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**Course Introduction**

In the first part of this course, students will be introduced to theories of different feminist schools as well as concepts of gender studies in a structured way. In the second part, emphasis will be put on discussing feminism from an interdisciplinary perspective, for example, feminism and art, feminism and biology, feminism and neuroscience, etc. The aim of this course is two-fold: on the one hand, it aims to give students a solid foundation in feminist and gender studies theories; on the other hand, students will be encouraged to approach the field in an interdisciplinary perspective.

**Course Outcomes, Teaching Activities and Assessment**

|  |
| --- |
| **Course Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs)** |
| Upon completion of this course students should be able to: |
| **ILO1** | describe the theories and concepts of major feminist schools of thought |
| **ILO2** | identify the key issues in feminism and gender studies |
| **ILO3** | analyse the key issues in feminist and gender studies with illustration from cultural texts |
| **ILO4** | discuss issues in relevant disciplines from a feminist and gender studies perspective |
| **ILO5** | write critical analysis of key issues of feminist and gender studies |

|  |
| --- |
| **Teaching and Learning Activities (TLAs)** |
| **TLA1** | Introduction to the major theories and concepts in different feminist schools and gender studies |
| **TLA2** | Introduction to the key issues in different feminist schools and gender studies |
| **TLA3** | Close reading of articles |
| **TLA4** | Critical discussion of theories with illustration from cultural texts |
| **TLA5** | In-class discussion |
| **TLA6** | Oral presentations by students |
| **TLA7** | Written works |

|  |
| --- |
| **Assessment Tasks (ATs)** |
| **AT1** | Oral presentation*students are to deliver an individual oral presentation on a specific topic which can demonstrate their understanding of the issue(s) and concepts(s) discussed in this course. Also, at the end of the presentation there will be time for class discussion.* | 35% |
| **AT2** | Class participation and discussion*Students are to take an active part in class discussion.*  | 15% |
| **AT3** | Final written project*Students are to write a research paper which can demonstrate a solid grasp of theories and concepts taught in the course. The research paper has to be a critical analysis of specific topic and adopt an interdisciplinary approach which can demonstrate students’ ability of critical thinking and analysis.* | 50% |
|  | TOTAL | 100% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Alignment of Course Intended Learning Outcomes, Teaching and Learning Activities and Assessment Tasks**  |
| **Course Intended Learning Outcomes** | **Teaching and Learning Activities** | **Assessment Tasks** |
| ILO1 | TLA1 | AT1, 2, 3 |
| ILO2 | TLA2,4 | AT1, 2, 3 |
| ILO3 | TLA2,4,5,6 ,7 | AT1, 2, 3 |
| ILO4 | TLA3,4,5,6,7 | AT1, 2, 3 |
| ILO5 | TLA7 | AT 3 |

**Course Schedule**

**Week 1 Introduction**

Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi.(2015*) We Should All be Feminists*. New York: Anchor.

Tong (2013) ‘Introduction: the Diversity of Feminist Thinking’ pp.1-10

**Week 2 Liberal Feminism**

Tong (2013) ‘Liberal Feminism’ pp.11-49.

Friedan, Betty. (2001) “The Problem That Has No Name.” *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: W. W. Norton. pp. 15-32.

**Week 3 Radical Feminism**

Tong (2013) ‘Radical Feminism’ pp.50-92.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. (1975) *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. New York: W. W. Norton. pp.157-178.

**Week 4 Marxist and Socialist Feminism**

Tong (2013) ‘Marxist and Socialist Feminism’ pp.93-126

Johnson, Lesley. (1999) “’As Housewives we Are Worms’: Women, Modernity, and the Home Question.” *Feminism & Cultural Studies*. Ed. Morag Shiach. London: Oxford University Press. pp. 475-491.

**Week 5 Psychoanalytic and Care-Focused Feminism**

Tong (2013) ‘Psychoanalytic and Care-Focused Feminism’ pp.126-172

Irigaray, Luce. (1985) “This Sex Which is Not One.” *This Sex Which is Not One*. Trans. Catherine Porter. New York: Cornell University. pp. 23-33.

**Week 6 Existentialist and Postmodern Feminism**

Tong (2013) ‘Existentialist and Postmodern Feminism’ pp. 173- 210

Simone de Beauvoir. (1992) “Introduction and Chapter 12 from *The Second Sex.*” *Feminist Theory: A Reader*. pp. 175-186.

