



***INTEGRATING FEMINIST PEDAGOGY WITH ONLINE TEACHING:  
FACILITATING CRITIQUES OF PATRIARCHAL VISUAL CULTURE<sup>1</sup>***

ALICE LAI & LILLY LU

---

**Abstract**

In exploring ways to facilitate student feminist critiques of images of women in patriarchal culture through the asynchronous online discussion, we draw from literature concerning women and online education, feminist visual culture pedagogy, and online pedagogy. In this article, we discuss our implementation of the Interaction Analysis Model (IAM) as example of an online feminist learning space. IAM, as elucidated from a feminist standpoint, recognizes five cognitive activities involved in construction of knowledge through online discussions: (a) sharing and comparing of ideas, (b) cognitive dissonance, (c) co-constructing knowledge, (d) assessing proposed constructions, and (e) applying newly constructed knowledge. We also present a sampling of student feminist critiques as facilitated by IAM, which includes the lack of women's voices, dearth of resources to understand women's creativity, gender stereotypes in classical mythology, gender inequality in the art world, and learning about women's lives through their creative works rather than the written records promoting male dominance.

---

<sup>1</sup> We adopt the editors' comments to use "patriarchal visual culture" to describe visual culture products that were examined by the students in this study and that impose a patriarchal order.

**Introduction**

Over the past decade we have been involved in teaching and developing college-level online art and art education courses that are entirely online, hybrid/blended, or technology-enhanced. As we experimented with various Internet communication technologies and considered their implications in art education (Lai, 2002; Lai & Ball, 2004; Lu, 2008), we came to view current trends and issues in online education from a feminist standpoint. In 2007, we took an asynchronous online discussion from an undergraduate online course, *Images of Women in Western Civilization*, as a case study to explore ways to facilitate student's online feminist critiques of images of women in the patriarchal culture. We also wanted to analyze the correlation between our facilitation and student construction of knowledge of women's lives and creativities in the Western patriarchal culture. We begin with a literature review that shaped our thinking, and then present the strategies that we adapted from the Interaction Analysis Model (IAM) as a form of online feminist pedagogy to facilitate student asynchronous online discussions. We conclude the article with analysis of student learning, and with reflections on our teaching.

**Women and Online Education**

Research focused on U.S. women and online education consistently predicts that women will continue to be major participants in postsecondary education and online education (Kramarae, 2001; 2007; Lokken, Womer, & Mullins, 2009; von Prummer, 2007). According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (Planty et al., 2008), from 1970 to 2006, female enrollment in degree-granting undergraduate institutions increased 178 percent (from 3.2 to 8.7 million). Correspondingly, the latest national annual survey conducted by Instructional Technology Council (Lokken et al., 2009) indicated that 59 percent of undergraduate online students were female. Kramarae's (2001) analysis of how women decide to take online courses indicates that some women believe that this is their only option for pursuing higher education because their family and job responsibilities hinder them from attending traditional campus-based college classes. Some women found that studying online, at their own pace, was more enjoyable than the traditional campus class-

room experience. Recent studies (Anderson & Haddad, 2005; Caspi, Chajut, & Saporta, 2008) find that female students experience a greater sense of deep learning and satisfaction in asynchronous online class discussion than in traditional face-to-face classrooms, while male students do not show such tendencies. However, even though there is a steady increase in women enrolled in online courses, technology-enhanced courses are not necessarily designed for women (Gunn, McSparran, MacLeod, & French, 2003; Haas, Tulley, & Blair, 2002; Miller, 2005). For example, information technologies employed in online courses are often based on “masculine metaphors rather than feminist ones” (Miller, 2005).

The NCES 2008 report indicates that asynchronous Internet-based technologies have been the most widely used strategy in online courses (Parsad & Lewis, 2008). Online education theorists (Anderson 2003; Anderson & Kuskis, 2007; Garrison, Anderson, & Archer, 2000; Gunawardena, Lowe, & Anderson 1997; Hiltz & Goldman, 2005; Miller, 2005), along with practitioner-researchers (Anderson & Haddad, 2005; Conrad & Donaldson, 2004; Lai & Lu, 2007; Palloff & Pratt, 2005; Torrens, 2007; Turpin, 2007), also strongly support the educational value of asynchronous online discussion. They argue that time for reflection, time-space flexibility, multi-linear discussion threads, multiple modes of technology-enhanced interaction, the complex cognitive activities involved in Internet communication and search, opportunity for all participants to express their ideas, and quick access to multiple Internet resources can all contribute to deep learning and increased opportunities for students to learn from diverse sources. Miller (2005), in particular, argues that these features support feminist metaphors of “connections, complexity and nonlinear thinking” (p. 152). Most of these features have also been addressed and used by art educators (Garber, 2003; Keifer-Boyd, 2007; Keifer-Boyd & Smith-Shank, 2006; Thurber & Zimmerman, 2002) in the practice of feminist pedagogy. As feminist teachers, we are convinced that with thoughtfully designed facilitation of sophisticated asynchronous online discussion the benefits of enhanced student knowledge construction, academic skills, and social responsibility increases.

