over material gathered since last session, before moving into participants' social activism planning (Activities 40 and 41).

Activity List:

Activity 21: [Name and Role Refresher*](#) p.66

Activity 38: [Web of Connections Warm-Up*](#) p.74

Activity 23: [Open Discussion](#) p.67

Activity 39: [Humour Hunt 2](#) p.74

Activity 40: [Social Activism Issues](#) p.74

Activity 41: [Social Activism Planning*](#) p.75

Humour and Social Justice

approx. 90 minutes

This is the final content-based workshop session. The overall aim of the session is to explore humour as a tool for communicating ideas. Humour can subtly and persuasively communicate protest and social critique but it can also be used to enact sexism, racism, hostility and aggression. A critical analysis of sexist humour and the arguments typically used to defend and legitimise these jokes may inform participants' social activism planning, and will also equip participants with the skills to identify and challenge hostile humour in everyday life if they choose.

The session begins with a close analysis of sexist jokes (Activities 42 and 43) before moving into a discussion of how rhetorics of political correctness and of freedom of speech are employed to attack and defend hostile humour (Activity 44). The session closes with a general discussion of the social function of humour. Activity 46 provides participants with an opportunity to write a 'note-to-self' for the future.

Activity List:

Activity 42: [Repair the Resource](#) p.75

Activity 43: [Dissecting Rape Jokes](#) p.76

Activity 44: [Close-Up: Political Correctness and Freedom of Speech*](#) p.76

Activity 45: [Just a Joke?*](#) p.77

Activity 46: [Note to Self*](#) p.77

Guest Presentation & Social Activism Idea Development

approx. 90 minutes

Similarly to Day 2, this session combines a guest presentation with time for participants to develop their social activism plans. The session is intended to introduce participants to the tangible practice of social justice activism. Ideally, you will have access to a guest presenter with experience in facilitating community social activism. Where this is not the case, I suggest presenting a case study of social activism relevant to the workshop to the group yourself. The New View Campaign's work challenging female genital cosmetic surgery in the United States is an excellent example of this kind of work (see <http://www.newviewcampaign.org/>). Whether or not you have a guest speaker, this 'activism in action' presentation should last for about 20 minutes, allowing an extra 10 minutes for questions.

Participants will spend the remaining 60 minutes in small groups developing and finalising their social activism plans. By the end of this session, groups should be ready to present to the whole group. If you have a guest speaker, invite them to stay on for the 60 minutes and circulate with you between groups, offering ideas and asking questions.

Presentation of Social Activism Plans

approx. 60 minutes

The final session of the workshop is devoted to discussing and celebrating participants' original proposals for social action. As a whole, the session should offer a diverse picture of how social activism can move us towards a better and more just social environment. Participants have an opportunity to share ideas they are passionate about with the whole group, ending the workshops on a positive note.

Activity List:

Activity 47: [Social Activism Presentations*](#) p.77

Wrap-Up and Farewell

approx. 15 minutes

Use the last 15 minutes the group has together to reflect on the entire workshop process. Encourage participants to carry any ideas they have found useful onwards and outwards, and encourage them to find ways to stay in touch with each other. If you have used an online forum and are planning to keep it alive, remind participants that this is an excellent platform for continuing critical conversations and keeping connected. You may wish to offer participants a way to reach you in the future if they want to get in touch about anything, and/or you may want to offer them support in pursuing their social activism plans.

Before presenting certificates to participants and ending the session, you may want to outline what this process has meant for you as a facilitator. Thank participants for their participation and for the ideas and experiences they have shared with the group. Remind everyone present to treat material shared respectfully and to maintain each others' privacy, if this was a group rule.

Activity List:

Activity 18: [Group Stretching*](#) p.65

Activity 48: [Certificates*](#) p.77

Process Notes

Running workshops is a rather different experience from planning them, or indeed reading about them. Below are some process notes about the three-day workshops, based on my experience of co-facilitating them (for a description of my workshops, including participant demographics, refer to the [Using Workshops, Session and Activities section](#) p.6).

- While I was hesitant about the workshop's reliance on discussion, conversation flowed freely and enthusiastically – so much so that moving into individual tasks and written reflection proved difficult. With one group, I abandoned written reflection altogether as participants weren't able to do it without bursting into conversation.
- The activities flowed well. After the first three-day workshop, I added in Activity 40: [Social Activism Issues](#) to guide the social activism planning. This was an effective addition, providing a bit more guidance about which direction(s) to pursue for subsequent participants.
- As I had hoped, participants took up opportunities to share and 'problem-pose' everyday experiences of gender and sexism, often referring back to childhood.
- The Name-and-Role Memory Game (see [Activities 2](#) and [21](#)) was very successful – participants enjoyed playing their roles and, when asked by a guest speaker to introduce themselves, some participants spontaneously added their discussion role to their biography!
- Group stretching and the other dynamic activities which got people up and moving around made a tangible difference to the energy levels in the room. Do not skip over these exercises.
- Participants used the online forum I created to share ideas and material with each other in between the workshop days. Combined with the 'take-home' activities, this encouraged participants to start conversations about their own concerns and interests. Sexism in video games was a key concern for several participants, and not something I had built into the workshop content at all. Creating these opportunities for participant input into content broadens the scope and utility of the workshops.
- Finding a balance between keeping conversation 'on track' and leaving participants to explore was difficult. I tended to redirect participants to the activity at hand only when conversation strayed away from the activity altogether. This did not happen frequently, and it also varied considerably – some days and some groups were more 'jumpy' than others.

Testimonials

As part of the three-day workshops, I asked participants to complete surveys on their experiences of the workshop process. Below are survey extracts which set out in participants' own words what the workshop process meant for them.

Has the workshop been what you expected, going into it? How has / hasn't it?

I didn't know much about what was going to be happening – but it went very well – I had a lot of fun and learned a great deal too. [Workshop 1: Participant 4]

I enjoyed it more than I expected. It was more informal and open-ended but also more thought-provoking. [Workshop 1: Participant 5]

I don't really know what I expected to be honest but I think it was an incredibly fun and informative experience. The mood was a lot more relaxed than I expected actually which made me more comfortable to speak my mind and know I wouldn't be judged about it. [Workshop: Participant 2]

It has in the way I've learnt a lot more about sexism, feminism etc (a LOT of things) and I am beginning to form more complex conclusions in the way I feel. [Workshop 2: Participant 4]

This workshop has exceeded my expectations (already quite high) and provided me with a lot of new information about society and issues in relation to sexual ethics as well as information about myself. It has helped me grasp a better knowledge of what views I hold and of social issues I was previously unaware of. [Workshop 2: Participant 8]

Has participating in the workshop changed the way you think about (a) your own life (b) your family and friends' lives (c) popular media (d) being a social justice activist? If so, how?

I feel confident to identify as a feminist now! Mainly because I feel like I now know what it means! I feel really motivated to take some action – even just challenging people in conversation about their own views on sexism! [Workshop 1: Participant 3]

It made me think about the "harmless" things that people say or comment on everyday that reinforce ideas in the collective mind of a group of people, the fact that such things are so commonly said (i.e. "that's gay," "she's PMSing") and accepted, suggests that the ideas behind such phrases are in essence accepted. It also reminded me of how not accepting those things that people say makes you a "buzz kill" or a "nagging feminist." [Workshop 2: Participant 1]

I feel like I'm more prepared to speak up in the next sexist situation I face and I feel safer knowing lots of people are anti-sexism, those in the workshop at least. I feel like my friends & family all have varying views and they'll have to put up with me lecturing them if they ever say anything sexist. Now I feel more careful about which media stuff I will watch, e.g. I won't be listening to blurred lines anymore! I feel great to be a social justice activist. [Workshop 2: Participant 3]

I think about my own life in a way, slightly differently now and how men treat me – others treat me and how I want to feel respected and equal, of course I feel the same about my friends and how they are treated / treat others. I see the media differently as I look for more hidden sexist references & realised how common they are. [Workshop 2: Participant 6]

List emotions you associate with your participation in the workshop, and explain why and when you felt each one

Intrigued: by the PhD itself, by the other participants' opinions, by what I was learning. Disturbed: by the blatant exploitation of gender roles etc, and by the everyday 'normalcy' of sexism in society. Determined: to try to expose some of the misconceptions about feminism and spread awareness about sexism in the world. [Workshop 1: Participant 2]

Shock – e.g. seeing some magazines, adverts etc (like the Aston Martin one!) was really horrifying! Everything's so sexualised. Inspired – listening to [guest speaker] talk about her activism. Enlightenment – the term 'vulva' was new to me. Also the 'social knowledge' discussion was really informative. Respect – Everyone shared really cool opinions, thoughts, feelings – lots to think about & learn from. Such an awesome group! FUN! – the whole thing was really great! [Workshop 1: Participant 3]

Concerned (actively) in a good way, happy, content, enlightened, scared (about society) excited (what I might be able to do), thoughtful. [Workshop 1: Participant 7]

Empowered – when looking at those websites of activists and when planning our own activism plans. It made me feel like it wouldn't be so hard to make a difference. [Workshop 2: Participant 1]

Nervous – at first I was afraid my opinions might be seen as wrong and I haven't really been exposed to some of these ideas before. Excited – I was also very excited to attend the workshop as it would provide me with new information, people and ideas. Fun – I found the workshops very fun and the tasks and activities we were given weren't boring. Informative: I have come out of the workshop knowing a lot more than I did before the workshop about both myself and society. Comfortable – I found the workshop a place where it was easy to be comfortable and express my ideas in an open-minded environment. [Workshop 2: Participant 8]

One-Day Workshop

Outline

Purpose Statement:

I developed the one-day workshop after the three-day workshop as a less taxing alternative format. Running three-day workshops requires a great deal of time and energy from facilitator and participants, making it a rich but not particularly practical approach. I was eager to experiment with condensing my material down into a one-day format, and I felt certain that it would be possible to undertake a praxis of 'un-knowing' one's place (see [Notes on Content](#) p.13) in a more compact manner.

To make this possible, I made several significant alterations to the three-day workshops. Firstly, participants do not plan their own original social activism project, nor do they have guest seminars on creative activism and skills (though examining creative activism is still a key part of the workshop). Secondly, less time and fewer activities are devoted to open discussion. The online forum has been removed, as have the take-home activities, for obvious reasons. In order to get through more activities and provide participants with a greater share in conversation, I recommend running one-day workshops with fewer participants (see [Notes on Group Work](#) p.9 for more detail).

Despite the more modest scope, the one-day workshop offers ample opportunity for encounters with ideas, exploration and reflection. Much of the theoretical content is retained, and the activities remain carefully choreographed to provide progressive opportunities for critical reflection and analysis. Like the three-day workshops, this format is still structured around growing a critical social analysis and providing participants with theoretical and practical tools to 'speak back' to everyday cultural assumptions which scaffold gender inequality.

After an orientation to the workshop, the first session introduces a critical social analysis. As with the three-day workshop, this session provides the theoretical backbone for the rest of your time together. Next, an exploration of everyday sexism is paired with a session on critical and creative activism. After lunch, the content moves through a critical analysis of 'choice' into a discussion of the conditions shaping the choice to oppose or to enact both sexism and feminism. The workshop ends with a critical analysis of the function of humour.

One-Day Workshop Schedule

SCHEDULE

10.30-11.00	Welcome and Orientation
11.00-11.30	Critical Social Analysis
11.30-12.15	Everyday Sexism
12.15-1.00	Activism
1.00-1.30	Lunch
1.30-2.30	Gender and Choice
2.30-3.15	Obscuring Sexism
3.15-3.20	Afternoon Tea
3.20-4.20	Humour and Social Justice
4.20-4.30	Wrap-Up and Farewell

Session-By-Session Guide

Welcome and Orientation

approx. 30 minutes

The first session of the day welcomes participants to the workshop, builds rapport and community and establishes an open, reciprocal dialogical space (see Freire, 2000; Souto-Manning, 2010). Setting a collaborative, inquiring tone from the outset is fundamental to the workshop's success. All 3 activities included here work towards establishing this kind of interactional space.

It is a good idea to begin by pointing out important features of the workspace you're in, if participants are not familiar with it: where to find the toilets and drinking water, for example. You may also wish to run through the day's schedule, or give participants a printed outline. Depending on the requirements of your project, you may want to use this time to provide some background on the sessions/workshops and complete any necessary administrative tasks (questionnaires, consent forms, demographic information etc.). You may also want to unpack the 'problem-posing' philosophy of the workshops by explaining that discussions are a forum for sharing the group's diverse expertise and working together to inquire into everyday experiences (see [Notes on Facilitation](#) p.11 for more detail).

Any group discussion of issues relating to sexism, gender and sexuality has the potential to raise sensitive issues for group members, lead to a serious personal disclosure and/or generate discomfort. As a facilitator, you must be prepared for these eventualities. Providing detailed information about local, accessible support services and identifying a procedure for participants to leave the discussion space should they need to are essential parts of care-taking facilitation. I recommend covering these points early in the first session.

Activity List:

Activity 3: [Ground Rules*](#) p.59

Activity 4: [Identity Mapping*](#) p.59

Activity 5: [Living Likhert Scale*](#) p.60

Critical Social Analysis

approx. 30 minutes

After welcoming participants to the workshop and establishing a collaborative interactive space in the first session of the day, the second session introduces the fundamental theoretical foundation of the workshops: a critical social analysis. The activities in this session are designed and sequenced to present critical theory in an accessible, meaningful and lively manner. First, the facilitator takes the lead, talking through the relationship between power and knowledge (see Foucault, 1978) in an interactive, seminar-style presentation. This is one of the only occasions during workshop process where the facilitator takes up a 'teacherly' role. Even so, it is possible to do this in an open manner, offering rather than mandating the critical social analysis you present. You may like to emphasise that the workshop is about holding theory and experience side by side and analysing points of connection and contradiction. As a facilitator, keep in mind that an uncritical use of theory to re-narrate experience is antithetical to the workshop process and purpose. You can also provide opportunities for participants to contribute ideas and expertise within the presentation in order to moderate the monological format of this activity (for a sample presentation see [Resource 4](#), p. 94). Take time to build this scaffold clearly, as participants will draw on it throughout the rest of the workshop process.

Activity List:

Activity 6: [Power / Knowledge Presentation*](#) p.60

Everyday Sexism

approx. 45 minutes

The third session of the day moves from the generalised critical social analysis introduced in the second session to the workshop's particular focus: gender and sexism in popular media and everyday life. Accordingly, many of the activities from this session onwards explicitly address these interests. The session includes a mixture of role play, small group work and whole group discussion to maintain momentum. These diverse activities also offer multiple avenues for participants to explore connections between feminist social theory and their own everyday experiences of gender and gendered power relations.

Activity List:

Activity 9: [Gender ≠ Genitals](#) p.62

Activity 10: [Men-Ups](#) p.62

Activity 49: [Defining Sexism](#) p.78

Activity 50: [Men and Women on the Wall](#) p.78

Activity 14: [Sexism in the Streets](#) p.64

Activism

approx. 45 minutes

The fourth session of the day introduces social activism, a focus which we will revisit across the workshop process. This session provides an opportunity to discuss the range of possibilities open to us to challenge commonsense ideas we find troubling. This shift in focus from analysing social relations in previous sessions to exploring ways to transform them in this session provides an infusion of positive, mood-lightening energy after a period of intense group work examining weighty social issues.