**Week 7 Feminism and Indigenous Women**

Barman, Jean. (2010) “Indigenous Women and Feminism on the Cusp of Contact.” *Indigenous Women and Feminism: Politics, Activism, Culture*, edited by Cheryl Suzack, Shari M. Huhndorf, Jeanne Perreault, and Jean Barman. Vancouver: UBC Press. pp. 92-108

Tsosie, Rebecca. (2010) “Native Women and Leadership: An Ethics of Culture and Relationship. *Indigenous Women and Feminism: Politics, Activism, Culture*, edited by Cheryl Suzack, Shari M. Huhndorf, Jeanne Perreault, and Jean Barman. Vancouver: UBC Press. pp. 29-42.

**Week 8 Feminism and Art**

Phelan Peggy. (2012) “Survey.” *Art and Feminism*, edited by Helena Reckitt. London: Phaidon Press. pp. 14-49.

McCabe, Janet. (2005) “Race, ethnicity and post-colonialism/modernism.” *Feminist Film Studies: Writing the Woman into Cinema (Short Cuts).* New York: Wallflower Press. pp. 88-111.

**Week 9 Feminism and Religion**

Rita M. Gross. (1996) *Feminism & Religion: An Introduction*. Boston: Beacon Press. pp. 25-148.

**Week 10 Feminism and Neuroscience**

Jordan-Young, Rebecca M. & Rumiati, Raffaella I. (2012) “Hardwired for Sexism? Approaches to Sex/Gender in Neuroscience.” *Neurofeminism: Issues at the Intersection of Feminist Theory and Cognitive Science*, edited by Robyn Bluhm, Anne Japp Jacobson and Heidi Lene Maibom. New York: Palgrave. pp. 105-120.

Roy, Deboleena. (2012) “Cosmopolitics and the Brain: The Co-Becoming of Practices in Feminism and Neuroscience.” *Neurofeminism: Issues at the Intersection of Feminist Theory and Cognitive Science*, edited by Robyn Bluhm, Anne Japp Jacobson and Heidi Lene Maibom. New York: Palgrave. pp. 175-192.

**Week 11 Ecology and Gender Studies**

Gruen, Lori. (2014) “Facing Death and Practicing Grief.” *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections with Other Animals & the Earth*. Edited by Carol J. Adams & Lori Gruen. New York: Bloomsbury. pp. 127-142.

Gaard, Greta. (2014) “Toward New EcoMasculinities, EcoGenders, and EcoSexualities.” *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections with Other Animals & the Earth*. Edited by Carol J. Adams & Lori Gruen. pp. 225-240.

**Week 12 Feminism and Deleuze**

Flieger, Jerry Aline. (2000) “Becoming-Woman: Deleuze, Schreber and Molecular Identification.” *Deleuze and Feminist Theory*, edited by Ian Buchanan and Claire Colebrook. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 38-63.

Colebrook, Claire. (2009) “On the Very Possibility of Queer Theory.” *Deleuze and Queer Theory*, edited by Chrysanthi Nigianni and Merl Storr. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 11-23.

**Week 13 Anthropocene Feminism**

Alaimo, Stacy. (2017) “Your Shell on Acid: Material Immersion, Anthropocene Dissolves.” *Anthropocene Feminism*. Edited by Richard Grusin. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press. pp. 89-120.

Schneiderma, Jill S. (2017) “The Anthropocene Controversy.” *Anthropocene Feminism*. Edited by Richard Grusin. Minneapolis & London: University of Minnesota Press. pp. 169-196.

**Week 14 Reading Week**

**Week 15 Recapitulation**

**Principal Readings**

Adichie, Chimamanda Ngozi.(2015*) We Should All be Feminists*. New York: Anchor.

Gross, Rita M. (1996) *Feminism & Religion: An Introduction*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Reckitt, Helena, ed. (2012) *Art and Feminism*. London: Phaidon Press.

Tong, Putam Rosemarie. (2015) *Feminist Thought: A More Comprehensive Introduction.* Student Edition. New York: The Perseus Books Group.

**References**

General

Bluhm ,Robyn, Jacobson, Anne Japp and Maibom, Heidi Lene, eds. (2012) *Neurofeminism: Issues at the Intersection of Feminist Theory and Cognitive Science*. New York: Palgrave.

Kolmar, Wendy & Frances Bartkowski. (2013) *Feminist Theory: A Reader*. 4th edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kolmar, Wendy K. & Bartkowdki, Frances. (2005) *Feminist Theory: A Reader*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Eduction.

Shiach, Morag, ed. (1999) *Feminism & Cultural Studies*. London: Oxford University Press.

Feminism and Indigenous Women

Suzack, Cheryl, Shari M. Huhndorf, Jeanne Perreault, and Jean Barman, eds. (2010) *Indigenous Women and Feminism: Politics, Activism, Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Feminism and Neuroscience

Bluhm ,Robyn, Jacobson, Anne Japp and Maibom, Heidi Lene, eds. (2012) *Neurofeminism: Issues at the Intersection of Feminist Theory and Cognitive Science*. New York: Palgrave.