## Why Feminist Pedagogy?

The term “feminism” was first coined in France in the 1880s as *féminisme*, which combines woman, *femm*, and social movement or political ideology, *-isme* (Freedman, 2002); and it encompasses complex beliefs and practices that are continually being redefined by feminists. Dubois’s (2006) account of women’s history in the U.S. shows that during the mid-nineteenth century middle class women outside of the south began organizing public civic activities and forming women’s clubs to reach out to those in need of support and to engage in system reforms. These activities marked first wave feminism, which in turn contributed to women’s and children’s labor legislation reforms and women’s suffrage. From then on, through activism and social reforms, feminists constantly (de)constructed and challenged women’s perceptions of self, relationships to others, and their place in various cultural institutions.

Dubois (2006) recounts that during the late 1960s, and early 1980s, second wave feminists in the U.S. strove to become empowered through obtaining equal rights in every aspect of their lives. They argued, for instance, for equal educational opportunity, equal quality education, equal employment opportunity, and equal pay. Some second wave feminist activists began establishing women’s studies as an academic field at universities in the U.S. Through theorizing, teaching, and hiring more female faculty, feminists were able to bring to university disciplines “women’s knowledge and voices in from obscurity and opened up a new way of looking at social reality” (Merrill, 2005, p. 42). However, as Dubois (2006) notes, they were “tempted to a degree of essentialism in making claims for all women on the basis of the experience of some” (p. 54). Several other scholars on feminism (Dicker & Piepmeier, 2003; Doyer & Jones, 2006; Snyder, 2008), along with feminist arts and humanities teachers (Love & Helmbrecht, 2007; Turpin, 2007), hold that such attempts to unite women have in turn marginalized other women, including lesbians, women of color, and working-class women. As these “other” women challenged the tendency within the second wave to produce a sweeping category of “women,” they have also paved the way for a third wave feminism to emerge.

Initiated by Rebecca Walker in 1992 (Snyder, 2008), new “third

wave” feminists are taking their own social and cultural conditions into account as they engage feminism in ways that they find more responsive to their time and psyche. Snyder (2008) summarizes three important approaches marking third wave feminism.

First, in response to the collapse of the category of “women,” the third wave foregrounds personal narratives that illustrate an intersectional and multiperspectival version of feminism. Second, as a consequence of the rise of postmodernism, third-wavers embrace multivocality over synthesis and action over theoretical justification. Finally, in response to the divisiveness of the sex wars, third-wave feminism emphasizes an inclusive and nonjudgmental approach that refuses to police the boundaries of the feminist political. (pp. 175-176)

The emerging discourses of third wave feminism are challenging women to reconsider “representation, empowerment and their place in the realm of social action” (Love & Helmbrecht, 2007, p. 42). For example, self-identified third wavers see themselves facing a world “colonized by the mass media and information technology” (Snyder, 2008, p. 178). Indeed, a body of literature has developed to explain or critique ways third wavers associate with (technologized) popular visual culture, media images of women, and diverse forms of body projects.<sup>2</sup> We are particularly intrigued by Johnson’s (2007) confession revealing how mass media teaches her about the world and empowered her life as a woman and academician. However, she admits that she is like other third wave feminists (Bailey, 2007; Baumgardner, 2000) in the academy who also grew up with and developed a sense of guilty pleasure toward mass media. They recognize how television promotes patriarchal culture, but they paradoxically embrace it as a site of empowerment and pleasure.

Dicker and Piepmeier (2003), Heywood and Drake (1997), and

2 We can cite several cases: Doyle and Jones’s (2006) writing on feminism and the visual arts; Johnson’s (2007) essays on third wave feminism and television culture; Love and Helmbrecht’s (2007) critical teaching of Pink—the Dove campaign, and the film *The Devil Wears Prada*; Pitts’s (2005) theorization of women’s and female cyborg’s body projects; and finally, Walker’s (2003) writing about her obsession with the skin colors and body images of others, as well as her own.