Activities 16 and 17 explore examples of feminist activism which 'speak back' to problematic social assumptions.

Activity List:

Activity 16: [Feminist Social Activism](#) p.65

Activity 17: [If Men Could Menstruate](#) p.65

Gender and Choice

approx. 60 minutes

The activities in this session are designed to open up critical perspectives on 'choice' and choice-based rhetoric. Theorising choice is an important scaffold for negotiating the 'postfeminist sensibility' which characterises popular media, advertising and idealised western femininities (see Gill, 2007b), as well as opening up a critical window on neoliberal subjectivities more generally. This session includes both embodied and dialogical approaches to maintain energy and stimulate critical reflection.

These activities shift between a consideration of 'choice' and 'choosing' in the abstract (Activities 25 and 26) and opportunities to contextualise choices in relation to gendered bodily practices (Activities 29 and 30). If time allows, finish the session with a problem-posing discussion about the politics of personal choices: why do we choose to present ourselves in gendered ways? What are the personal, social and political consequences of these choices?

Activity List:

Activity 25: [Defining Choice*](#) p.68

Activity 26: [What Can We Choose?*](#) p.68

Activity 29: [Choice in Context: Sushi for Lunch*](#) p.70

Activity 30: [Choice and Body Hair](#) p.70

Obscuring Sexism

approx. 45 minutes

The fourth session of the day builds on the complex theorisation of choice the group has already explored. This session connects a critical analysis of choice to sexism and feminism, focussing particularly on the choice to see sexism, and the choice to challenge it.

Activity 32 invites participants to discuss the complexities of these choices, and to consider these choices in their own lives. Activities 33 and 34 focus particularly on feminism and direct participants' analysis towards the affective loading of a 'feminist' identity. These activities create an occasion for participants to reassess negative social assumptions they may have about feminism, if they choose to. The session ends with Activity 36, which introduces an intersectional analysis of privilege in an accessible manner. You may wish to round off the session with a group discussion about the implication of privilege for someone's choices and responsibilities.

Activity List:

Activity 32: [Choosing Against Feminism](#) p.71

Activity 33: [Straw Feminists](#) p.72

Activity 34: [Seeing & Challenging Sexism](#) p.72

Activity 36: [Thinking about Privilege*](#) p.73

Humour and Social Justice

approx. 60 minutes

This is the final content-based workshop session. The overall aim of the session is to explore humour as a tool for communicating ideas. Humour can subtly and persuasively communicate protest and social critique but it can also be used to enact sexism, racism, hostility and aggression. A critical analysis of sexist humour and the arguments typically used to defend and legitimise these jokes may inform participants' social activism planning, and will also equip participants with the skills to identify and challenge hostile humour in everyday life if they choose.

The session begins with a close analysis of sexist jokes (Activities 42 and 43) before moving into a discussion of how rhetorics of political correctness and of freedom of speech are employed to attack and defend hostile humour (Activity 44). The session closes with a general discussion of the social function of humour. Activity 46 provides participants with an opportunity to write a 'note-to-self' for the future.

Activity List:

Activity 42: [Repair the Resource](#) p.75

Activity 43: [Dissecting Rape Jokes](#) p.76

Activity 44: [Close-Up: Political Correctness and Freedom of Speech*](#) p.76

Activity 46: [Note to Self*](#) p.77

Wrap-Up and Farewell

approx. 10 minutes

Use the last 10 minutes the group has together to reflect on the entire workshop process. Encourage participants to carry any ideas they have found useful onwards and outwards. You may wish to offer participants a way to reach you in the future if they want to get in touch with you.

Before presenting certificates to participants and ending the session, you may want to outline what this process has meant for you as a facilitator. Thank participants for their participation and for the ideas and experiences they have shared with the group. Remind everyone present to treat material shared respectfully and to maintain each others' confidentiality, if this was a group rule.

Activity List

Activity 48: [Certificates*](#) p.77

Process Notes

The one-day workshop format was adapted and condensed down from the original three-day workshop template. Having run the three-day workshops successfully, I had some idea of what to expect, though I anticipated that the lack of activism planning would change the process considerably.

Below are some process notes about the one-day workshop, based on my experience of facilitating the (see Introduction for details on my workshops). Where observations from the one-day format are in line with observations from the three-day workshops, I have not repeated them. Anything novel or contradictory is listed below.

- I was interested to see how a workshop would flow with three participants, and as it eventuated I ran a workshop with two participants. I was nervous about it, but the day flowed well. I found that with only three of us, I adapted the content as I went to include fewer embodied activities – these felt awkward in such a small group.
- Depending on the number of participants you have, the number of activities you get through will vary. Unsurprisingly, the workshop I ran with two people was shorter than with four.
- Critical conversations and experiential sharing went well for both workshops, despite having less time to establish the collaborative, problem-posing tone within the group. I was concerned that the two-person workshop might be too intimate a setting for critical discussion, but this was not the case. Indeed, one participant noted she particularly appreciated the conversational space which came with having just the three of us present.
- With less time for unstructured conversation, participants' conversation did not stray off course. This flipside of this was that there were fewer opportunities for participants to bring in their own ideas and materials.

Overall, the one-day format is an effective practical alternative to the three-day workshops. It offers a more streamlined experience which nevertheless supports participants' inquiry into the gendered contours of everyday life.

Testimonials

As part of the one-day workshops, I asked participants to complete brief surveys on their experiences of the workshop process. Below are extracts which set out in participants own words what the workshop process meant for them.

List emotions you associate with your participation in the workshop, and explain why and when you felt each one

Knowledgeable – learned more about gender problems, where they are from. Empowered – to do something about these problems and let others know about them. Included – because of the small group able to voice my opinion and have a lot of say. Interested – was a topic I know about I was able to draw on previous knowledge and understand more. [Workshop 3: Participant 2]

Anger – about hearing some of the examples of sexism and injustice. Pride – in being able to challenge people's ideas. Curiosity – I want to hear more about the issues discussed. Confused – some of the issues were tricky to try and understand at first. Yay! I felt happy that I came. [Workshop 4: Participant 2]

Interesting – it's interesting in general to hear what other people think. Confused – when you think about things you hadn't considered before. Shocked – some examples of harassment etc were shocking. Challenged – to question by beliefs. Excited – to be able to share my opinion. [Workshop 4: Participant 3]

Joy – discussion and voicing opinions is quite good – it lets me express things usually unexpressed. Challenge – when opinions have challenged my preset opinions. I've felt excited to do specific things that enable me to have exposure to different points of view. Shock at some of the information shown. Touched by some of the videos etc shown. [Workshop 4: Participant 4]

Has participating in the workshop changed the way you think about (a) your own life (b) your family and friends' lives (c) popular media (d) being a social justice activist? How?

My opinion of feminism is positive now. Opinions on advertising: I'll be more critical in my evaluation, 'what stereotypes does this support'? Awareness of the social change which needs to occur. [Workshop 3: Participant 1]

Yes, I feel like I know more about this/these problems, I got to hear and see different sides and things that I didn't know about. I felt like there are more people passionate about this and I felt like I can be more open I talking about it and talk about more information with people (inform more than I could have). [Workshop 3: Participant 2]

I definitely feel more comfortable with conveying my own feminist views to those around me and openly. It is also encouraging that others possess similar views and wish to take action. [Workshop 4: Participant 1]

Changed how I think about political correctness and racism. [Workshop 4: Participant 2]

It has really made me realise how much of what I do and believe is influenced by social constructs. I hope that I can see through this more in future and not get so caught up in things like body image and needing to be super feminine. [Workshop 4: Participant 3]

90-Minute Workshop

Outline

Purpose Statement

This 90-minute workshop outline introduces a critical social analysis and invites participants to collaboratively explore it. As with the transition from a three-day to a one-day format, condensing the one-day workshop into a 90-minute format involved reframing the scope of the workshops and dramatically reducing content. I have tried to do this in a manner which retains the integrity of the workshop, and fulfils its essential purpose: providing participants with the forum and the tools to share and interrogate their own observations and experiences, connect dominant knowledge and social practices to power relations and begin to imagine how things might be otherwise. Despite offering fewer opportunities for participation, this 90-minute format still offers opportunities for problem-posing discussion and runs in an open and collaborative manner.

The content retained was chosen because of its suitability to brief delivery and its potential utility for participants – I judged this primarily on the applicability of ideas to understanding and challenging sexism, either in media or in everyday experience. The topics and activities retained here are intended to offer participants fresh ideas and diverse analytic tools to help resist and challenge sexism in their own lives, if they choose.

This 90-minute workshop could relatively easily be adjusted into a 'seminar-style' presentation deliverable to very large groups by either removing or altering the participatory activities. For example, one could invite participants to complete the 'Gender ≠ Genitals' exercise while seated in an auditorium, or ask for volunteers to share examples rather than attempting to hear from everybody present. I recommend using the workshop format where possible, however, because it offers greater scope for participation and critical catalysis.

Session Guide

Introduction

approx. 10 minutes

Use the first ten minutes of your time to introduce the content of the workshop and explain the purpose of the workshop: to provide theoretical tools for participants to take up and explore if they choose to. Run Activity 3 and 5 in a manner that sets a collaborative, dialogical tone for the workshop.

It is a good idea to begin by pointing out important features of the workspace you're in, if participants are not familiar with it: where to find the toilets and drinking water, for example. Depending on the requirements of your project, you may want to use this time to provide some background on the workshop and complete any necessary administrative tasks (questionnaires, consent forms, demographic information etc.). You may also want to unpack the 'problem-posing' philosophy of the workshop by explaining that discussions are a forum for sharing the group's diverse expertise and working together to inquire into everyday experiences.

Any group discussion of issues relating to sexism, gender and sexuality has the potential to raise sensitive issues for group members, lead to a serious personal disclosure and/or generate discomfort. As a facilitator, you must be prepared for these eventualities. Providing detailed information about local, accessible support services and identifying a procedure for participants to leave the discussion space, should they need to, is an essential part of care-taking facilitation. I recommend covering these points early in the session.

Activity List:

Activity 3: [Ground Rules*](#) p.59

Activity 5: [Living Likhert Scale*](#) p.60

Feminist Social Analysis

approx. 30 minutes

After welcoming participants to the workshop and establishing a collaborative mood, move into the fundamental theoretical foundation of the workshop: a critical social analysis. The activities in this session are designed and sequenced to present critical theory in an accessible, meaningful and lively manner. First, give a brief, interactive presentation on the relationship between power and knowledge (see Foucault, 1978). To make the most of the time available, keep the presentation anchored in examples relating to gender. You can provide opportunities for participants to contribute ideas and expertise within the presentation in order to moderate the monological format of this activity (for a sample presentation see [Resource 4](#), p.83). Try to build this scaffold clearly, as participants will draw on it throughout the rest of the workshop.

After the presentation, use Activities 9 and 17 to provide an alternative way into a feminist social analysis – through embodied experience in Activity 9 and through a humorous thought experiment in Activity 17.

Activity List:

Activity 6: [Power / Knowledge Presentation*](#) p.60

Activity 9: [Gender ≠ Genitals](#) p.62

Activity 17: [If Men Could Menstruate](#) p.65

Gender and Choice

approx. 20 minutes

The activities in this section are designed to open up critical perspectives on 'choice' and choice-based rhetoric. Theorising choice is an important scaffold for negotiating the 'postfeminist sensibility' which characterises popular media, advertising and idealised western femininities (see Gill, 2007b), as well as opening up a critical window on neoliberal subjectivities more generally.

Discussion shifts from an abstract consideration of choice in Activity 25 to a contextualised analysis of choice in relation to gendered body hair removal practices in Activity 30. If time allows, finish the session with a problem-posing discussion about the politics of personal choices: why do we choose to present ourselves in gendered ways? What are the personal social and political consequences of these choices?

Activity List:

Activity 25: [Defining Choice*](#) p.68

Activity 30: [Choice and Body Hair](#) p.70

Humour and Sexism

approx. 25 minutes

The last section of the workshop is an exploration of humour as a tool for communicating ideas. Humour can subtly and persuasively communicate protest and social critique but it can also be used to enact sexism, racism, hostility and aggression. A critical analysis of sexist humour and the arguments typically used to defend and legitimise these jokes will equip participants with the skills to identify and challenge hostile humour in everyday life if they choose.

The session begins with a close analysis of rape jokes in Activity 43, and then uses Rion Sabeau's Men-Ups (see [Resource 5](#) p.84) to explore a very different use of humour. If time permits, move into a general discussion of the social functions of humour and an open discussion of the kinds of gender-based humour participants encounter in their day-to-day lives.

End the session with a consideration of the Men-Ups as an example of creative social activism. If you have time, ask the group to brainstorm all the activities which could constitute 'activism', and draw attention to the power of everyday actions (conversations, jokes, comments online) to challenge – or reinforce – sexism.

Activity List:

Activity 43: [Dissecting Rape Jokes](#) p.76

Activity 10: [Men-Ups](#) p.62

Wrap-Up

approx. 5 minutes

End the workshop with Activity 46, which provides participants with an opportunity to write a 'note-to-self' to be posted back to them in a few weeks' time. In the remaining minutes, summarise what you hope the utility of the material covered might be, and encourage participants to carry any ideas they have found useful onwards and outwards. Thank participants for their participation and for the ideas and experiences they have shared with the group (if appropriate). Remind everyone present to treat material shared respectfully and to maintain each others' confidentiality.

Activity List:

Activity 46: [Note to Self*](#) p. 77

Activities

This section of the resource contains an index of all the activities referred to in the earlier workshop outlines. The index is followed by an Activity Outline section which runs through the activities in numerical order. Each outline contains details about the purpose of the activity, estimated duration, group configuration and a description of the activity process. Where supplementary materials and/or resources are required, this is indicated and a page number will direct you to the appropriate resources in the following section. Note that the 'purpose' specified for each activity is brief and utilitarian. Refer to the session descriptions contained in the three-day, one-day or 90-minute workshop outlines for an account of the role each activity can play within a workshop session. When running activities, be aware that activity duration varies depending on group size and the interactional styles within the group (refer to [Using Workshops, Session and Activities](#) p.6 and [Notes on Group Work](#) p.9 for further guidance).

An asterisk (*) is used to denote activities which do not explicitly address gender and sexism. These could be transposed into a differently-themed workshop with no significant alteration.