Feminism and Religion

Anderson, Leona M. & pamela Dickey Young, eds. (2015) *Women and Religious Traditions.* 3rd edition. London: Oxford University Press.

Fisher, Mary Pat. (2006) *Women in Religion*. New York: Pearson.

Sharma, Arvind & Matherine K. Young, eds. (1998) *Feminism and World Religions*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Ecology and Gender Studies

Adams, Carol J, and Lori Gruen, eds. (2014) *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections with Other Animals and the Earth*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Warren, Karen J., ed. (1997) *Ecofeminism: Women, Culture, Nature*. New York: Indiana University Press.

Diamond, Irene & Gloria Orenstein, eds. (1990) *Reweaving the World: The Emergence of Ecofeminism*. New York: Sierra Book Club.

Gaard, Greta. (2017) *Critical Ecofeminism*. London: Lexington Books.

Feminism and Deleuze

Buchanan, Ian and Claire Colebrook, eds. (2000) *Deleuze and Feminist Theory*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Stark, Hannah. (2017) *Feminist Theory After Deleuze*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
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**Assessment Rubric for Oral Presentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Exemplary** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Communication Skills** | Consistently speaks with appropriate volume, tone, and articulation. | Generally speaks with appropriate volume, tone, and articulation. | Has difficulty speaking with appropriate volume, tone, and articulation. | Does not speak with appropriate volume, tone, and articulation. |
| Consistently employs appropriate eye contact and posture. | Frequently employs appropriate eye contact and posture. | Employs infrequent eye contact and/or poor posture. | Makes no eye contact. |
| Consistently employs appropriate nonverbal communication techniques. | Adequately employs appropriate nonverbal communication techniques. | Employs limited nonverbal communication techniques. | Does not employ nonverbal communication techniques. |
| Consistently exhibits poise, enthusiasm, and confidence. | Generally exhibits poise, enthusiasm, and confidence. | Exhibits limited poise, enthusiasm, and confidence. | Lacks poise, enthusiasm, and confidence. |
| Adheres to prescribed time guidelines. | Adheres to prescribed time guidelines. | Violates prescribed time guidelines. | Violates prescribed time guidelines. |
| Employs creative use of visual aids that enrich or reinforce presentation. | Employs appropriate visual aids that relate to presentation. | Employs ineffective visual aids. | Uses no visual aids. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Content and Coherence** | Effectively defines a main idea and clearly adheres to its purpose throughout presentation. | Adequately defines a main idea and adheres to its purpose throughout presentation. | Insufficiently defines a main idea and adheres to its purpose throughout presentation. | Does not define a main idea or adhere to its purpose. |
| Employs a logical and engaging sequence which the audience can follow. | Employs a logical sequence which the audience can follow. | Employs an ineffective sequence confusing to the audience. | Lacks an organizational sequence. |
| Demonstrates exceptional use of supporting details/ evidence. | Demonstrates sufficient use of supporting details/ evidence. | Demonstrates insufficient supporting details/ evidence. | Demonstrates no supporting details/evidence. |
| **Responses to questions** | Confidently, politely, and accurately responds to instructor’s or classmates’ questions and comments. | Politely and accurately responds to instructor’s or classmates’ questions and comments. | Ineffectively responds to instructor’s or classmates’ questions and comments. | Unacceptably responds/does not respond to instructor’s or classmates’ questions and comments. |

**Assessment Rubric for Class Participation and Discussion**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Exemplary** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Preparation** | Arrives fully prepared at every class session | Arrives mostly, if not fully, prepared (ongoing) | Preparation isinconsistent | Rarely or neverprepared |
| **Initiative** | Questions asked focus, clarify and summarize discussion | Occasionally ask good questions | Raise questions only when asked by lecturer | Demonstrates anoticeable lack of interest  |
| **Response** | Quality of response reflects knowledge, comprehension and application of readings | Quality of response reflects knowledge, and some comprehension of readings | Quality of response occasionally reflects knowledge of readings | Quality of response shows a lack of knowledge of readings |
| **Discussion** | Quality of response extends the discussion with peers and reflects analysis, synthesis and evaluation | Quality of response extends the discussion with peers  | Quality of response is poor | Unable to participate in discussion |
| **Group****Dynamics** | Group dynamic and level of discussion areoften better because of candidate’spresence | Group dynamic and level of discussion are occasionally better, but not worse, because of candidate’s presence | Group dynamic and level of discussion aresometimes disruptedby candidate’spresence | Group dynamic and level of discussion areoften disrupted by candidate’s presence |