Snyder (2008) assert that many feminists find the approaches of the third wave problematic, especially their uncritical acceptance and creation of popular visual culture and personal narratives, their playful and apolitical stances, their over-emphasis on individual pleasure, their lack of interest in theoretical analysis or theoretically justifying their actions, and their lack of a unified vision by which to inspire a social movement. Nevertheless, in defending the third wave’s approaches, Bailey (2007) argues:

[Third wavers are] active, primarily engaging with cultural images of women, both in the critique of such images and in the creation of new ones, especially the production of music, zines, and web-sites. [...] These cultural productions and critiques constitute meaningful feminist activism primarily as resistance to the cultural forces that shape their development as subjects. (p. 81)

As feminist visual culture teachers, we are particularly aware of the critique of third wave approaches to popular visual culture and technology. We agree with Love and Helmbrecht (2007) that feminist teachers should raise “a consciousness of social conditions and a commitment to the undoing of patriarchal systems” among our students (p. 44). Therefore, we delve deeper in the next section on ways art educators and online educators integrate feminist pedagogy with visual culture art education and online pedagogy to encourage students to challenge patriarchy.

### Feminist Approaches to Knowledge Construction

Feminist scholars in the arts (Chadwick, 2002; Freedman, 2002; Meskimmon, 2003; Nochlin, 1989; Pollock, 1999) argue that because of gender inequalities, knowledge of art produced by the canon has marginalized women’s creativity and contributions to the art worlds. Clark and Folgo (2006) in their article, *Who says there have been great women artists?*, provide evidence of imbalanced representations of female artists in art textbooks. Doyle and Jones (2006) stress that gendered experience and discrimination in the art world cannot be examined independent

from raced, classed, and sexed experiences. Therefore, a feminist critique of *the canon* should also challenge the dearth of works from and about women of color and lesbians. Further, Keifer-Boyd (2003) and Meskimmon (2003) have shown how student responses to art are often based on normative gender stereotypes. Unfortunately, “stereotypes of females tend to be aligned with qualities not highly valued in this society and do not match prevalent definitions of art and artists” (Keifer-Boyd, 2003, p. 315).

Feminist art educators (Garber, 2003; hooks, 2000; Keifer-Boyd, 2003; Keifer-Boyd, Amburgy, & Knight’s 2007; Lai, 2009; Love & Helmbrecht, 2007; Turpin, 2007), however, have tenaciously used feminist pedagogy to counteract gender inequalities, such as, by implementing learning activities and materials that challenge and (re)shape gendered knowing and gendered knowledge. Particularly, Keifer-Boyd et al.’s (2007) learning activity on gender constructions provides an opportunity for students to learn that one’s sense of gendered identity—how one knows how to perform or what constitutes masculinity or femininity—can be shaped by popular visual culture such as children’s toys. Furthermore, current discussions on visual culture orientations in art education have encouraged a rethinking of what and why visual culture should be included in formal education. Having recognized problems associated with the gendered canonical tradition in art education, art educators (Freedman, 2003; Garber, 2003; Keifer-Boyd et al., 2007; Lai & Ball, 2002; Love & Helmbrecht, 2007) urge art teachers to incorporate into the curriculum not only a wider variety of visual culture that students are encountering in their everyday lives (e.g., mass media product, children’s toy, yard art, popular music, and body art), but also various critical approaches, including feminist ones, to analyze visual culture.

Nevertheless, we are concerned that art educators may not provide ample opportunities for students to explore diverse visual cultures from a feminist approach. The online asynchronous discussion, however, can provide a feminist learning space that allows, for example, simultaneously multiple analyses of visual cultures for collective, extended viewing. Yet, it takes a careful consideration of online feminist pedagogy, as elaborated below, to effectively facilitate student online discussions.

In our study, we adopted a knowledge construction framework,

known as the Interaction Analysis Model (IAM), to help students develop feminist critiques of images of women in patriarchal visual cultures. IAM was developed in 1997 by Gunawardena, Lowe, and Anderson, who are proponents of social psychology and constructivism. IAM is a grounded theory that outlines five types of cognitive activity involved in the construction of knowledge in the context of asynchronous online discussions: (a) sharing and comparing of ideas, (b) cognitive dissonance, (c) co-construction of knowledge, (d) assessing proposed constructions, and (e) applying newly constructed knowledge. While these cognitive activities do not always appear sequentially in online discussions, they indicate increasing levels of knowledge construction. Therefore, when teachers facilitate online discussions they should encourage students to move from sharing personal ideas to applying newly constructed knowledge outside the classroom. Gunawardena et al., (1997) also suggest that the more different types of cognitive activity occur in discussions, the more we can expect intricate learning outcomes.