Activity Index

Activity 1: Blind Assassins/ Wink Murder*	58
Activity 2: Name-and-Role Memory Game*	58
Activity 3: Ground Rules*	59
Activity 4: Identity Mapping*	59
Activity 5: Living Likhert Scale*	60
Activity 6: Power / Knowledge Presentation*	60
Activity 7: Master and Servant*	61
Activity 8: The Social Iceberg*	61
Activity 9: Gender ≠ Genitals	62
Activity 10: Men-Ups	62
Activity 11: Sexism Quick-Association	62
Activity 12: Media Men and Women on the Wall	63
Activity 13: Intimate Relationships	63
Activity 14: Sexism in the Streets	64
Activity 15: Activism Brainstorm*	64
Activity 16: Feminist Social Activism	65
Activity 17: If Men Could Menstruate	65
Activity 18: Group Stretching*	65
Activity 19: Introducing the Online Forum*	66
Activity 20: Sexism Scan 1	66
Activity 21: Name and Role Refresher*	66
Activity 22: Quick Association Game*	67
Activity 23: Open Discussion	67
Activity 24: Sexism Scan 2 & Repair the Resource	67
Activity 25: Defining Choice*	68
Activity 26: What Can We Choose?*	68
Activity 27: Close-Up: Female Genital Cutting	69
Activity 28: Conscience Alley	69
Activity 29: Choice in Context: Sushi for Lunch*	70
Activity 30: Choice and Body Hair	70
Activity 31: Reflection / Discussion Statements	71
Activity 32: Choosing Against Feminism	71
Activity 33: Straw Feminists	72
Activity 34: Seeing & Challenging Sexism	72
Activity 35: Street Harassment: Sexism?	73
Activity 36: Thinking about Privilege*	73
Activity 37: Humour Hunt 1	73
Activity 38: Web of Connections Warm-Up*	74
Activity 39: Humour Hunt 2	74
Activity 40: Social Activism Issues	74

Activity 41: Social Activism Planning*75
Activity 42: Repair the Resource.75
Activity 43: Dissecting Rape Jokes.76
Activity 44: Close-Up: Political Correctness and Freedom of Speech*76
Activity 45: Just a Joke?*77
Activity 46: Note to Self*77
Activity 47: Social Activism Presentations*77
Activity 48: Certificates*77
Activity 49: Defining Sexism78
Activity 50: Men and Women on the Wall.78

Activity Outlines

Activity 1: Blind Assassins/ Wink Murder*

Purpose: A 'warm-up' in both senses, this activity gets people up and moving about and also is an effective ice-breaker.

Duration: 2-5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Up to 15 people per circle.

Blind Assassins or Wink Murder is a group warm up exercise commonly used in drama, theatre sports and other kinds of group work. Assemble the group in a large circle(s), and ask everyone to then lower their heads so they're looking at their toes, keeping their eyes open. Explain that on the count of three, everyone will raise their heads and look directly at the eyes of someone else in the circle. Any pair who make eye contact are 'murdered' and must fall to the ground, acting out as dramatic a death as they can muster. Everyone lowers their heads for a second time, and the process repeats. The game continues until one player remains, or until players have devised a strategy to avoid making eye contact.

Activity 2: Name-and-Role Memory Game*

Purpose: To learn names and to distribute 'discussion roles'. Encouraging participants to take on a 'discussion role' is a good way to diffuse responsibility for guiding and facilitating group discussion among participants, encouraging a more participatory process (see Moane, 2011 for a description of the utility of discussion roles)

Resource 1: Discussion Role Cards p.80

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This activity combines a name-learning challenge with the distribution of 'discussion roles' among the group. To prepare, ensure that you have enough discussion role cards for everyone present. Have one 'Facilitator' role card for each facilitator, and make up the rest of the cards from the five other role options (motivator, vibe watcher, mediator, reality tester, balance keeper).

Each card has a role name on one side, and a role description on the other. Lay discussion role cards out in front of the group, with the role name side of the card facing up. The facilitators pick up the facilitator card/s and invite each participant to choose a card. The role each person chooses outlines their particular responsibilities for guiding group work. Once everyone has chosen and has had time to read the description of the role, the name game begins. Starting with a volunteer, go around the group introducing everyone present like this: I am A, and I'm a balance keeper. The next person begins 'this is A, she is a balance keeper. I am B, and I am a mediator.' The chain continues, and grows progressively longer so that the last person has to repeat the full chain of names and roles before stating their own. This is intended to be an amusing task which requires concentration and encourages group cohesion – mistakes are part of the process and what counts is that the group completes the full chain together.

Activity 3: Ground Rules*

Purpose: To collectively establish rules which clarify group expectations, boundaries and responsibilities. This is very important when a group will be working together on sensitive issues and/or sharing personal experiences.

Materials: Flipchart/Whiteboard.

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

As one large group, ask participants to contribute to a brainstorm of rules they agree to abide by for the workshop. The aim of the rules is to help things run smoothly and to clarify group expectations, boundaries and responsibilities. Invite participants to offer suggestions, to second rules they like and to challenge rules they don't think are practical. Once you have a range of ideas, decide as a group on a list of ground rules which everyone is satisfied with. As a facilitator you are part of the group, and you may want to contribute your own ideas. Explicitly addressing confidentiality is particularly important to include in group work where people will be working together on sensitive issues and/or sharing personal experiences. Be sure to ask participants to elaborate on what confidentiality or privacy means to them, and how they would like their comments and stories to be treated. Ideally, there will be a consensus around what can be told (general features of discussion, for instance) and what remains untold (personal anecdotes or identifying details). While the group is free to decide against having any restrictions of this kind, remind participants that this decision may influence what everyone present feels comfortable disclosing.

Place the finalised list somewhere visible in the room.

Activity 4: Identity Mapping*

Purpose: To provide an opportunity for participants to share biographical stories and to highlight commonalities and diversity across the group.

Materials: Pens and scrap paper.

Duration: 15 minutes or more, depending on group size.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This mapping activity is inspired by my own experience of participatory mapping at the Public Science Project's annual 'Summer Institute' (Public Science Project, 2013). This is an open format exercise, which allows room for creativity without mandating it. Everyone in the group, including the facilitator, draws a map of their 'route' to the session today. Participants can take this instruction as literally or as metaphorically as they choose; it could be a physical map, or the map of a life course. Allow about five minutes for everyone to draw their maps, and then go around the group, taking it in turns to display maps and explain the journey illustrated.

Activity 5: Living Likhert Scale*

Purpose: To give everyone an opportunity to see the diversity of identity, experience and opinion in the room. This activity disrupts assumptions of sameness and builds tolerance. It also provides a useful snapshot of opinions for participants to reflect back on at the end of the workshop process.

Resource 2: [Strongly Agree/Always and Strongly Disagree/Never signs](#) p.81;

Resource 3: [Living Likhert List](#), p.82.

Materials: Masking tape/Chalk

Duration: 15 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This activity is called the 'Living Likhert Scale' in reference to the eponymous social science tool. It builds on continuum-based socio-dramatic techniques (for example, the Line Up and the Power Shuffle; see Souto-Manning, 2010). As the facilitator reads aloud a list of statements (see [Resource 3](#), p. 82), participants position and reposition themselves on a real-life spectrum created with masking tape or chalk on the floor, with 'Strongly Agree/Always' and 'Strongly Disagree/Never' signs positioned at either end of the line. The statements can include a mixture of personal items e.g. 'I challenge people who I disagree with', experiential items e.g. 'I have been sexually harassed in the street' and opinion-based items 'I believe gender equality has been achieved in this country'. Offer participants the opportunity to contribute additional items to your list.

This exercise allows participants and facilitators to enact and observe the group's patterning of experience, identity and opinion, and it can provide a foundation to explore different dimensions of privilege within the group.

Activity 6: Power / Knowledge Presentation*

Purpose: To introduce the key ideas and key terminologies associated with a critical social analysis, introducing general principles and drawing on diverse examples.

Resource 4: [Power / Knowledge Presentation](#); see template on p.83

Materials: Projector (optional)

Duration: Variable.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This is an open-ended activity. Exactly how you decide to present a critical social analysis and the kinds of examples and case-studies you include will vary greatly depending on your particular interests and requirements. This session could be as short as ten minutes, or as long as an hour. Whatever the format of your presentation, it needs to communicate two fundamental tenets of 'critical' (by which I mean broadly social constructionist) social theory. Firstly, that knowledge has social and cultural dimensions; secondly, that knowledge about social groups has implications for power relations between groups. This can be done relatively straightforwardly by illustrating how cultural 'commonsense' varies over time and space, and by tracing the connections between social knowledge and a range of tangible effects (work and educational opportunities, surveillance and imprisonment, self-determination) and intangible effects (beliefs, emotions, feelings of entitlement and possibility, hopes, expectations).

In my own facilitation, I use a range of historical and contemporary examples to illustrate how the logics of domination and subordination are similarly patterned over time and space (for instance, that colonised peoples, women or the mentally 'ill' are vulnerable and unfit for independence, and therefore that control over them ought to be given to more capable, benevolent others). I then move into a more complex account of gendered power relations. Refer to [Resource 4](#) p.83 for a more detailed template.

Activity 7: Master and Servant*

Purpose: To facilitate embodied experience of the dynamics of domination and subordination discussed in Activity 6.

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Pairs.

This pair-based role-play activity is a variation on a socio-dramatic technique known as Columbian Hypnosis (Souto-Manning, 2011). Ask participants to pair up. The person with the next birthday will play master and the other will play servant. Participants will then mime a scenario where the servant helps the master to dress, responding to specific prompts from the facilitator (for example, searching for socks, presenting a choice of hats, helping the master into shoes, etc). Then ask half of the pairs to sit down. Those still standing are to run through the situation again with the same actions and the same roles, but the pairs must try to exaggerate the power distance between the master and servant. Once this is done, ask the seated pairs to stand and repeat the scenario, but this time the pairs must role-play the servant and master as relative equals, and/or have the servant covertly resist the master's power (i.e. tricking him, being disrespectful behind his back). Finish by inviting participants to discuss their experience of the exercise. How did it feel to embody different levels of power? Where do you see these dynamics of domination and subordination in your life?

Activity 8: The Social Iceberg*

Purpose: To practise applying a critical social analysis to a local example of inequitable resource distribution and to explore the power of 'commonsense' explanations of social phenomena.

Materials: Flipchart/Whiteboard

Duration: 20 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group; pairs.

This exercise uses local data that documents inequitable resource distribution as springboard into a critical analysis of social attributions and their links to wider social knowledge. This exercise demonstrates the power of 'commonsense' social knowledge to present inequitable outcomes as unjust, or as deserved.

While your context and the workshop context will determine which data you use, official statistics are a useful departure point. In my facilitation, I use freely available data from Statistics New Zealand. For example, in the June 2013 quarter, New Zealanders' median hourly earnings from wage or salary jobs showed disparities by gender – men: \$22.59; women: \$20.30 – and ethnic group – Pakeha: \$22.50; Maori: \$18.82; Pasifika: \$18.00 (Statistics New Zealand, 2013). Choose your data and ask participants to work in pairs to generate three possible explanations for the disparity (for example, explanations for why men/Pakeha people earn more than women/Maori/Pasifika people). Pairs should produce at least one explanation which legitimises the disparity and one explanation which challenges the disparity.

These explanations become the basis for the 'social iceberg' exercise. The purpose of this exercise's metaphor is to illustrate that beneath commonsense, apparently straightforward social attributions (i.e. what we see above water) lies a mass of unseen social knowledge and implicit judgements. For example: the explanation that women are paid less because they are suited to less skilled jobs is tied to assumptions about women's competence and the gendered dimensions of 'skilled' work

Ask the pairs to report back their explanations to the group. Using a whiteboard or flip-chart, draw an iceberg with the tip floating above sea level. Working through each group's example, place the explanation as the 'tip' above water and work as a group to make visible the assumptions and implicit judgements which lie beneath the surface of your 'simple' statements. Some assumptions or 'icebergs' may appear unconnected above water but may in fact be connected underwater to the same mass of assumptions.

Activity 9: Gender ≠ Genitals

Purpose: To differentiate gender from sex, to generate embodied experience of gender as ‘performative’ and to re-energise the group.

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

As well as livening up the group and generating humour, this activity encapsulates the idea of gender as *performance* (see Butler, 1990), drawing attention to the way we ‘do’ and recognise gender in everyday life. Ask participants to space themselves out across the room. They will individually mime activities as you read them out loud, first in a ‘feminine’ way, then in a ‘masculine’ way. Have a list of familiar scenarios prepared: standing; sitting; greeting a friend; walking home late at night; eating a huge piece of pizza.

Once you have gone through several scenarios for each gender, come together for a group discussion about the difference between gender and sex. To stimulate discussion, ask participants how they felt during the mime, what kinds of things they did to ‘mark’ gender and whether they do this in real life. You might also like to ask participants whether they felt any similarities between this exercise and [Activity 7](#). Discuss people’s responses.

Activity 10: Men-Ups

Purpose: To draw attention to gendered conventions in photography and their connection to power relations.

Resource 5: Men-Ups by Rion Sabeen, p.84

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This activity is based around Rion Sabeen’s Men-Up Photographs. Use a projector to share the photos with participants. Use the images to catalyse a critical discussion of gendered photographic conventions, and gendered body language more generally. Why is it unremarkable and somewhat sexual for a female body to be posed in a submissive manner, but laughable and non-sexual for male bodies to be presented in this way? What do these images suggest about the differences between male and female bodies? What are the consequences of this ‘difference’ for power relations between men and women in everyday life?

Activity 11: Sexism Quick-Association

Purpose: To generate a high-speed brainstorm about sexism and to gauge the group’s existing knowledge.

Materials: A ‘hot potato’ object to pass around (e.g. a soft toy or a small ball), Flipchart/Whiteboard

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Using the object you brought along, play a hot-potato quick association game. Whoever is holding the object contributes a (new) word to the sexism brainstorm before passing the object on. Write down all contributions. Participants have three seconds to contribute a new word before they are eliminated from the game.

Once most participants are eliminated and you have generated a good number of words, stop the game and take a closer look at the brainstormed words. Begin a group discussion which springboards from the associations the group has provided. For example: Who experiences sexism? What are the criteria for something being sexist or not? Can sexism be fun(ny)? Is sexism the same as misogyny? Who cares about sexism? How do you know when sexism has happened?

n.b. you may like to keep a record of the group’s key ideas about sexism to revisit during [Activity 33](#).

Activity 12: Media Men and Women on the Wall

Purpose: To introduce media as a tool for sharing and policing ideas about gender, and to examine the features of culturally dominant constructions of masculinity and femininity.

Materials: Magazines, pens, 2x A3 printed human outlines (draw one yourself or use an online template)

Duration: 20 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group discussion, split group exercise.

Begin this activity by briefly discussing the role of the media as a tool for sharing, reinforcing and policing social ideas about masculinity and femininity. What do participants think about the media's 'power'? How do the claims the media make about men and women influence people? And how do you think the media might affect you personally?

To examine dominant media messages about gender more concretely, ask the group to divide into two, and give one A3-size human outline to each group, along with pens and magazines. Ask one group to focus on masculinity, and the other group to focus on femininity. Using magazines and their own accumulated knowledge, ask participants to fill their human outlines with ideas and information the media presents us with about the ideal, typical man or woman. This could include expectations of appearance and behaviour, likes and dislikes, shoulds and shouldn'ts, strengths and weaknesses.

After 10 minutes, each group presents their 'media man' or 'media woman' and discusses his or her features. After a closer look at some of these ideas, ask the group whether their ideas about the media's influence have shifted, and how so. You may like to pin the media man and media woman onto the wall of the room once the exercise is finished.

Activity 13: Intimate Relationships

Purpose: To explore how dominant media representations of masculinity and femininity shape gender relations and heterosexual relationships.

Resource 6: [Hollway's Dominant Discourses of Heterosexuality](#) p.85

Materials: Flipchart/Whiteboard

Duration: 20 minutes.

Group Configuration: Split groups.

In the same groups as [Activity 11](#), ask participants to produce a list of financial, sexual and emotional expectations for men (one group) or women (the other group) in heterosexual relationships.

After a few minutes, ask each group to write their list of expectations on one side of the whiteboard or flipchart. Discuss the differences. How do those stereotypes fit into opposite-sex and same-sex relationships they have observed? What are the power implications? To augment this discussion, you may wish to introduce Hollway's critical analysis of dominant discourses of heterosexuality to participants, and explore their responses to her ideas.