**Assessment Rubric for Term Paper**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Exemplary** | **Satisfactory** | **Developing/ Emerging** | **Unsatisfactory** |
| **Focus** | Presents an insightful and focused thesis statement. | Presents a thesis statement with adequate insight and focus. | Presents a thesis statement with minimal insight and focus. | Presents a thesis statement with no insight or focus. |
| Draws strong and clear connections between the thesis and significant related ideas. | Draws adequate connections between thesis and related ideas. | Draws insufficient connections between thesis and related ideas. | Shows no understanding of connections between thesis and related ideas. |
| **Organization** | Effectively provides a logical progression of related ideas and supporting information in the body of the paper. | Adequately provides a progression of ideas and supporting information in the body of the paper. | Provides a poorly organized progression of ideas and supporting information in the body of the paper.  | Does not provide a progression of ideas and supporting information in the body of the paper. |
| Effectively uses transitions to connect supporting information clearly. | Adequately uses transitions to connect supporting information. | Ineffectively uses transitions to connect supporting information. | Does not use transitions to connect supporting information. |
| Arrives at a well-documented, logical conclusion, involving critical thinking. | Arrives at an adequately-documented conclusion. | Arrives at an insufficiently documented conclusion. | Does not arrive at a documented conclusion. |
| **Support/ Elaboration** | Effectively synthesizes complex ideas from research sources. | Sufficiently synthesizes ideas from research sources. | Ineffectively synthesizes ideas from research sources. | No evidence of synthesizing ideas from research sources.  |
| Demonstrates exceptional selection of supporting information clearly relevant to the thesis and its related ideas. | Demonstrates sufficient selection of supporting information clearly relevant to the thesis and its related ideas. | Demonstrates insufficient selection of supporting information clearly relevant to the thesis and its related ideas. | Lacks supporting information clearly relevant to thesis and its related ideas. |
| Provides a meaningful presentation of multiple perspectives. | Provides an adequate presentation of multiple perspectives. | Provides a limited presentation of multiple perspectives. | Does not present multiple perspectives. |
| Effectively balances use of quotations and student paraphrasing. | Adequately balances use of quotations and student paraphrasing. | Insufficiently balances use of quotations and student paraphrasing. | Does not balance use of quotations and student paraphrasing. |
| **Style** | Exhibits skillful use of language, including effective word choice, clarity, and consistent voice. | Exhibits good use of language, including some mastery of word choice, clarity, and consistent voice. | Exhibits ineffective use of language, including weak word choice, limited clarity, and inconsistent voice. | Exhibits severely flawed use of language, including weak word choice, no clarity, and no voice.  |
| Demonstrates exceptional fluency through varied sentence structure, paragraphing, flow of ideas, and transitions. | Demonstrates sufficient fluency through sentence structure, paragraphing, flow of ideas, and transitions. | Demonstrates limited fluency through sentence structure, paragraphing, flow of ideas, and transitions. | Lacks fluency through sentence structure, paragraphing, flow of ideas, and transitions. |
| **Conventions** | Demonstrates a sophisticated use of the prescribed format (MLA or APA), including title page, pagination, and citations.  | Demonstrates adequate use of the prescribed format (MLA or APA), including title page, pagination, and citations. | Demonstrates limited use of the prescribed format (MLA or APA), including title page, pagination, and citations. | Demonstrates no use of the prescribed format (MLA or APA), including title page, pagination, and citations. |
| Consistently uses standard writing conventions in grammar, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and usage. | Generally uses standard writing conventions in grammar, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and usage. | Minimally uses standard writing conventions in grammar, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and usage. | Does not use standard writing conventions in grammar, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, and usage. |
| **Information Literacy** | Conscientiously and consistently demonstrates integrity in citing practices. | Generally demonstrates integrity in citing practices. | Inconsistently demonstrates integrity in citing practices. | Does not demonstrate integrity in citing practices. |
| Effectively employs an extensive variety of primary and secondary sources, including a significant amount of current information.  | Adequately employs a sufficient variety of primary and secondary sources including a sufficient amount of current information.  | Employs a limited variety of primary and secondary sources including an insufficient amount of current information. | Does not employ a variety of primary and secondary sources and/or does not include current information. |
| Demonstrates strong evaluation skills in determining resource credibility and reliability. | Demonstrates sufficient evaluation skills in determining resource credibility and reliability. | Demonstrates limited evaluation skills in determining resource credibility and reliability. | Demonstrates no evaluation skills to determine resource credibility and reliability. |