The instructional strategies for each type of cognitive activity may differ. To encourage students sharing and comparing ideas—including personal narratives, observations, and questions—the teacher facilitates personal testimonies that help students learn about each other. The teacher actively welcomes students to share their ideas, and models respect for different ideas. Students should then feel empowered enough to speak out as they learn that their ideas are important, and they learn to communicate effectively without physical cues, thus establishing a non-threatening feminist online learning environment. Cognitive dissonance refers to inconsistency or disagreement among ideas. To turn cognitive dissonance into learning moments, the instructor can guide students to discover and explore areas of inconsistency or disagreement as their narratives unfold. Teachers can help students learn to raise questions to gain further understanding of each other’s perspectives and they can ask students to marshal evidence to support their ideas. This helps students exercise critical inquiry and hone self-reflective skills, which are utilized by feminist art educators (Keifer-Boyd et al., 2007; Love & Helmbrecht, 2007; Turpin, 2007). To facilitate co-construction of knowledge, teachers can prompt students to examine assumptions influencing their ideas, negotiate meanings, evaluate different ideas, and propose new ideas

embodying co-construction. To engage students with assessing proposed constructions, teachers can suggest that students compare their proposed ideas against existing cognitive schema, prior knowledge or assumptions, personal experience, or contradictory testimony in the literature, and then modify proposed constructions. These strategies can address the critique of the third wave approach to visual culture by preventing students from uncritically accepting each other's personal narratives, and these strategies help students to deeply engage with diverse perspectives and theorization. To encourage students to apply newly constructed knowledge, teachers can ask students to find ways to integrate this new knowledge in their everyday experiences. Students can then discuss and assess their experiences to discover whether their ways of thinking have indeed changed.

Research shows that successful online learning is grounded in social constructivism (Campos, 2004; Gunawardena et al., 1997; Gunawardena & McIsaac, 2004; Jeong, 2003; Kanuka & Anderson, 1998; Palloff & Pratt, 2005). Learning takes place as students construct knowledge and negotiate meaning through socially interactive conversations and non-threatening intensive collaboration. This corresponds to feminist developmental psychology and pedagogy. For instance, Miller (2005) argues that feminist metaphors "depict cognitive development as collaboration, mutual support, forming connections, cooperation, and flexible negotiation of complex (rather than simple linear) developmental routes" (p. 150). Kirkup (2005) maintains that feminist online pedagogy emphasizes student voice, participation, and negotiation. Garber (2003) suggests that feminist art teachers should help students seek knowledge on their own terms, through group and collaborative learning. Furthermore, Lather (2006) and Sanchez-Casal and Macdonald (2002) note that feminist teachers show deep respect for experience-based knowledge and encourage students to situate and apply knowledge in a way that is personally meaningful and relevant. Considering these views regarding feminist pedagogy, we consider the IAM useful for guiding our online feminist pedagogy.

## **Design of the Case Study**

We conducted a case study of our facilitation of feminist critiques of images of women in patriarchy in a 15-week undergraduate upper-level online art appreciation course, *Images of Women in Western Civilization*, which was held at a college in the northeastern United States. The course was delivered entirely online by a comprehensive course management system called ANGEL (Asynchronous New Global Environment for Learning). There was no required face-to-face meeting during the semester. As a general education course, the majority of the students were non-art or non-art education majors. Alice Lai was the instructor for the course. Lilly Lu observed discussions. The participants included 29 female and 4 male students who participated in student-initiated asynchronous online discussions, which was the focus of our study. We implemented this discussion activity to enable students, rather than the instructor, to assume the role of knowledge developers. Each week the discussion initiator chose an issue or topic of interest derived from the course readings as the focus of his or her discussion thread. The instructor applied IAM to help students conduct their discussions and apply different types of cognitive activities to construct knowledge.

Data collected included student online discussion posts and student learning journals. The goals of data analysis were to identify the types of cognitive activity in student's discussions and discern recurring feminist critique of images of women in patriarchal culture. We performed an interpretative qualitative content analysis. We coded and analyzed data with "category construction" (Merriam, 1998, p. 179) to identify "recurring regularities or patterns" (p. 181). In the next section, we present recurring critiques that point toward a radical feminist perspective.

## **Facilitation of Student Feminist Critiques of Images of Women in Patriarchy**

Illustrated in this section is a sampling of students' feminist critiques of images of women in patriarchal culture as facilitated by IAM.

This sampling is selected from a recurring and the most enthusiastic issue students explored in their asynchronous online discussion: the impact of the lack of women's voices in the Western civilizations especially from The Paleolithic Period to the Rome Empire. A concern—noted by one of the students (VG), which was also recognized by other students—indicated that a full picture of women's lives was absent in visual and written records. Women's perceptions of self and their creativity was difficult for students to reconstruct due to the dearth of authentic primary sources by and about women, and the predominant focus on men's lives.