Activity 14: Sexism in the Streets

Purpose: To discuss connections between social representations of gender, gendered power imbalances and sexism using applied examples.

Resource 7: [Sexism in the Streets Presentation](#) p.86

Duration: 20 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

The final part of this session is called 'Sexism in the Streets', and covers everyday sexism. To prepare for this activity, you will need to pick applied examples. In my facilitation, I use examples which cover sexism in the workplace (Nicki Minaj video clip), sexism in media/women's sport (Marion Bartoli wins Wimbledon) and street heckling (Everyday Sexism Project).

Share your examples with participants and then facilitate a group discussion about what you've seen. What are these incidents? How do you explain what's going on in each one? Are they 'real' issues? What do they suggest about gendered power relations?

Linking back to the social iceberg metaphor from [Activity 8](#), ask participants to unpick some of the statements and explanations they have offered. What ideas lie beneath our own reactions and attributions? You may wish to finish the activity by inviting participants to share any of their own experiences of everyday sexism.

Activity 15: Activism Brainstorm*

Purpose: To stimulate creative thinking about what 'activism' entails and to draw attention to the activist possibilities of 'small acts' (Moane, 2006).

Materials: Flipchart/Whiteboard

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

As a group, ask participants to brainstorm their ideas about activism. What counts as activism? What ways can we take action or 'speak back' to ideas and practices that trouble us? Encourage participants to think broadly and to consider small, everyday actions as well as more ambitious kinds. You may want to save the list and/or display it in the room.

Activity 16: Feminist Social Activism

Purpose: To introduce and critically discuss examples of feminist social activism.

Resource 8: [Feminist Social Activism Resource Packet](#) p.87

Duration: 15 minutes.

Group Configuration: Small groups.

Prepare a feminist social activism resource packet for this exercise. The packet should contain information about three examples of feminist activism you have selected, plus a question sheet for each group (see [Resource 8](#) p.87 for an example). In my facilitation, I use Guerrilla Girls, the New View Campaign and the Who Needs Feminism? Campaign.

Ask participants to divide into three groups and invite each group to take information about one of the activism campaigns along with a question sheet. Each group has 10 minutes to read through the information in the resource packet and use it to answer the questions on their question sheet. The questions are designed to mimic the social iceberg deconstruction process, asking about the problem the group identifies, their activism, and how the activism connects to the group's attributions about the cause of the problem.

After 10 minutes have elapsed, bring everyone back together and ask the groups to take it in turns to explain their example of activism and to share their answers to the questions posed.

Activity 17: If Men Could Menstruate

Purpose: To explore a powerful and unconventional example of feminist social activism

Resource 9: ['If Men Could Menstruate' by Gloria Steinem \(1983\)](#) p.89;

Resource 10: [Feminist Activism Reference List](#), p.90

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Display or distribute extracts from Gloria Steinem's essay 'If Men Could Menstruate'. Take it in turns to read sentences out loud, travelling around the group. Once it's finished, discuss participants' responses to it. What was effective about it? Does it qualify as 'activism'? To end the exercise you may wish to offer participants a reference list for feminist activism to explore in their own time.

Activity 18: Group Stretching*

Purpose: To reconnect with our bodies and increase energy levels.

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Ask everyone to stand together in a large circle. Take turns suggesting stretches for the group to do – whoever suggests the stretch models it, and others follow on. Continue for about 5 minutes, or until the group is stretched out.

Activity 19: Introducing the Online Forum*

Purpose: To provide and explain an online forum for sharing ideas and responses to the workshop and to a critical/feminist social analysis more generally.

Resource 11: [Online Forum](#) p.92

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This activity requires you to establish an online forum which participants can access in between workshop days. I use a Wordpress blog, but there are a variety of suitable platforms available. Make sure you choose something which all participants will be able to access.

Begin by talking participants through the forum you have set up. Outline its purpose – to provide a place for discussion outside the workshop, enabling participants to stay connected with each other and to share resources. Be sure to explain how to access and use the forum, and provide participants with an opportunity to ask questions.

Activity 20: Sexism Scan 1

Purpose: To facilitate participant contribution to workshop content and to encourage use of the online platform.

Duration: 2 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

In preparation for the next workshop session, invite participants to do a 'sexism scan' of the media they encounter between now and then. Ask each participant to bring along two media items to the next workshop: one item they find problematic, one item they like. Invite participants to post their items onto the online forum where possible. Participants should come to the next workshop prepared to briefly discuss their items and why they chose them.

Activity 21: Name and Role Refresher*

Purpose: To re-establish the group dynamic and remind people of names and discussion roles.

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Take a moment for participants to recall their discussion role from Day 1. As for [Activity 2](#), ask a volunteer to begin a name and discussion roles chain by stating their name and their role. Continue along the chain with each person adding their name and role until you reach the last person, who recites the names and roles of all the previous group members (with assistance if necessary) before adding their own.

Activity 22: Quick Association Game*

Purpose: To warm up the group and introduce some of the day's themes

Resource 12: [Quick Association Words](#) p.93

Materials: A 'hot potato' object

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Ask participants to stand in a circle. Drawing from your list of quick association words relevant to the day's activities, choose a word and ask participants to contribute a related word, passing the 'hot potato' object around as they do so. Continue for at least one circuit of the group, then substitute in a new word, and repeat the process. Use between 5 and 10 different quick association words.

Activity 23: Open Discussion

Purpose: To provide an open discussion space for participants to share and analyse material of their choosing (which connects to the workshop themes in some way).

Duration: Open-ended.

Group Configuration: Up to 10 participants per discussion group.

Explain to participants that this activity is an open forum for them to discuss ideas and issues related to the last session and/or to share related experiences. You may like to use prompting questions: Has anyone had any interesting thoughts, conversations or experiences since we last met that they would like to share? How do friends and family respond when you tell them about what you're doing? Facilitators may well have related ideas and anecdotes to contribute to the group themselves. The duration of this session is open. I would recommend continuing with it for as long as you perceive that the conversation is flowing fruitfully.

Activity 24: Sexism Scan 2 & Repair the Resource

Purpose: To discuss the items participants collected for Sexism Scan 1 and to identify and 'repair' problematic social assumptions embedded in them.

Resource 13: [Sexism Scan Materials](#) (including facilitator contribution) p.94

Duration: 30 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group discussion, pair work.

Review together the items participants have identified as part of Activity 19 ([Sexism Scan 1](#)). Ideally, participants will have either brought along printed material or have posted the item onto the online forum. In the latter case, you may want to print examples or else share them with the group using a laptop and projector. It is also a good idea to bring along your own supplementary examples. Ask participants to explain their choice of items: what they liked or didn't like about them.

Next, ask participants to get into pairs and to choose an item they find sexist or problematic from those discussed. Their task is to 'repair' the resource so that it no longer affirms problematic social assumptions. To do this, it may be useful to remind participants of the social iceberg ([Activity 8](#)): suggest that each pair traces the social assumptions about gender underlying their item. From here, the pairs can reformulate the item's message in a way which challenges oppressive or problematic messages they see in it. This 'repair' job can be done in whatever way the pair chooses – retouching it, through graffiti, through a satirical re-working. In the final five minutes of the session, invite pairs to share their item and the repair job they have designed.

This activity is arguably a form of social activism: you may want to point this out to participants, reminding them that this kind of process could be relevant to their own social action planning later in the workshop.

Activity 25: Defining Choice*

Purpose: To catalyse critical thinking about the concept of choice and what it means to choose.

Resource 14: 'Absolutely free choice' and 'Absolutely forced choice' signs p.95

Materials: Flipchart/Whiteboard, Masking tape or chalk

Duration: 20 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Begin the session with a general group discussion of choice. How do participants define choice? How is it possible to distinguish between free and unfree/forced choices?

Next, ask participants to make a list of everything they have chosen to do today, and also anything they have had to do/felt forced to do today. Encourage participants to be creative – our lives are full of small choices and imperatives. After a few minutes, go around the group in a circle and invite people to share a few examples. Divide your whiteboard or flipchart into two and label the halves 'free' and 'forced'. Write participants' examples under the heading each participant assigned them to. Looking at the examples, ask participants to discuss the categorisations. Where is there consensus? Are there any contradictions? Is there anything you think should be swapped around? Note that there is likely to be some disagreement between participants here – and that's a good thing!

Next, introduce an alternative model of choice using a 'Living Likhert Scale' (see Activity 5). Create an axis along the floor with the masking tape or chalk and place the free and forced choice signs at opposite ends. Remind participants to position and reposition themselves along the spectrum as you read out different examples. Read out a range of free and forced choice examples from the whiteboard discussion. You may want to supplement these examples with a few additional items (I add, for example, shaving your legs). Offer participants the opportunity to contribute additional items too.

Finally, bring the group back together and begin a discussion about the two exercises. Do participants prefer a category or a spectrum based exercise? Why? If participants positioned themselves differently for certain items, ask the group how they might explain these differences.

Activity 26: What Can We Choose?*

Purpose: To stimulate critical thinking about the limits on choice

Resource 15: Choice Scenario: Dish of the Day p.96 (optional)

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group, pairs.

If you are using a springboard scenario to illustrate the limits of choice, begin by sharing it with participants. I use the 'Dish of the Day' passage from Douglas Adams' book *The Restaurant at the End of the Universe*. Ask one participant to read the scenario aloud.

Next, ask participants to get into pairs and discuss the following questions (with your scenario as a starting point, if you are using one):

- Is it still a choice if we're choosing to do something inconvenient? Or painful? Or harmful?
- How can we distinguish between a free choice and a forced choice?
- Are there some things we should not be allowed to 'choose'?

Remind participants that these questions could occupy a lifetime's worth of thought, and encourage them to come up with responses rather than answers. End the pair-based discussion in enough time to allow the whole group to come together for a shared discussion of the questions. Invite each pair to outline their responses and explore the range of opinion across the group.

Activity 27: Close-Up: Female Genital Cutting

Purpose: To explore the cultural complexities of choice with a concrete example: traditional versus cosmetic Female Genital Cutting (FGC).

Resource 16: [Female Genital Cutting Presentation](#) p.97

Materials: Flipchart/Whiteboard, presentation/handout about FGC ([see p.97](#) for an example).

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

For this activity, the facilitator must have a short presentation or handout prepared about Female Genital Cutting (FGC; see Braun, 2009). The presentation should present the similarities and differences between 'traditional' and 'cosmetic' FGC, with a particular emphasis on how the language of choice is deployed across both examples (western women 'freely choose' cosmetic FGC, whereas African, Asian and Middle-Eastern women are 'coerced' into traditional FGC).

To begin the session, ask participants what they know about FGC, and record any responses on the board (they may be familiar with the term 'female genital mutilation', which used to describe some traditional FGC). Next, run through your prepared handout or presentation on FGC covering both cosmetic and traditional forms. Ask participants to discuss the differences and similarities between the two 'kinds': when is FGC acceptable and when is it unacceptable? When is a choice to have FGC procedures 'really' a choice? How do assumptions about Western versus 'other' women relate to cultural stereotypes and global power relations?

Activity 28: Conscience Alley

Purpose: To provide an embodied exploration of how social pressures shape individuals' choices, using traditional and cosmetic FGC as examples.

Resource 17: [Conscience Alley Character Descriptions](#) p.98

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Conscience Alley is a theatre technique associated with Theatre of the Oppressed (Boal, 1979). This activity asks participants to voice and experience the conflicting desires and social pressures 'speaking' to a chosen character by creating a physical dilemma corridor for each participant to walk through.

First, introduce two 'characters': two women who are considering undergoing FGC, one for traditional reasons, one for cosmetic reasons. Ask participants to arrange themselves in two lines, facing one another, raising their hands towards the person opposite so that a living tunnel is created.

Begin with a practice, asking participants in the corridor to begin to speak out loud the thoughts, feelings and pressures they imagine are influencing the first woman's decision. Participants should speak non-stop repeating one or more key phrases and statements and talking over the top of each other. Once the group has the hang of it, explain to participants that they will be taking turns to peel off the corridor and walk through it, listening to the words others are speaking. Begin at one end of the tunnel, and alternate sides. Each participant takes their turn to peel off and walk through the corridor on their own, listening and then joining the tunnel at the opposite end. Once a participant has rejoined the tunnel, the next one can peel off. Once everyone has walked through, run the exercise again, but this time the group speaks the social pressures and thoughts surrounding the second woman's decision. To finish the exercise, come back together and discuss the experience – when done properly, this is a powerful exercise that generates strong responses.

Activity 29: Choice in Context: Sushi for Lunch*

Purpose: To explore the role of context in choice

Resource 18: [Choice in Context: Sushi for Lunch](#) p.99

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This exercise is a light springboard into a discussion of the role of context in choice. Ask three members of the group to reading out one of the three 'sushi for lunch' scenarios (or prepare your own version) in turn. Each scenario features the same choice but with different contextual elements influencing that choice. Discuss the three scenarios as a group. What is it about them which 'feels' different? Which is the most 'free'? Would you feel equally free across the three scenarios? How do feelings of freedom relate to contextual constraints?

Activity 30: Choice and Body Hair

Purpose: To relate the complex understanding of choice built up across the session to the practice of body hair removal and to explore the relationships between body hair, gender and gendered relations of power.

Resource 19: [Body Hair Quotes](#) from Fahs (2011) p.100

Duration: 15 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Begin with an open discussion of body hair removal. Ask who in the group removes some kind of body hair (remembering this can encompass a wide range of practices, including men's facial hair, plucking eyebrows, etc). Ask participants to pick one kind of body hair removal (it doesn't need to be something they do), and consider what it would be like if they stopped doing it/ started doing it. How would they feel, and how would others respond?

Next, briefly describe the Breanna Fahs study and distribute handouts with quotes from her participants. Go around the group, taking turns to read out the quotes. Discuss the quotes as a group. Which ones stood out to you, and why? Can you imagine having similar experiences? Why, why not? How do men and women's accounts play into or resist dominant masculinities and femininities? If time allows, move into a more general discussion about the gendered behaviours we (i.e. both participants and facilitator) choose for ourselves. Why do we choose them? Are they in line with gendered expectations? What are the costs and benefits? What are the consequences for how we feel, and are treated?

Activity 31: Reflection / Discussion Statements

Purpose: To make space for reflection and discussion about the social impact of individual choices.

Materials: Reflection/Discussion Statements; Flipchart/Whiteboard or projector to display statements.

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Individual reflection, whole group discussion.

Prepare for this activity by finding or formulating a few statements which encourage reflection on the social impact of individual choices – how the decisions we make affect others (or not). This activity (and one of the statements) is borrowed from Kleinman, Copp and Sandstrom (2006) I use these three statements:

- It doesn't matter what you choose: being a housewife, a scientist or a model. What matters is having that choice to make.
- 'The content of each choice matters – for reproducing or challenging inequality' (Kleinman et al., 2006)
- Every individual choice shapes the landscape in which others' choices are made. Thus, one individual who chooses 'against the crowd' can enhance others' freedom to choose.

Give participants five minutes to reflect individually on the quotes below, before coming together for a group discussion. Which statement(s) do you agree with?

Activity 32: Choosing Against Feminism

Purpose: To take critical thinking about choice in general to focus specifically on the choice to *not* identify as feminist/to not name sexism.

Resource 21: [Sample Choosing Against Feminism Quotes](#) p.103

Duration: 10 minutes

Group Configuration: Whole group.