I was amazed at the lack of identity that women had in the early times. As these depictions were furnished by the male gender, what do you think the women were thinking about the lack of identity and respect that was offered them? Do you think that women actually never recorded their thoughts? (VG, personal communication, February 4, 2007)

This post immediately evoked enthusiastic responses, which indicated that students were very interested in speculating what women actually “thought” of their lives when they were silenced, rather than theorizing, for example, what causes the silence of women's voice within a historical context. The majority of the students agreed with the assumption that women did not have agency or an ability to assert their voices, and hence did not leave records of their life experiences, especially in the early civilizations prior to the Roman Empire. As GS put it: “I think women in this time period didn't have much choice. I believe it was the norm and they had to be accepting of it and pretty much keep living day to day” (GS, personal communication, February 6, 2007). On the other hand, a few students with a different assumption claimed that “there definitely is a pattern of male dominance [...] but there are always the women who just don't accept it as the norm” (MB, personal communication, February 9, 2007). Within a week, students reached a consensus that it is difficult today to understand what women thought of themselves in the past because of the dearth of information.

We observed that students began to take a radical feminist perspective to critique patriarchal culture, yet also held that men were at

fault (rather than a patriarchal society) for women's oppression. Although there were two distinct positions that developed in their discussions, students seemed to be ready to settle with their own opinions and “agree to disagree.” We were concerned that if discussion were to stop there, students would not engage in deeper learning about whether or not there were records of women's lives and creativity, and regarding the patriarchal system, and other sources of oppression. Nor would they be able to develop critical inquiry and self-reflexive skills that they could use in other contexts to critique and reject images promoting patriarchy. Thus, we strategically prompted students to apply different types of cognitive activity to generate new perspectives. Alice acknowledged the enthusiasm elicited by the discussion topic and asked students to find supporting evidence to sustain their opinions.

These facilitation strategies helped move discussions towards deeper, richer, and critical directions. For example, in a sub-thread discussion, students who supported the first assumption began analyzing different sources of oppression to support their views. MM hypothesized how mythology contributed to male dominance, the silencing of women, and gender stereotypes: “While men, much like gods, are often congratulated for having more than one sexual relationship, women are thought of as evil and disgusting for doing the same thing. Many of our current attitudes toward sex and gender come right from mythology” (personal communication, February 6, 2007). Consequently, whereas mythology was originally perceived as leisure time innocent reading, SW began joining MM in the task of de-romanticizing Greek mythology (personal communication, February 10, 2007). SW realized that mythology could hinder women's sense of self-worth and make them feel inferior to men. To offer a counter argument, MB used visual images and information found on the Internet—about Hera, the Amazon women, and the women from Lesbos—as examples to demonstrate that literature did not always depict women as inferior and belittled (personal communication, February 9, 2007). We immediately acknowledged MB's extra effort.

VG, the discussion initiator, offered a “terrible tale of Philomela [found at] [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weaving\\_\(mythology\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weaving_(mythology))” to counter the idea that women did not record their thoughts (VG, personal communication, February 13, 2007). She learned the story while surfing on

the Internet looking for some intriguing example of women's creative works in ancient times: In Greek mythology, Philomela was raped and her tongue was cut out. Without a voice, she wove her story into tapestry and sent it to her sister so that together they could take revenge. This tale, as VV affirmed, revealed how "women used art as a form of communication. Without it, today, we would not be familiar with what occurred in the past" (personal communication, February 17, 2007). As a result, students began including URL links in their discussion posts and sharing images of women's creative works and lives. Greek vases of about 560 B.C.E., clothes, quilts, pottery, and students' own needle works were other examples that emerged from student discussions. These examples of visual culture as MM asserted "gave a voice to a woman who may not have had one any other way" (personal communication, February 15, 2007). From the standpoint of knowledge construction, we observed a distinct transformation from sharing ideas to cognitive dissonance and then to co-construction of knowledge. Students first assumed that women's experiences in the early civilizations were not recorded; then they discussed areas of disagreement, which led them to begin seeing that women documented their struggles and experiences through a variety of creative works.

Still students persistently asserted that women's creativity had long been suppressed by various institutional and gender norms. They affirmed that women's creativity shown in clothes, pottery, cooking, home decoration, and gardening is generally not regarded as art by contemporary art historians and critics. They pondered whether this was because women had lower social status than men and, therefore, their ideas and works were seen as less important and less intelligent. SW asserted: "These items do tell a story of women's lives and should be considered art" (personal communication, February 10, 2007). However, other students pointed out that lacking formal education and social status available to their male counterparts, women rarely had chances to assert their creativity.

We observed that students continued to exercise higher-level cognitive activities: co-construction of knowledge and assessing proposed constructs. They gained new knowledge and perspectives through investigating how and through what artifacts women of ancient Greek and

Roman civilizations were able to express their voices. They demonstrated a feminist perspective of intersectionality as they saw that women's experiences of oppression cannot and should not be analyzed and appreciated exclusively by gendered designations. Class location, education, and age should also be considered. Of the five types of cognitive activity, application of newly constructed knowledge, however, rarely appeared in this particular discussion thread. We could only select MM's post to illustrate the attempt to apply newly constructed knowledge to situations outside the course. MM's post also indicated how students might apply their newly-learned feminist critique of patriarchal visual culture to challenge gender inequalities in other contexts.

[Women's] work, if it has survived at all, is usually displayed in historical museums rather than art museums. This makes me consider whether or not crafts and objects made for the home should be classified as art. If we do not call them art, we will be excluding thousands of years of work created almost exclusively by women. Should crafts be considered art? Should the people who created these crafts appear in a section of an art history textbook? (MM, personal communication, April 22, 2007)

### **Reflection and Conclusion**

Taking cues from a number of self-identified proponents of third wave feminism (Bailey, 2007; Baumgardner & Richards, 2000; Dicker & Piepmeier, 2003; Heywood & Drake, 1997; Johnson, 2007), we recognize that our students are living in postmodern cultural and material realities. They have particular interests in popular visual culture, Internet technologies, global capitalism, and seeing self as a construct of multiple cultural identities. We applied IAM, student-initiated online discussion and discussion facilitation strategies reflecting third wave approaches to knowledge construction: non-threatening/playful, personal narrative, intersectional, simultaneous multivocal, inclusive, and experiential (as opposed to theoretical). However, we did not intend to simply encourage students to share their personal narratives uncritically and without

guidance in asynchronous discussions. We agree with feminist scholars (Dubois, 2006; Love & Helmbrecht, 2007; Snyder, 2008) that a sense of women's history, a critical response to and rejection of patriarchal visual culture, and the ability to engage in intelligent dialogue about personal narratives and women's experiences are imperative to our teaching goals. As illustrated, student feminist critiques of images of women resonated with a feminist scholarly critique (Meskimmon, 2003; Pollock, 1999) of visual culture in a patriarchy: the lack of women's voices, dearth of resources made by women to understand women's lives and experiences, gender stereotypes as represented in classical mythology, gender inequality in the art world, and the possibility of learning about women's lives through their creative works rather than through written records.

Our observation and analysis of student discussions indicate that students have achieved feminist consciousness-raising and developed a critical view towards their social and educational environment. Nevertheless, there was no strong evidence suggesting that students intended to apply their newly constructed knowledge as well as a new critical voice to *undo* patriarchal systems (Love & Helmbrecht, 2007). Our literature review indicates that feminist teaching encourages activism; and third wave feminists in particular embrace action over theoretical analysis. Because students were physically dispersed in different geographical locations and time zones, it was rather unfeasible for students to organize civic activities together and apply their newly constructed knowledge or critical voice to advocate issues important to the lives of women today. While some students revealed in their learning journals that they have begun "talking back" when they see or hear gender stereotypes, in our view such action is based on individual effort and may not achieve large-scale social change. In the future, we plan to experiment with Internet-based activism to allow students to utilize technology to engage with feminist social change.

As feminist teachers, we have learned about and advocated several aspects of online feminist pedagogy. A feminist approach to asynchronous online discussion encourages students to thoughtfully compose feminist critiques of patriarchal visual culture, compare and contrast their discoveries with each other, and continue to build on each others' ideas. It in turn helps students become knowledge developers rather than

passive consumers of knowledge and visual culture. Students can attach images or insert URL links (to images) to their posts. This technology makes it possible for students to overcome time, space, and resource constraints as they examine carefully and together how women are represented in various forms of visual culture. Quick access to a wealth of still and motion digital visual culture on the Internet also motivates students to actively search for images and information. Yet, to ensure quality and reliability of student-generated Internet information, the instructor needs to help students learn how to differentiate reliable Internet resources from unreliable ones. This process in turn can strengthen the student's ability to be a critical viewer of visual culture. Finally, we maintain that by applying the Interaction Analysis Model we can foster a feminist learning space that privileges dialogue, collaboration, experience-based knowledge, and gender-centeredness—all of which resonates with feminist pedagogy.