To prepare for this activity, assemble quotes which discuss or demonstrate the choice to not identify as feminist and/or to *not* name sexism. I use a mixture of quotes (sourced online) from famous women distancing themselves from feminism (see [Resource 21](#), p. 103).

Share your prepared quotes with participants and use them to catalyse a discussion about the individual consequences of choosing to be a feminist or articulating a feminist analysis. Next, use the social iceberg approach to dissect the quotes. What assumptions about what feminism is and who feminists are underlie these statements? And whose interests do these characterisations serve?

Activity 33: Straw Feminists

Purpose: To critically examine the group's social knowledge about feminists and feminism.

Materials: 3x A3-size printed human outlines (draw one yourself or use an online template), pens, *Women, Know Your Limits!* Youtube video (see below; optional), projector (for optional video)

Duration: 15 minutes.

Group Configuration: Split the group into 3 (or more if you choose – just be sure to print more outlines).

Split participants into as many groups as you have printed human figure outlines, and ask each group to work together to fill in the outlines with their social knowledge about feminists – they can write words and/or use the outline to draw a feminist's body. After 5 minutes, come back together and ask each group to present their 'straw feminist'. Discuss the caricatures the groups have generated. Is it true? Is it fair? Whose interests does it serve? Does it make you want to be feminist? If time allows, you may want to show the 'Women, Know Your Limits' skit video, which playfully makes connections between sexism and the vilification of feminists, among other things. The video can be found at:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LS37SNYjg8w>

Activity 34: Seeing & Challenging Sexism

Purpose: To revisit the group's thinking about sexism and to generate reflection and discussion about possibilities for seeing and challenging sexism in participants' own lives.

Materials: Flipchart/Whiteboard.

Duration: 15 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group discussion, pair-based work.

Begin by reminding participants about the sexism discussion ([Activity 11](#)) from the last workshop. If you made notes, read them out to the group. Invite participants to reassess the ideas. Do you still agree with what you said before? Does it capture the elements you feel are important now? How would you define sexism in a sentence or two?

Next, discuss how the group's definition fits with the following statements:

- It can't be sexism if it wasn't intended to offend / didn't offend anyone
- Things men and women enjoy can't be sexist

After the discussion has run its course, ask the participants to split into pairs and to discuss why they think people they know a) don't see sexism and b) don't challenge sexism. Both individual and interpersonal reasons are relevant. Are there particular people who are more or less likely to talk about sexism? Are there particular contexts which make it harder or easier to do so? After 5 minutes ask pairs to feed-back key ideas to the group, and continue into a group discussion of dominant patterns and differences in responses. You may like to end the discussion by broadening it out to consider other social issues. Are there similar constraints to seeing and naming racism or homophobia? Why / why not?

Activity 35: Street Harassment: Sexism?

Purpose: To examine the issue of ‘intent’ in relation to everyday sexism and the assumptions underlying street harassment.

Materials: Flipchart/Whiteboard

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Prepare a relatable scenario describing mundane street harassment. I use the scenario of a man shouting a sexual comment at a female pedestrian from his car. Working from this basic description, present the group with two different elaborations of your scenario. In the first, the man and woman disagree about the incident: he says it was a flattering compliment, she says it was sexist harassment. In the second, both agree that it was a flattering compliment.

As a group, discuss whether each scenario is an example of sexism. What makes something sexist, intention or effect? Finish off the activity with a social iceberg deconstruction of the social ideas and assumptions underlying ‘cat-calling’. What messages does cat-calling give us about men and women: what they’re like, what their roles are, what they expect from each other. How does this shape gendered power relations?

Activity 36: Thinking about Privilege*

Purpose: To introduce a critical, intersectional understanding of ‘privilege’ and generate discussion about responsibility.

Resource 22: [Privilege Handout: ‘Straight While Male: Lowest Difficulty Setting There Is’](#) by John Scalzi, see p.104

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This activity is based around reading and discussing an article written by John Scalzi about understanding privilege. You may wish to use the same article, or find / write another. Distribute copies of your handout to participants, and allow them time to read it through. Once participants have finished, discuss the article’s messages about privilege, particularly unwanted privilege. If you haven’t asked to be privileged, what responsibilities (if any) do you have to less privileged people? This is a particularly useful resource for emphasising an intersectional approach to privilege, touching on gender but also pointing to the role of wealth, ethnicity, class and sexuality.

Activity 37: Humour Hunt 1

Purpose: To encourage use of the online forum and to facilitate participant input into Day 3 of the workshop.

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This activity is a variation on the Sexism Scan activity given to participants at the end of Day 1 of the workshop. Introduce humour as a key theme of the next session, and invite participants to prepare for next time by thinking about the relationship between sexism and humour. Ask participants to find an example of something gender-related which they think is funny to share in the next session. Participants can bring along a clipping or a photo, or post an image or video onto the online forum.

Activity 38: Web of Connections Warm-Up*

Purpose: To reconnect the group.

Materials: A long piece of string or rope.

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This activity requires you to have prepared a question to ask the group. The question can be anything you choose. To keep the activity light, I use 'Who was the first band or artist you loved?'

Ask participants to stand in a close circle. State the question for everyone to answer, and begin by answering it yourself while holding the string or rope. Next, throw the string or rope to someone else in the group, while still holding on to one end yourself. This person answers the question and then passes on the string or rope, keeping hold of part of it. The game continues until everyone has answered the question, by which time everyone should be connected by the string or rope and the circle will be crisscrossed with it (make sure you have enough length to connect everyone comfortably). Then, without using verbal instructions, you must find a way to unravel yourselves into a straight line, without anyone letting go of the string.

Activity 39: Humour Hunt 2

Purpose: To discuss and analyse the materials participants collected for the Humour Hunt activity

Materials: Collated Humour Hunt Material (with your own contribution)

Duration: 20 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Review together the items participants have chosen as part of Activity 36 ([Humour Hunt 1](#)). Ideally, participants will have either brought along printed material or have posted the item to the online forum. In the latter case, you may want to print examples or else share them with the group using a laptop and projector. It is also a good idea to bring along your own supplementary examples. Ask participants to describe why they chose their examples. What did you like about them? Where does the humour come from? Who might not find this funny? Conversation could also touch on the different styles of humour present – what kinds of humour do participants enjoy? Why?

Activity 40: Social Activism Issues

Purpose: To generate a list of potential foci for participants' social activism planning.

Materials: Flipchart/Whiteboard

Duration: 10 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

As a whole group, quickly brainstorm as many social issues as you can which relate to gender, sexism or feminism in some way. Ideas can include material covered in the workshop, and other ideas too. Once you have at least 12 ideas recorded, work as a group to cut the list down to 6 pressing issues suited to social activism. These issues will form the basis for the next activity: social activism planning.

Activity 41: Social Activism Planning*

Purpose: To facilitate participants' social activism planning

Resource 23: [Social Activism Planning Sheet](#) p.106

Materials: Scrap paper, pens,

Duration: 30 minutes.

Group Configuration: Small groups.

Give participants a few minutes to organise themselves into small groups of 2-4 people and to decide on one of the issues identified in the previous activity to tackle. Groups can choose the same issue.

Next, distribute a Social Activism Planning Sheet to participants. This sheet contains guiding questions to structure participants' planning, and to structure the social activism presentations each group delivers at the end of the day. Participants will need to explain the issue and why they chose it, identify a cause, explain how their proposed action addresses this cause, and discuss the practicalities of undertaking the project. Remind participants that the social iceberg activities they have done across the workshops are excellent preparation for this way of thinking: paring back an issue to underlying assumptions, and tackling those assumptions in a generative way.

Answer any questions and then let participants begin work. You may want to circulate between groups during this brainstorming stage and contribute to participants' thinking.

Activity 42: Repair the Resource

Purpose: To examine the function of humour in advertising and to hone participants' critical analysis skills.

Resource 24: [Sexism and Humour Resource Packet](#) p.107

Duration: 30 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group; pairs.

This activity requires prepared sexism and humour resource packets, which should include a mixture of humorous advertisements which relate to gender in some way. Ideally, you will pull together 5 or 6 examples of humour which range from certainly sexist to certainly not sexist.

Begin discussion by asking participants to share any experiences they have had with hostile joking: where someone has made a 'joke' which felt uncomfortable / hurtful / aggressive. Next, move into the Repair the Resource activity. Remind participants of the principles: everyone gets into pairs and the pairs work collaboratively to 'repair' one or more of the resources. It may be useful to remind participants of the social iceberg ([Activity 8](#)): suggest that each pair traces the social assumptions about gender underlying their item. From here, the pairs can reformulate the item's message in a way which challenges oppressive or problematic messages they see in it. This 'repair' job can be done in whatever way the pair chooses – retouching it, through graffiti, through a satirical re-working.

After about 20 minutes, bring everyone back together for a group discussion of the resources which needed repairing and those which didn't. Does everyone agree? For those resources which needed to be repaired, how did people go about it? Remind participants that this process may help them with their social action planning.

Activity 43: Dissecting Rape Jokes

Purpose: To bring a critical analysis of humour to bear on a common form of gendered humour: rape jokes.

Resource 25: 'Humour Against Rape' Exemplars p.108;

Resource 26: 'How to Make a Rape Joke' by Lindy West, p.109

Duration: 20 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This activity examines rape jokes and considers the use of social justice-oriented humour to address the topic of rape. I recommend preparing a few examples of humour to share with the group, as well as distributing copies of Lindy West's article 'How to Make a Rape Joke' which is an excellent example of the use of humour for social justice combined with a critical analysis of rape jokes. The article contains swearing, so you may prefer to find/write an alternative.

Begin with a general discussion of rape jokes. Ask participants how they would define a rape joke, and whether/where they come across rape jokes. What do people think about them? Share a few rape joke and/or 'humour against rape' exemplars with the group, and discuss them – are all rape jokes problematic? Why, or why not?

From here, I distribute the 'How to Make a Rape Joke' article or your chosen alternative. Give participants time to read through it, and discuss your responses together. What do you agree with, and what do you disagree with? What do you think about West's argument about free speech and the censorship of humour?

Activity 44: Close-Up: Political Correctness and Freedom of Speech*

Purpose: To critically analyse the use of freedom of speech and political correctness arguments in relation to sexism and hate-speech.

Materials: Flipchart/Whiteboard, Stewart Lee's *Political Correctness Gone Mad* (see below)

Duration: 15 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Begin with a brainstorm about the phrase 'political correctness'. What does it mean, and what contexts does it appear in? What are some examples of practices or people who might be called 'PC'? Next, run a similar brainstorm about freedom of speech. What is it, and what contexts do you hear it in? Who supports it, and who complains about it? After gauging participants' responses, use these quotes from an interview with Theatre of the Oppressed practitioner Julian Boal (Emert & Friedland, 2011) to stimulate further discussion:

- "Ok, we have a person here who hates Jews, and we have a person here who is a Jew, so it's good for us to hear both opinions" (Emert & Friedland, 2011, p. 179).
- "Jean Luc Godard said that if objectivity is to give equal time in your movie to the perspective of Jews and the perspective of the Nazis, then he is against objectivity" (ibid.)

Explore participants' responses to these statements – which one they are they attracted to? This could lead into a more general discussion of the relationship between freedom of speech, political correctness and social justice depending on the group's interests.

Finish the segment by showing a short Youtube video, Stewart Lee's 'Political Correctness Gone Mad'. Lee uses humour to point out the hostility underlying attacks on political correctness. You can access the video at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bmsV1TuESrc> You may wish to pull out a couple of Lee's quote from the video for discussion afterwards, e.g.

- "What is political correctness? It's an often clumsy negotiation towards a more formally inclusive language, and there are all sorts of problems with it but it's better than what we had before."

Activity 45: Just a Joke?*

Purpose: To provide a forum for participants to think through the function and significance of jokes.

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

This activity is an open-ended opportunity to think through jokes together, drawing on the humour-based material covered previously. What do jokes mean, and what do they do? Does it make a difference what we as individuals joke about and laugh at? Why, and why not? Is a joke ever 'just a joke'? As a group, puzzle through these questions.

Activity 46: Note to Self*

Purpose: To provide an opportunity for reflection and for participants to identify a thought, idea or experience they would like to carry forward.

Materials: envelopes, loose paper, pens

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Individual

For this activity, distribute loose paper and an envelope to each participant. Invite participants to reflect on the workshops so far and to write down a 'note to self': a personal resolution, an idea or experience they want to remember. If they wish, participants can put their notes into the envelope you provided and self-address it. Collect any addressed envelopes and post them out to participants a week or two after the workshops.

Activity 47: Social Activism Presentations*

Purpose: To share, discuss and celebrate participants' original proposals for social action

Duration: 60 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Invite the small groups to take turns to present their social activism plans to the rest of the group. Depending on how many participants there are, presentations should run for about 10 minutes, with 5 minutes of questions to follow.

In any spare time at the end of the presentations, ask everyone about their experiences of the whole process – is it what you expected? Has it offered you anything useful? What changes would you suggest? What did you think about the focus on sexism? What other social issues would you like to look at? If you are evaluating the workshop, this is a good time to distribute surveys.

Activity 48: Certificates*

Purpose: To provide official acknowledgement and congratulations to participants for completing the workshop series.

Resource 27: [Certificate Template](#) p.110

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

Present each participant in turn with a certificate, clapping for each person.

Activity 49: Defining Sexism

Purpose: To generate a collective definition of sexism

Materials: none

Duration: 5 minutes.

Group Configuration: Whole group.

In one group, ask participants to take turns describing what sexism means to them. You may like to use prompting questions: What kinds of connotations does sexism have? Who does it affect? How can you tell if something is sexist or not? When and where does sexism most often crop up in your lives? Encourage participants to reflect critically on the similarities and differences in their responses. What are the points of contention, if there are any?

Activity 50: Men and Women on the Wall

Purpose: To explore how social knowledge about masculinity and femininity shape intimate relationships.

Resource 6: [Hollway's Dominant Discourses of Heterosexuality](#) p.85.

Materials: pens, 2x A3-size printed human outlines (draw one yourself or use an online template)

Duration: 20 minutes.

Group Configuration: Two groups.

This activity condenses [Activities 13](#) and [14](#) into one. First, ask participants to split into two groups, and give each group a human outline. One group will use their outline to illustrate the financial, physical, sexual and emotional expectations for men in intimate relationships, and the other group will do the same for women in intimate relationships. After 10 minutes, each group presents their 'man' or 'woman'. Discuss the differences as a group. How do those stereotypes fit into heterosexual and homosexual relationships they have observed? What are the power implications? To augment this discussion, introduce Hollway's critical analysis of dominant discourses of heterosexuality to participants, and explore their responses to her ideas.