## References

- Anderson, T. (2003). *E-learning in the 21st century: A framework for research and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Anderson, D. M., & Haddad, C. J. (2005). Gender, voice and learning in online course environments. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 9(1), 3-14.
- Anderson, T., & Kuskis, A. (2007). Modes of interaction. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of distance education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 295-309). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Bailey, C. (2007). When girls just wanna have fun: Third-wave cultural engagement as political activism. In D. Orr, D. Taylor, E. Kahl, K. Earle, C. Rainwater & L. Lopez McAlister (Eds.), *Feminist politics: Identity, difference, and agency* (pp. 81-98). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Baumgardner, J. (2000). Introduction to Jennifer. In J. Baumgardner & A. Richards (Eds.), *Manifesta: Young women, feminism, and the future* (pp. xv-xxi). New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Baumgardner, J., & Richards, A. (Eds.). (2000). *Manifesta: Young women, feminism, and the future*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
- Campos, M. (2004). A constructivist method for the analysis of networked cognitive communication and the assessment of collaborative learning and knowledge-building. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 8(2), 1-29.
- Caspi, A., Chajut, E., & Saporta, K. (2008). Participation in class and online discussions: Gender differences. *Computers & Education*, 50(3), 718-724.
- Chadwick, W. (2002). *Women, art, and society* (3rd ed.). New York: Thames & Hudson Inc.
- Clark, R., & Folgo, A. (2006). Who says there have been great women artists? Some afterthoughts. *Art Education*, 59(2), 47-52.
- Conrad, R., & Donaldson, J. A. (2004). *Engaging the online learner: Activities and resources for creative instruction*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dicker, R. C., & Piepmeier, A. (Eds.). (2003). *Catching a wave: Reclaiming feminism for the 21st century*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Doyer, J., & Jones, A. (2006). Introduction: New feminist theories of visual culture. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 31(3), 607-615.
- Dubois, E. C. (2006). Three decades of women's history. *Women's Studies*, 35(1), 47-64.
- Freedman, E. (2002). *No turning back: The history of feminism and the future of women*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Freedman, K. (2003). *Teaching visual culture: Curriculum, aesthetics, and the social life of art*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Garber, E. (2003). Teaching about gender issues in the art education classroom: Myra Sadker Day. *Studies in Art Education*, 45(1), 56-72.
- Garrison, D. R., Anderson, T., & Archer, W. (2000). Critical thinking in a text-based environment: Computer conferencing in higher education. *Internet and Higher Education*, 2(2-3), 87-105.
- Gunawardena, C. N., Lowe, C. A., & Anderson, T. (1997). Analysis of a global online debate and the development of an interaction analysis model for examining social construction of knowledge in computer conferencing. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 17(4), 397-431.
- Gunawardena, C. N., & McIsaac, M. S. (2004). Distance education. In D. H. Jonassen (Ed.), *The handbook of research on education communications and technology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 355-395). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Gunn, C., McSporrán, M., MacLeod, H., & French, S. (2003). Dominant or different? Gender issues in computer supported learning. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, 7(1), 14-30.
- Haas, A., Tulley, C., & Blair, K. (2002). Mentors versus masters: Women's and girls' narratives of (re)negotiation in web-based writing spaces. *Computers and Composition*, 19(3), 231-249.
- Heywood, L., & Drake, J. (Eds.). (1997). *Third wave agenda: Being feminist, doing feminism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hiltz, S. R., & Goldman, R. (Eds.). (2005). *Learning together online:*

- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Jeong, A. C. (2003). The sequential analysis of group interaction and critical thinking in online. *American Journal of Distance Education*, 17(1), 25-43.
- Johnson, M. L. (Ed.). (2007). *Third wave feminism and television: Jane puts it in a box*. New York: I.B. Tauris.
- Kanuka, H., & Anderson, T. (1998). Online social interchange, discord, and knowledge construction. *Journal of Distance Education*, 13(1) 57-74.
- Keifer-Boyd, K. (2003). A pedagogy to expose and critique gendered cultural stereotypes embedded in art interpretations. *Studies in Art Education*, 44(4), 315-334.
- Keifer-Boyd, K. (2007). From content to form: Judy Chicago's pedagogy with reflections by Judy Chicago. *Studies in Art Education: A Journal of Issues and Research in Art Education*, 48(2), 133-153.
- Keifer-Boyd, K., Amburgy, P., & Knight, W. B. (2007). Unpacking privilege: Memory, culture, gender, race, and power in visual culture. *Art Education*, 60(3), 19-24.
- Keifer-Boyd, K., & Smith-Shank, D. L. (2006). Speculative fiction's contribution to contemporary understanding: The handmaid art tale. *Studies in Art Education*, 47(2), 139-154.
- Kirkup, G. (2005). Developing practice for online feminist pedagogy. In R. Braidotti & A. van Baren (Eds.), *The making of European women's studies* (Vol. VI) (pp. 26-40). Utrecht: Athena.
- Kramarae, C. (2001). *The third shift: Women learning online*. Washington, DC: AAUW Educational Foundation.
- Kramarae, C. (2007). Gender matters in online learning. In M. G. Moore (Ed.), *Handbook of distance education* (2nd ed.) (pp. 169-180). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Lai, A. (2002). From classrooms to chatrooms: Virtualizing art education. *Art Education*, 55(4), 33-39.
- Lai, A. (2009). Images of women in visual culture. *Art Education*, 62(1), 14-19.
- Lai, A., & Ball, E. (2002). Home is where the art is: Exploring the places people live through art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 44(1), 47-65.
- Lai, A., & Ball, E. L. (2004). Students online as cultured subjects: Prolegomena to researching multicultural arts courses on the web. *Studies in Art Education*, 46(1), 20-33.
- Lai, A., & Lu, L. (2007). Facilitative strategies for enhancing knowledge construction through asynchronous discussion in an online art course. In C. Crawford (Ed.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education International Conference 2007* (pp. 2673-2680). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.
- Lather, P. (2006). The absent presence: Patriarchy, capitalism, and the nature of teacher work. In E. F. Jr. Provenzo (Ed.), *Critical issues in education: An anthology of readings* (pp. 154-167). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lokken, F., Womer, L., & Mullins, C. (2009). 2008 *Distance education survey results: Tracking the impact of e-learning at community colleges*. Washington, DC: Instructional Technology Council.
- Love, M. A., & Helmbrecht, B. M. (2007). Teaching the conflicts: (Re) Engaging students with feminism in a postfeminist world. *Feminist Teacher*, 18(1), 41-58.
- Lu, L. (2008). Art Café: A 3D virtual learning environment for art education. *Art Education*, 61(6), 48-53.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Merrill, B. (2005). Dialogical feminism: Other women and the challenge of adult education. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 24(1), 41-52.
- Meskimmon, M. (2003). *Women making art: History, subjectivity, aesthetics*. New York: Routledge.
- Miller, P. H. (2005). Gender and information technology: Perspectives from human cognitive development. *Frontiers*, 26(1), 148-167.
- Nochlin, L. (1989). *Women, art, and power and other essays*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Palloff, R. M., & Pratt, K. (2005). *Collaborating online: Learning together in community*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Parsad, B., & Lewis, L. (2008). *Distance education at degree-granting*