Resources

Resources Index

Resource 1: Discussion Role Cards	80
Resource 2: Strongly Agree/Always and Strongly Disagree/Never signs	81
Resource 3: Living Likhert List	82
Resource 4: Power / Knowledge Presentation	83
Resource 5: Men-Ups	84
Resource 6: Hollway's Dominant Discourses of Heterosexuality	85
Resource 7: Sexism in the Streets Presentation	86
Resource 8: Feminist Social Activism Resource Packet	87
Resource 9: 'If Men Could Menstruate'	89
Resource 10: Feminist Activism Reference List: 2013	90
Resource 11: Online Forum	92
Resource 12: Quick Association Words	93
Resource 13: Sexism Scan Materials	94
Resource 14: Absolutely free choice and Absolutely forced choice signs	95
Resource 15: Choice Scenario: Dish of the Day	96
Resource 16: Female Genital Cutting Presentation	97
Resource 17: Conscience Alley Character Descriptions	98
Resource 18: Choice in Context: Sushi for Lunch	99
Resource 19: Body Hair Quotes	100
Resource 20: Guest Presenter Brief	102
Resource 21: Sample Choosing Against Feminism Quotes	103
Resource 22: Privilege Handout	104
Resource 23: Social Activism Planning Sheet	106
Resource 24: Sexism and Humour Resource Packet	107
Resource 25: 'Humour Against Rape' Exemplars	108
Resource 26: 'How to Make a Rape Joke'	109
Resource 27: Certificate Template	110

Resource 1: Discussion Role Cards

Below is a template for discussion role cards. Print them out, cut along the horizontal lines and fold in half and stick together to create cards with the role name on one side and the role description on the other.

<p>Facilitator</p>	<p>The facilitators are in charge of structuring and organising the sessions, bringing in material to discuss and posing questions.</p>
<p>Motivator</p>	<p>The motivators are in charge of keeping energy levels high, and helping the group focus on the tasks at hand.</p>
<p>Vibe Watcher</p>	<p>The vibe watchers are in charge of monitoring the feelings of the group. They try to ensure everyone feels supported and included in the group work.</p>
<p>Mediator</p>	<p>Mediators take the lead when there are conflicting opinions across the group. They try to ensure all voices are heard and that conversation remains open and respectful.</p>
<p>Reality Tester</p>	<p>Reality testers keep things practical. They are in charge of connecting abstract ideas to the real world and they keep the group grounded.</p>
<p>Balance Keeper</p>	<p>Balance keepers make sure everyone in the group has a chance to contribute. They balance the amount of speaking different group members do and encourage participation.</p>

Resource 2: Strongly Agree/Always and Strongly Disagree/Never signs

Write or print out the words Strongly Agree/Always and Strongly Disagree/Never on two separate pieces of A4 paper, large enough so that they can be read at a distance, e.g.:

**STRONGLY AGREE /
ALWAYS**

**STRONGLY DISAGREE /
NEVER**

Resource 3: Living Likhert List

Below is a sample list of statements for use in Activity 5: [Living Likhert Scale*](#) (p.60). You may wish to make alterations, but ensure that your final list includes a range of identity and opinion-based statements.

- 1. I support the legalisation of gay marriage**
- 2. Abortions should be illegal**
- 3. I have been sexually harassed in the street**
- 4. The welfare system is an essential support for the needy**
- 5. New Zealand is a sexist country**
- 6. New Zealand is a racist country**
- 7. I find it hard to challenge people I disagree with**
- 8. I'm happy with the way I look**
- 9. Animals have equal rights with humans**
- 10. All New Zealand citizens ought to receive full, free medical care**
- 11. New Zealand should accept more refugees**
- 12. I fit in with my family**
- 13. Smokers ought to have the right to smoke in public places**
- 14. I think that the way you speak affects the way people treat you**
- 15. I have masculine and feminine traits**
- 16. Cosmetic surgery should be R21**

Resource 4: Power / Knowledge Presentation

Below are suggestions for presentation content and structure taken from the Power / Knowledge presentation I designed for these workshops.

- Knowledge about ourselves and the world changes over time and space: knowledge is ‘socially constructed’ (for further reading, see Tuffin, 2005). Rather than being “the truth” knowledge is contextual – it arises in a particular time and place. What is commonsense in one time and place may not be commonsense in another.

Example: extract from the department store publication *Earnshaw's Infants' Department* (as cited in Paoletti, 2012, p. 85)

“The generally accepted rule is pink for the boy and blue for the girl. The reason is that pink being a more decided and stronger colour is more suitable for the boy, while blue, which is more delicate and dainty, is prettier for the girl.”

- Knowledge about human nature, social groups and group differences is NOT neutral: it makes arguments about how the world is, what different groups are like and what is normal or natural.
- These claims have implications for social power relations: KNOWLEDGE RELATES TO POWER.
- Historically, it is the experiences, perspectives and interests of the powerful which become legitimised as knowledge, which in turn justifies inequality and reinforces the status quo.

The logic goes like this:

Group A is superior to Group B
therefore
Group A gets to be in charge of Group B

GROUP A	GROUP B
Colonisers	Colonised peoples
Men	Women
Heterosexuals	Homosexuals
Upper class/caste	Lower class/caste
Able-bodied	Not able-bodied
Mentally ‘healthy’	Mentally ‘ill’
Religion A	Religion B
Rich	Poor
“White” People	“Brown” “Black” or “Yellow” people

- The subordinate group is defined by the dominant group as inferior and incapable, often due to biology (e.g. they are naturally submissive or less intelligent). Subordinate status is thus the best thing for subordinates, who need direction and/or protection by rational, intelligent dominants.
- Knowledge can shape identities, actions, emotions, aspirations

Example: the social-psychological phenomenon of ‘stereotype threat’ (Steele & Aronson, 1995).

Example: social knowledge shape’s individual’s sense of entitlement, satisfaction and desire (see McClelland, 2010 for a feminist analysis of sexual satisfaction).

Resource 5: Men-Ups

'Men-Ups' is a Rion Sabean photography project which disrupts gendered photographic conventions by styling masculine bodies and practices in ways normally reserved for female bodies. For copyright reasons his Men-Ups cannot be reproduced in this resource. His series of photographs and further details about the project can be found at <http://www.rionsabean.com/men-ups>

Resource 6: Hollway's Dominant Discourses of Heterosexuality

Wendy Hollway theorised three dominant 'discourses' or clusters of assumptions about men and women's sexuality which, she argues, scaffold heterosexual relations (Hollway, 1984, 1989).

The *Male Sex Drive Discourse* encompasses the social knowledge we have about male sexuality: that men have an innate, powerful sex drive and that normal men pursue and need sex. According to this discourse, men's rational capacities can be overwhelmed by sexual urges, making men 'liable to be trapped into a relationship by their 'drive' for sex' (Hollway, 1984, p.66).

The *Have and Hold Discourse* encompasses the social knowledge we have about female sexuality: women do not share the same sex drive as men and are instead motivated by a need for relationships and commitment. Women accommodate or 'give' sex in order to maintain relationships with men.

The *Permissive Discourse* challenges monogamy by representing both men and women as able and entitled to pursue sex for pleasure (see also Hare-Mustin, 1994). This argument intersects differentially with the discourses outlined above, and so in practice, the Permissive Discourse has different consequences for men and women. For men, permissiveness removes social and moral constraints on the male sex drive discourse, allowing men to pursue sex outside committed relationships. For women, the permissive discourse may contribute to sexual coercion by removing a rationale for refraining from sex with a man who "needs" it, and by positioning women who do so as frigid or selfish.

Together, these three discourses suggest a template for undertaking and understanding heterosexual intimate relationships. Men want sex and may use relationships to get it; women want relationships and may use sex to get them. As well as having implications for gendered relations of power (women are positioned as attempting to control men, and men are positioned as without a need for relationships), these discourses work together to provide a cultural scaffolding for rape (Gavey, 2005).

Resource 7: Sexism in the Streets Presentation

In my facilitation, I choose material for this presentation which illustrates potential connections between social representations of gender, gendered power imbalances and ‘everyday’ sexism. You may like to use these examples, or you may prefer to find your own (ideally the examples would be recent or topical).

1. Sexism in the Workplace

I chose a video clip of Nicki Minaj, a well-known rap/pop artist, where she discusses sexual double standards in the entertainment industry. Nicki says: ‘When I am assertive, I’m a bitch. When a man is assertive, he’s a boss... No negative connotations behind being a boss; lots of negative connotations behind being a bitch.’ It’s an unconventional video and it contains swearing, making it potentially unsuitable for some purposes and audiences. Nevertheless, it is a powerful gendered critique conveyed by a famous and admired woman. The video can be found at: <http://tinyurl.com/n83wx9h> <http://tinyurl.com/n83wx9h>

2. Sexism in Media / Women’s Sport

To examine sexism in media, I chose a topical example: media commentary on Marion Bartoli’s Wimbledon tennis victory. This focus also allowed an examination of sexism in women’s sport. I used a clip from ‘media watch’ (a Radio New Zealand National programme) which critically analyses international and local media coverage of Bartoli’s win and sexism in sports commentary more generally. The link for this programme is: <http://tinyurl.com/ks7akw7> cued from 1:41

I also showed participants some of the twitter commentary on Bartoli during the Wimbledon final, including tweets such as:

‘Bartoli looks like she’s a cross between man and ape #notaWimbledonBabe’

‘Feeling for the trophy presenter who had to exchange kisses with the fat ugly sweaty pig Bartoli’

‘Someone as ugly and unattractive as Bartoli doesn’t deserve to win’

‘I want Lisicki to win because she is really fit. Bartoli wouldn’t even get raped let alone fucked’

Some of these tweets are visible through a screenshot tweeted by The Everyday Sexism Project, and can be accessed at: <https://twitter.com/EverydaySexism/status/353537169354276865/photo/1>

3. Everyday Sexism

To explore mundane encounters with sexism, such as street heckling, I showed participants The Everyday Sexism Project, a UK-based online forum where women document and share their experiences of everyday sexism. I use a laptop/projector set up to show participants the website and explore some comments posted – the volume is telling: <http://www.everydaysexism.com/>

We then look at a local version of this website, established for Wellington women to share and protest street harassment: <http://www.ihollaback.org/?s=wellington>

Resource 8: Feminist Social Activism Resource Packet

The resource packet I assembled for [Activity 16](#) includes three different examples of feminist social activism and a guiding question sheet. Explore their websites for relevant examples and materials to share with participants, or find your own alternatives if you choose. My resource packets included images, articles and information about each group.

Example 1: Guerrilla Girls:

Guerrilla Girls describe themselves as ‘masked avengers in the tradition of anonymous do-gooders like Robin Hood, Wonder Woman and Batman’ who challenge sexism, racism and injustice in the art world with ‘facts, humour and outrageous visuals’ (Guerrilla Girls, 2013).

<http://guerrillagirls.com/>

Example 2: New View Campaign: Challenging the Medicalization of Sex

The New View Campaign, established in 2000, sets out to challenge the ‘distorted and oversimplified messages about sexuality that the pharmaceutical industry relies on to sell its new drugs’ (New View Campaign, 2013). As well as producing educational resources, starting petitions, attending conferences and raising public awareness through activist art and street protest, the New View campaign have created a satirical video about female genital cosmetic surgery “Dr Vajayjay: Privatise those Privates!”:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T9kCw0Lmaa0>

<http://www.newviewcampaign.org/>

Example 3: Who Needs Feminism? Campaign

This popular and successful campaign began at Duke University with a bunch of students determined to challenge the perception that feminism is no longer necessary. The campaign, which has now spread internationally, involves submitting statements, often handwritten and then photographed, which challenge stereotypes of feminists and feminism and make personalised arguments for feminism’s continuing importance and relevance.

<http://www.whoneedsfeminism.com/index.html>

Below is a question template to distribute to participants as part of [Activity 16](#). These questions are intended to guide participants through the resource packets you have prepared.

Social Activism Resource Packet Questions

Theoretical Analysis

1. What or who is the problem or issue identified by your organisation?
2. Who or what is presented as being responsible for the problem or issue?
3. What is the response or solution to the problem? And how does that solution fit with the organisation’s explanation of the problem, as outlined above?

Overall Impressions

1. What do you like about the project – the way it is presented, the proposed action, the chosen issue?
2. What might you change about this organisation's work?
3. Is there anything you think isn't covered, or anything which is misrepresented?

Group Questions

Come up with two questions for the other groups to answer about your organisation's work.

1.
2.

Resource 9: 'If Men Could Menstruate'

Gloria Steinem's 'If Men Could Menstruate' appeared in *Ms Magazine* in 1978. It is a humorous thought experiment which imagines how the meanings and practices associated with menstruation might change if it was men rather than women who had periods. I have reproduced an extract from the original with the generous permission of the author. A full version of the essay can be found in Gloria Steinem's (1983) book *Outrageous Acts and Everyday Rebellions*.

If Men Could Menstruate

Gloria Steinem, *Ms. Magazine* (1978)

A white minority of the world has spent centuries conning us into thinking that a white skin makes people superior – even though the only thing it really does is make them more subject to ultraviolet rays and to wrinkles. Male human beings have built whole cultures around the idea that penis envy is "natural" to women – though having such an unprotected organ might be said to make men vulnerable, and the power to give birth makes womb envy at least as logical. In short, the characteristics of the powerful, whatever they may be, are thought to be better than the characteristics of the powerless – and logic has nothing to do with it. What would happen, for instance, if suddenly, magically, men could menstruate and women could not? The answer is clear – menstruation would become an enviable, boast-worthy, masculine event:

- Men would brag about how long and how much.
- Boys would mark the onset of menses, that longed-for proof of manhood, with religious ritual and stag parties.
- Sanitary supplies would be federally funded and free.
- Military men, right-wing politicians, and religious fundamentalists would cite menstruation ("men-struation") as proof that only men could serve in the Army ("you have to give blood to take blood"), occupy political office ("can women be aggressive without that steadfast cycle governed by the planet Mars?"), be priest and ministers ("how could a woman give her blood for our sins?") or rabbis ("without the monthly loss of impurities, women remain unclean").
- Street guys would brag ("I'm a three pad man") or answer praise from a buddy ("Man, you lookin' good!") by giving fives and saying, "Yeah, man, I'm on the rag!"
- TV shows would treat the subject at length. So would newspapers. (JUDGE CITES MONTHLY STRESS IN PARDONING RAPIST.)
- Lesbians would be said to fear blood and therefore life itself – though probably only because they needed a good menstruating man.
- Male intellectuals would offer the most moral and logical arguments. How could a woman master any discipline that demanded a sense of time, space, mathematics, or measurement, for instance, without that in-built gift for measuring the cycles of the moon and planets – and thus for measuring anything at all? In the rarefied fields of philosophy and religion, could women compensate for missing the rhythm of the universe? Or for their lack of symbolic death-and-resurrection every month?

In fact, if men could menstruate, the power justifications could probably go on forever. If we let them.

Steinem, G. (1983). *Outrageous acts and everyday rebellions*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Resource 10: Feminist Activism Reference List: 2013

Activist Groups and Projects

The Everyday Sexism Project

<http://www.everydaysexism.com/>

I Will End Sexual Violence tumblr

<http://iwillesv.tumblr.com/>

Holla Back project:

<http://www.ihollaback.org/>

Who needs feminism? Tumblr

<http://whoneedsfeminism.tumblr.com/>

Guerrilla Girls, protesting sexism in the art world

<http://www.guerrillagirls.com/>

Fed Up Honeys, challenging stereotypes of women of colour

<http://www.fed-up-honeys.org/>

SPARK movement website

<http://www.sparksummit.com/category/take-action/>

Ilona Granet, street sign activism

<http://ilonagranet.blogspot.co.nz/p/street-signs.html>

Fuck yeah feminists tumblr

<http://fuckyeahfeminists.com/>

The New View Campaign challenging the medicalisation of women's sexuality

<http://www.newviewcampaign.org/default.asp>

Courage To Be Real Campaign

<http://beautyisinside.com/2012/03/courage-to-be-real-campaign/>

Slutwalk

<http://jezebel.com/tag/slutwalk>

Men Against Pornography

<http://www.antipornmen.org/>

Pinterest boards

<http://pinterest.com/safercampus/social-justice/>

<http://pinterest.com/laragactyl/social-justice/>

The Pink and Blue Project

<http://www.brainpickings.org/index.php/2009/12/11/pink-and-blue-project/>

Anti-racism posters

<http://racismstillexists.tumblr.com/>

Videos

Dr Vajayjay parody video from the New View Campaign (2013)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T9kCw0Lmaa0>

Parody of 'Dove Real Beauty Campaign':

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FpWkZiZaQsA>

TED talks about gender justice and inequality

<http://www.ted.com/talks/tags/women>

Spoken word poetry activism:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jOv47njeLHQ>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kBl6x-16iYc>

Ali G on feminism:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OFA-x7ayvGM>

Documentary about UK feminism

<http://ukfeminista.org.uk/about/the-documentary/>

'Dirty Girls' documentary:

<http://tinyurl.com/mz7q3oo>

Articles

The Onion – satirical news website, e.g.

Women now empowered by everything a woman does:

<http://tinyurl.com/2aze8pl>

Woman rushed into cosmetic surgery with 8 glaring imperfections:

<http://tinyurl.com/leej66c>

11 Qualities of the perfect woman?

<http://tinyurl.com/klqkwy4>

Sexism Fatigue: When Seth McFarlane is as ass and you don't even notice:

<http://tinyurl.com/lklurx5>

Derailing for Dummies: An ironic guide to being sexist/racist/oppressive:

<http://tinyurl.com/2bmgcan>

Do you feel any more confident yet?

<http://tinyurl.com/kyw3rav>

Resource 11: Online Forum

As part of the three-day workshop, I recommend establishing an online forum for participants to connect and share information between the workshop sessions. The forum becomes a living record of the workshop process and provides a way for participants to keep connected after the workshops come to an end. There are a variety of online platforms you could use. I created a private Wordpress blog, only visible to people with a Wordpress account:

<http://medialsexismandsocialaction.wordpress.com/>

The screenshot shows a WordPress blog page for 'Media Sexism and Social Action'. The header features a red heart balloon icon and the site title. The main content area includes a subtitle 'Analysing Gender, Sexual Ethics and Social Justice in Popular Culture and Daily Life', an 'ABOUT' section with a welcome message and a description of the blog's purpose, and a '2 comments' section with two user comments. The right sidebar contains a search bar, 'RECENT POSTS' with a list of article titles, 'RECENT COMMENTS', 'ARCHIVES' with a list of months, 'CATEGORIES', and 'META' links for registration and login. A 'Follow' pop-up window is overlaid on the right side, prompting the user to follow the blog and enter their email address.

Resource 12: Quick Association Words

To prepare for [Activity 22](#), you will need to come up with a list of words which reference key themes of the upcoming session. The quick association words I used were:

Sexism

Pubic Hair

Graffiti

Camera

Student

Feminism

Pornography

Decision

Make-up

Scary

School

Funny

Resource 13: Sexism Scan Materials

To prepare for [Activity 24](#), collate print-outs of any material participants have posted to the online forum, and bring along a couple of your own examples. Ideally, you will be able to find examples of campaigns and images which are featured locally. I used a range of online images advertising Aston Martin used cars, sperm donation, Burger King and potato chips.

Resource 14: Absolutely free choice and Absolutely forced choice signs

**ABSOLUTELY FREE
CHOICE**

**ABSOLUTELY FORCED
CHOICE**

Resource 15: Choice Scenario: Dish of the Day

For the choice scenario, I used an extract from Douglas Adams's (Adams, 2002) book *The Restaurant at the End of the Universe*. This quote is taken from the point in the narrative where the main characters arrive at a restaurant. To their horror, they are invited to 'greet' the dish of the day, an animal bred with the desire to be eaten. These extracts raise questions about the limits of choice and what it is (and ought to be) possible to choose:

'Good evening', it lowed and sat back heavily on its haunches, **'I am the main Dish of the Day. May I interest you in parts of my body?'** It harrumphed and gurgled a bit, wriggled its hind quarters into a more comfortable position and gazed peacefully at them. [...] **Something off the shoulder perhaps? [...] May I urge you to consider my liver?'** asked the animal, **'It must be very rich and tender by now, I've been force feeding myself for months.'** (p.284-5)

The use of this extract follows Annabelle Mooney's (2008) discussion of it, which was the inspiration for this activity.

Resource 16: Female Genital Cutting Presentation

Female Genital Cutting (FGC) is the practice of removing female genital tissue for **non-medical** reasons (see Braun, 2009). Motivations may be cultural, social and/or psychological, and the practice is generally intended to secure what is perceived to be normal genitalia and normal female sexuality. The practice of FGC is tied up in cultural beliefs about women's genitals being ugly, dirty or undesirable.

I have made the table below to summarise key information about traditional and cosmetic FGC, drawing from Braun (2009). For a more in-depth account, refer to Braun's original article.

Traditional FGC	Cosmetic FGC
Done to maintain cultural tradition.	Done to fix a non-medical 'problem'
Associated with Africa, the Middle East and parts of Asia	Associated with Western countries, particularly the USA
Is perceived as a forced choice	Is perceived as a free choice
Is a normative practice in some regions	Is a marginal practice
Can be performed without consent	Always requires consent
Is performed on women and young girls	Is only performed on adult women
Seen as a form of violence against women	Marketed as 'empowering' for women

Resource 17: Conscience Alley Character Descriptions

The following are the two character descriptions I used for [Activity 28](#).

Keisha, 18

- Is deciding whether to have a traditional FGC procedure to mark her transition to womanhood, and as a marker of her cultural identity.
- Her family expect her to have the procedure.
- She is concerned about the pain.
- She wants to please her family and friends, and 'fit in' with social expectations of a marriageable woman.

Tanya, 18

- Is deciding whether to have a cosmetic FGC procedure she has found out about on the internet to 'fix' her genitals which she thinks are ugly and embarrassing.
- Her sister suggested she have the procedure.
- She is concerned about the pain.
- She wants to have perfect genitals which will please current and future sexual partners and make her feel sexually confident.

Resource 18: Choice in Context: Sushi for Lunch

Below are the three 'Sushi for Lunch' scenarios I use to stimulate critical discussion about the role of context in shaping choice as part of [Activity 29](#). Ask the group who likes sushi, and use one volunteer's name for the exercise.

Sushi for Lunch – Take #1

_____ is hungry.

She goes to the cafeteria to get something for lunch.

She looks around at all the options on display. She scratches her head, tossing up between a sandwich, a pie, a salad, sushi, chocolate bars, or a scone.

She chooses sushi, pays for it and heads off to eat her lunch.

Sushi for Lunch – Take #2

_____ is hungry.

She goes to the cafeteria to get something for lunch.

She looks around at all the options on display. _____ knows that eating sushi for lunch is very desirable. Men find it attractive; parents hope their daughters will do it. In fact, NOT choosing sushi is seen as quite a radical social statement.

_____ scratches her head, tossing up between a sandwich, a pie, a salad, sushi, chocolate bars or a scone.

She chooses sushi, pays for it and heads off to eat her lunch.

Sushi for Lunch – Take #3

_____ is hungry.

She goes to the cafeteria to get something for lunch.

She looks around and sees that there is only sushi on display.

_____ chooses sushi, pays for it and heads off to eat her lunch.

Resource 19: Body Hair Quotes

Below are quotes from a published article by Breanne Fahs (2011) 'Breaking body hair boundaries: Classroom exercises for challenging social constructions of the body and sexuality'. These participant quotes are reproduced here with generous permission from the author. In my facilitation, I divided the quotes into two sections: experiences of not shaving (from participants who routinely shaved) and experience of shaving (from participants unaccustomed to shaving).

EXPERIENCES OF NOT SHAVING:

- Beth: [my brother] asked me if this was some kind of sign that my women's studies degree was corrupting me and turning me into a big lesbian. He said that any woman with body hair certainly couldn't get a man, so I'd have to start dating women if I wanted to have sex.
- Mona: My Mum asked me if this was just an excuse because I wanted to get a sex change.
- Lynn: My 19 year old sister lifted up my arm for everyone to see and said, 'Look!' I was so embarrassed. I got at least 10 'Ewwws' and lots of 'Why?' and 'That's so gross!' and 'You look like a man'.
- Deena: [my boyfriend's friends] ask him about it all the time. They wanted to know 'what it was like' and one specifically asked him if I was 'beastly'...Even though he laughed about the situation, it made me feel unwanted and not as feminine as a girlfriend 'should' be.
- Lynn: My fiancé told his father about the body hair thing I'm doing. He was very offended by it. The first thing he asked was, 'Did she ask your permission first?'...As if my fiancé was in control of what I do to my body!
- Laura: She wanted to know whether I'd received permission from the person I was dating. It was just a smack in the face.
- Cindy: If someone asks anything about my hair, it is usually about how my husband feels. I specifically say husband because people are concerned about a man dealing with a hairy woman.
- Elaine: I personally had a hard time with the constant feeling of being unclean. I didn't mind how I physically looked, but I mentally felt dirty. Even after I showered I would still feel unclean simply because I haven't shaved.
- Lupe: I come from a family that didn't have much money, and to let yourself go is going against everything I have been taught. I'm always careful about coming across as respectable and clean, just so I don't confirm all of those stereotypes people have of me as dirty and low class.
- Cecelia: My mother was so upset that she scolded me and asked if I needed money to purchase razors or if something was wrong.
- Tom: I mentioned the assignment to a group of guys and they said it was fine for men to shave but disgusting for women not to shave.
- Zoe: To watch my hair grow in was a journey in and of itself; to see my hair pattern as my hair fully grew in; to feel it in difference stages of growth from prickly to rather soft and long – it was all part of the experience. I definitely feel more in tune with my body; its patterns and textures. I formed this weird attachment to my body hair and I felt like 'we' really bonded.

EXPERIENCES OF SHAVING:

- Ben: My use of the buck knife, [a folding hunting knife] and box cutter made me feel even more intimidating and masculine. I caught many people's attention by shaving in public at my convenience. That part was kind of fun.
- June: I honestly felt embarrassed and uncomfortable. I felt bald and exposed, disgusting, almost as if everything were exposed all at once. It even felt weird to walk and sit; it was simply just an unnatural feeling. There's really no way to describe what I felt. But it certainly wasn't womanly, and if it was then it's a frightening, degrading, disgusting feeling I want nothing to do with. I felt weak, frivolous, and a trivial woman girl. I felt like a fish person, like a non-mammal creature that should be swimming in the ocean somewhere in all my sleek baldness.
- Max: I would never do this otherwise but halfway through I started wondering why I kept repeating that it was for a class assignment to people who asked me about it. Why couldn't I just say that I did it because I felt like it? I'm a man. I don't need a reason.

Fahs, B. (2011). Breaking body hair boundaries: Classroom exercises for challenging social constructions of the body and sexuality. *Feminism & Psychology*, 22(4), 482–506.

Resource 20: Guest Presenter Brief

Guest Presenter Brief: Film Skills

Thanks for offering to help out with this workshop series, 'Gender, Sexism and Social Activism: A Creative Workshop for Future Social Justice Leaders'.

The workshops are focussed around reflection and discussion of sexism in popular media and in daily life. Alongside talk and activities which address these questions, the workshops will include time for participants to learn about creative forms of social critique (culture jamming, film-making, poster-making) and to use these new skills to design an original creative intervention into a social justice issue of their choosing. This is where your skills come in!

You are invited to steer a 1.5 hour session which is intended to equip students with the basic skills and knowledge they need to make short films or skits, and take photographs. Topics covered could include:

- Framing an image: good filming and photography
- Coming up with an idea
- The basics of script-writing
- What you need to film (camera, lights, sound) and where to get them*
- The editing process, software you need and where to find it*
- Ethical film-making
- The interview project / documentary: when to use it and helpful tips
- The mockumentary: when to use it and some helpful tips
- A case study: either your own work, or if you don't have anything relevant, you could talk through this video: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T9kCw0Lmaa0>

** If there are open source programmes available, then mention these – otherwise you could cover the facilities and programmes available in Universities and schools / for cheap hire.*

Where possible, it would be great if you could use examples which connect with the theme of the workshops (i.e. social justice, sexism).

A suggested time frame would be 30 minutes presenting on the first 6 bullet points and 30 minutes for discussion of a case study and questions from the group. The last 30 minutes of the session is reserve time – if discussion is still flowing or you need more time, this is a cushion so there's no need to rush. If the session finishes on time or early, then participants will use the last half hour to get into small groups and begin planning their social intervention. If you have time, you could stay for this and circulate among the groups, helping students to develop their ideas.

If you need any materials (a camera to demonstrate with, for example), please let me know a few days in advance. My email is octavia.calder-dawe@auckland.ac.nz

Thank you and good luck!

Resource 21: Sample Choosing Against Feminism Quotes

I used the following quotes in my facilitation. They, along with others, can be accessed here:
http://www.salon.com/2013/04/06/im_not_a_feminist_but/

Beyonce:

"That word [feminist] can be very extreme...I guess I am a modern-day feminist. I do believe in equality"

Taylor Swift:

"I don't think about things as guys versus girls. I never have. I was raised by parents who brought me up to think if you work as hard as guys, you can go far in life."

Bjork:

"I don't identify as a feminist because I think it would isolate me"

Resource 22: Privilege Handout

I use an online article by John Scalzi (2012) in my workshop facilitation to explore privilege. This article is reproduced here with the generous permission of the author. The article can be found online at <http://whatever.scalzi.com/2012/05/15/straight-white-male-the-lowest-difficulty-setting-there-is/>

Straight White Male: The Lowest Difficulty Setting There Is

By John Scalzi

I've been thinking of a way to explain to straight white men how life works for them, without invoking the dreaded word "privilege," to which they react like vampires being fed a garlic tart at high noon. It's not that the word "privilege" is incorrect, it's that it's not *their* word. When confronted with "privilege," they fiddle with the word itself, and haul out the dictionaries and find every possible way to talk about the word but not any of the things the word signifies.

So, the challenge: how to get across the ideas bound up in the word "privilege," in a way that your average straight white man will get, without freaking out about it?

Being a white guy who likes women, here's how I would do it:

Dudes. Imagine life here in the US — or indeed, pretty much anywhere in the Western world — is a massive role playing game, like World of Warcraft except appallingly mundane, where most quests involve the acquisition of money, cell phones and donuts, although not always at the same time. Let's call it The Real World. You have installed The Real World on your computer and are about to start playing, but first you go to the settings tab to bind your keys, fiddle with your defaults, and choose the difficulty setting for the game. Got it?

Okay: In the role playing game known as The Real World, "Straight White Male" is the lowest difficulty setting there is.

This means that the default behaviors for almost all the non-player characters in the game are easier on you than they would be otherwise. The default barriers for completions of quests are lower. Your leveling-up thresholds come more quickly. You automatically gain entry to some parts of the map that others have to work for. The game is easier to play, automatically, and when you need help, by default it's easier to get.

Now, once you've selected the "Straight White Male" difficulty setting, you *still* have to create a character, and how many points you get to start — and how they are apportioned — will make a difference. Initially the computer will tell you how many points you get and how they are divided up. If you start with 25 points, and your dump stat is wealth, well, then you may be kind of screwed. If you start with 250 points and your dump stat is charisma, well, then you're probably fine. Be aware the computer makes it difficult to start with more than 30 points; people on higher difficulty settings generally start with even fewer than that.

As the game progresses, your goal is to gain points, apportion them wisely, and level up. If you start with fewer points and fewer of them in critical stat categories, or choose poorly regarding the skills you decide to level up on, then the game will still be difficult for you. But because you're playing on the "Straight White Male" setting, gaining points and leveling up will still by default be easier, all other things being equal, than for another player using a higher difficulty setting.

Likewise, it's certainly possible someone playing at a higher difficulty setting is progressing more quickly than you are, because they had more points initially given to them by the computer and/or their highest stats are wealth, intelligence and constitution and/or simply because they play the game better than you do. It doesn't change the fact you are still playing on the lowest difficulty setting.

You can lose playing on the lowest difficulty setting. The lowest difficulty setting is still the easiest setting to win on. The player who plays on the “Gay Minority Female” setting? *Hardcore*.

And maybe at this point you say, hey, I like a challenge, I want to change my difficulty setting! Well, here’s the thing: In The Real World, you don’t unlock any rewards or receive any benefit for playing on higher difficulty settings. The game is just *harder*, and potentially a lot less fun. And you say, okay, but what if I want to replay the game later on a higher difficulty setting, just to see what it’s like? Well, here’s the *other* thing about The Real World: You only get to play it once. So why make it more difficult than it has to be? Your goal is to *win* the game, not make it difficult.

Oh, and one other thing. Remember when I said that you could choose your difficulty setting in The Real World? Well, I lied. In fact, the computer chooses the difficulty setting for you. You don’t get a choice; you just get what gets given to you at the start of the game, and then you have to deal with it.

So that’s “Straight White Male” for you in The Real World (and also, in the real world): The lowest difficulty setting there is. All things being equal, and even when they are not, if the computer — or life — assigns you the “Straight White Male” difficulty setting, then brother, you’ve caught a break.

Scalzi, J. (2012). Straight While Male: The Lowest Difficulty Setting There Is [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://whatever.scalzi.com/2012/05/15/straight-white-male-the-lowest-difficulty-setting-there-is/>

Resource 23: Social Activism Planning Sheet

Social Activism Planning

The Brief:

To design and present a plan for an 'intervention' or action to solve, improve or raise awareness about a social justice issue you care about. You could choose an example from the media (for instance, a particular advertisement you don't like), it could be a broad social justice issue (e.g. unequal pay), or it could be something that happens in everyday life which you would like to change (e.g. street harassment). You are welcome to address sexism or to tackle something which connects to another 'ism' – the choice is yours! Be as creative as you like – there are so many ways to take action, you can go in any direction you want to.

As well as thinking big, think realistic. If you plan something that is actually possible (with time and the right support), then we might be able to work together to make it actually happen. Your posters, films, petitions, plays, artwork, website could get out there and start making a difference!

The Presentation:

At the end of the day, your group needs to present your plan in detail to everyone else. Hopefully you will have something to talk about which is personal, playful and powerful – but it doesn't have to be perfect!

Your presentation back to the rest of the group needs to cover these central questions:

1. What is the issue / example / situation you have chosen?
2. Why did you choose this in particular? What about it felt important, or personal?
3. What is the cause of the issue, in your opinion?
4. What are you planning to do to tackle the issue, and how does it address the cause you've identified?
5. How will you make sure your idea catches people's interest?
6. What practical support will you need? What materials, how much time, how many people, how much money, what kinds of permissions?

As well as these things, come up with a couple of questions to ask the group at the end of your presentation – things you would like feedback on, anything you're unsure about or would like to know.

Resource 24: Sexism and Humour Resource Packet

This activity requires prepared sexism and humour resource packets, which should include a mixture of humorous advertisements which relate to gender in some way. Ideally, you will pull together 5 or 6 examples of humour which could range from certainly sexist to certainly not sexist.

I used a range of advertising campaigns and images which are or have been featured locally. These included advertisements for beer, used cars, house insurance, tampons and satellite TV. Look online and in newspapers for current examples – you won't be short of options!

Resource 25: 'Humour Against Rape' Exemplars

Rape jokes routinely surface online and offline. Nevertheless, discussion of sexual violence and humour must be done sensitively. You may or may not choose to present an example of a hostile rape joke to the group for critical analysis. Regardless, I recommend sharing what might be termed 'humour against rape': examples that combine humour with a critical social analysis of rape. The '10 Top Tips to End Rape' poster displayed on the following page is a useful example of 'critical' or social justice-oriented humour addressing the topic of rape. I have reproduced this image with the generous permission of Rape Crisis Scotland, who crafted the poster as part of a wider campaign critiquing the tendency of rape prevention campaigns to responsabilise women for sexual assault prevention. An online version of the poster and more information about the campaign can be found here:

<http://www.rapecrisisscotland.org.uk/campaigns/10-top-tips-to-end-rape/>



© Rodchenko & Stepanova Archive, DACS, RAO, 2011

10 Top Tips to End Rape

- 1 Don't put drugs in women's drinks.
- 2 When you see a woman walking by herself, leave her alone.
- 3 If you pull over to help a woman whose car has broken down, remember not to rape her.
- 4 If you are in a lift and a woman gets in, don't rape her.
- 5 Never creep into a woman's home through an unlocked door or window, or spring out at her from between parked cars, or rape her.
- 6 **USE THE BUDDY SYSTEM!**
If you are not able to stop yourself from assaulting people, ask a friend to stay with you while you are in public.
- 7 Don't forget: it's not sex with someone who's asleep or unconscious – it's RAPE!
- 8 Carry a whistle! If you are worried you might assault someone 'by accident' you can hand it to the person you are with, so they can call for help.
- 9 Don't forget: Honesty is the best policy.
If you have every intention of having sex later on with the woman you're dating regardless of how she feels about it, tell her directly that there is every chance you will rape her. If you don't communicate your intentions, she may take it as a sign that you do not plan to rape her and inadvertently feel safe.
- 10 Don't rape.

Looking for information and ideas on how to campaign against rape?
Check out the following websites: www.thisisnotaninvitationtorapeme.co.uk
www.notever.co.uk

Resource 26: 'How to Make a Rape Joke'

Lindy West's (2012) article 'How to Make a Rape Joke' is a humorous and incisive comment on rape humour combined with a critical analysis of the use of freedom of speech and political correctness arguments to stifle critique of hostile humour. The article contains swearing and may not be suitable for all audiences. The article can be found online here:

<http://jezebel.com/5925186/how-to-make-a-rape-joke>

Resource 27: Certificate Template

Each participant in a one-day or three-day workshop receives a certificate of completion. I have included a sample certificate below. Please email me at octavia.calder-dawe@auckland.ac.nz for the A4 printing template.

The certificate is enclosed in a decorative border with stylized corner ornaments. The text is centered and reads:

Certificate of Completion

This certifies that

was selected for and has completed the

Media Sexism, Ethics and Social Action

Workshop

for Future Social Justice Leaders

Signed: _____

Institution: _____ Date: _____

References

- Adams, D. (2002). *Hitchiker's guide to the galaxy: The trilogy of four, the restaurant at the end of the universe*. London: Pan MacMillan.
- Ahmed, S. (2010). Killing joy: Feminism and the history of happiness. *Signs*, 35(3), 571–594.
- Appadurai, A. (2006). The right to research. Globalisation, *Societies and Education*, 4(2), 167–177.
- Bailey, S. M. (1993). *The current status of gender equity research in American schools*. *Educational Psychologist*, 28(4), 321–339. doi:10.1207/s15326985ep2804_3
- Baker, J. (2010). Claiming volition and evading victimhood: Post-feminist obligations for young women. *Feminism & Psychology*, 20(2), 186–204. doi:10.1177/0959353509359142
- Boal, A. (1979). *Theatre of the Oppressed*. London: Pluto.
- Braun, V. (2009). "The women are doing it for themselves": The rhetoric of choice and agency around female genital "cosmetic surgery". *Australian Feminist Studies*, 24(60), 233–249. doi:10.1080/08164640902852449
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge.
- Cahill, A. J. (2011). *Overcoming Objectification: A Carnal Ethics*. New York: Routledge.
- Cahill, C. (2007a). Doing research with young people: Participatory research and the rituals of collective work. *Children's Geographies*, 5(3), 297–312. doi:10.1080/14733280701445895
- Cahill, C. (2007b). The personal is political: Developing new subjectivities through participatory action research. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 14(3), 267–292.
- Calder-Dawe, O. (in progress). "Maybe I am all those things, maybe I'm not': Change-oriented critical qualitative research as an invitation to un-know.
- Copp, M., & Kleinman, S. (2008). What we teach: Practicing feminist strategies for teaching about sexism. *Feminist Teacher*, 18(2), 101–124.
- Coy, M., & Horvath, M. A. H. (2011). Lads' Mags, Young Men's Attitudes towards women and acceptance of myths about sexual aggression. *Feminism & Psychology*, 21 (1), 144–150. doi:10.1177/0959353509359145
- Coy, M., Thiara, R., & Kelly, L. (2011). *Boys think girls are toys? An evaluation of the NIA project prevention programme on sexual exploitation*. London.
- Emert, T., & Friedland, E. (2011). Considering the future of theatre of the oppressed: An interview with Julian Boal. In T. Emert & E. Friedland (Eds.), *Come Closer: Critical Perspectives on Theatre of the Oppressed*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Fahs, B. (2011). Breaking body hair boundaries: Classroom exercises for challenging social constructions of the body and sexuality. *Feminism & Psychology*, 22(4), 482–506. doi:10.1177/0959353511427293
- Fine, M., & Torre, M. E. (2004). Re-memembering exclusions: Participatory action research in public institutions. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 1(1), 15–37.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality Vol. 1: The will to knowledge*. 1978. New York: Pantheon.
- Fox, H. (2007). Playback Theatre: Inciting dialogue and building community through personal story. *The Drama Review*, 51(4), 89–105. doi:10.1162/dram.2007.51.4.89
- Freire, P. (1989). *Learning to question: A pedagogy of liberation*. New York: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (30th Anniv.). New York: Continuum.
- Gavey, N. (2005). *Just sex? The cultural scaffolding of rape*. London: Routledge.

- Gill, R. (2007a). Critical respect: The difficulties and dilemmas of agency and "choice" for feminism: A reply to Duits and van Zoonen. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 14(1), 69–80. doi:10.1177/1350506807072318
- Gill, R. (2007b). Postfeminist media culture: Elements of a sensibility. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 10(2), 147–166. doi:10.1177/1367549407075898
- Gill, R. (2008). Culture and Subjectivity in Neoliberal and Postfeminist Times. *Subjectivity*, 25(1), 432–445. doi:10.1057/sub.2008.28
- Gill, R. (2011). Sexism reloaded, or, it's time to get angry again! *Feminist Media Studies*, 11(1), 61–71. doi:10.1080/14680777.2011.537029
- Giroux, H. A. (2000). Public pedagogy as cultural politics: Stuart Hall and the "crisis" of culture. *Cultural Studies*, 14(2), 341–360.
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Guerrilla Girls. (2013). Guerrilla Girls. Retrieved March 26, 2014, from <http://www.guerrillagirls.com/>
- Hare-Mustin, R. (1994). Discourses in the mirrored room: A postmodern analysis of therapy. *Family Process*, 33(March), 19–35.
- Holland, K. J., & Cortina, L. M. (2013). When sexism and feminism collide: The sexual harassment of feminist working women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 37(2), 192–208. doi:10.1177/0361684313482873
- Hollway, W. (1984). Women's power in heterosexual sex. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 7(1), 63–68.
- Hollway, W. (1989). *Subjectivity and method in psychology: Gender, meaning and science*. London: Sage.
- Kleinman, S., Copp, M., & Sandstrom, K. (2006). Making sexism visible: Birdcages, martians, and pregnant men. *Teaching Sociology*, 34(2), 126–142. doi:10.1177/0092055X0603400203
- McClelland, S. I. (2010). Intimate justice: A critical analysis of sexual satisfaction. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(9), 663–680. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00293.x
- McClelland, S. I., & Fine, M. (2008). Writing on cellophane: Studying teen women's sexual desires, inventing methodological release points. In K. Gallagher (Ed.), *The methodological dilemma: Creative critical and collaborative approaches to qualitative research* (pp. 232–260). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- McRobbie, A. (2004). Post-feminism and popular culture. *Feminist Media Studies*, 4(3), 255–264. doi:10.1080/1468077042000309937
- McRobbie, A. (2009). *The aftermath of feminism: Gender, culture, and social change*. London: Sage.
- Moane, G. (2006). Exploring activism and change: Feminist psychology, liberation psychology, political psychology. *Feminism & Psychology*, 16(1), 73–78. doi:10.1177/0959-353506060823
- Moane, G. (2010). Sociopolitical development and political activism: Synergies between feminist and liberation psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 34(4), 521–529. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2010.01601.x
- Moane, G. (2011). *Gender and colonialism: A psychological analysis of oppression and liberation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mooney, A. (2008). Boys will be boys. *Feminist Media Studies*, 8(3), 247–265. doi:10.1080/14680770802217287
- New View Campaign. (2013). New View Campaign. Retrieved March 26, 2014, from <http://newviewcampaign.org/>
- Paoletti, J. B. (2012). *Pink and blue: Telling the boys from the girls in America*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Parrotta, K. L., & Rusche, S. N. (2011). Extraterrestrials and generic social processes: Minimizing resistance in teaching the reproduction of inequality. *Teaching Sociology*, 39(3), 320–328. doi:10.1177/0092055X11407351

- Public Science Project. (2013). Critical Participatory Action Research Summer Institute. In *Critical Participatory Action Research Summer Institute*. New York.
- Scalzi, J. (2012). Straight While Male: The Lowest Difficulty Setting There Is [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://whatever.scalzi.com/2012/05/15/straight-white-male-the-lowest-difficulty-setting-there-is/>
- Souto-Manning, M. (2010). *Freire, teaching, and learning: Culture circles across contexts*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Souto-Manning, M. (2011). Playing with power and privilege: Theatre games in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27(6), 997–1007. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2011.04.005
- Spivak, G. C. (1993). More on power/knowledge. In *Outside in the teaching machine* (pp. 25–52). New York: Routledge.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2013). *New Zealand Income Survey: June 2013 quarter*. Retrieved from http://www.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/income-and-work/Income/nz-income-survey-info-releases.aspx
- Steele, C. M., & Aronson, J. (1995). Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(5), 797–811.
- Steinem, G. (1983). *Outrageous acts and everyday rebellions*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Stoudt, B. G., Fox, M., & Fine, M. (2012). Contesting privilege with critical participatory action research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(1), 178–193.
- The Everyday Sexism Project. (2014). The Everyday Sexism Project. Retrieved March 26, 2014, from <http://www.everydaysexism.com/>
- Tolman, D. L. (2012). Female adolescents, sexual empowerment and desire: A missing discourse of gender inequity. *Sex Roles*, 66(11-12), 746–757. doi:10.1007/s11199-012-0122-x
- Tuffin, K. (2005). *Understanding critical social psychology*. London: Sage.
- West, L. (2012). How to make a rape joke [Blog post]. Retrieved from <http://jezebel.com/5925186/how-to-make-a-rape-joke>

ISBN: 978-0-473-28359-9