- postsecondary institutions: 2006–07 (NCES 2009–044)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Pitts, V. (2005). Feminism, technology and body projects. *Women's Studies*, 34(3), 229-247.
- Planty, M., Hussar, W., Snyder, T., Provasnik, S., Kena, G., Dinkes, R., Kewalramani, A., & Kemp, J. (2008). *The condition of education 2008 (NCES 2008-031)*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Pollock, G. (1999). *Differencing the canon: Feminism and the writing of art's histories*. New York: Routledge.
- Sanchez-Casal, S., & Macdonald, A. A. (Eds.). (2002). *Twenty-first-century feminist classrooms: Pedagogies of identity and difference*. New York: Palgrave.
- Snyder, R. C. (2008). What is third-wave feminism? A new directions essay. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 34(1), 175-196.
- Thurber, F., & Zimmerman, E. (2002). An evolving feminist leadership model for art education. *Studies in Art Education*, 44(1), 5-27.
- Torrens, K. M. (2007). Disrupting transmission: Online learning in gender communication. *Transformations*, 18(1), 52-62.
- Turpin, C. A. (2007). Feminist praxis, online teaching, and the urban campus. *Feminist Teacher*, 18(1), 9-27.
- von Prummer, C. (2007). Distance education. In B. J. Bank, S. Delamont & C. Marshall (Eds.), *Gender and education: An encyclopedia* (Vol. 1) (pp. 163-170). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Walker, R. (2003). Forward. In O. Edut & R. Walker (Eds.), *Body outlaws: Rewriting the rules of beauty and body image* (2nd ed. (pp. xiii-xix.). Emeryville, CA: Seal Press.

### About the Authors

Alice Lai, Ph.D., is associate professor of the arts and educational studies at Empire State College, State University of New York, where she also chairs the Center for Distance Learning's undergraduate program in the arts. Her research spans the areas of critical multicultural art education, critical pedagogy, visual culture studies, and distance education. Her publications have appeared in *Studies in Art Education*, *Art Education*, and *Pedagogy*.

Lilly (Li-Fen) Lu, Ph.D., is an assistant professor of art education at Northern Illinois University. With a background in Instructional Technology, her research focuses on integrating emerging technology into art education and digital visual culture. Her specialty areas include virtual worlds pedagogy and research methodology, online distance education and communities of practice, and technology in teacher education. Lilly is currently working on the research grant "Art Café @ Second Life," awarded by National Art Education Foundation (2008-2009), to explore and develop the virtual pedagogies and investigate "virtual" visual culture for 21st century art education. Recent selected publications include: "Art Café: A 3D Virtual Learning Environment for Art Education" in *Art Education* (2008) and "Knowledge Construction in In-service Teacher Online Discourse: Impacts of Instructor Roles and Facilitative Strategies in the *Journal of Research on Technology in Education* (2006).

Correspondence regarding this article should be addressed to the authors at Alice.Lai@esc.edu and lillylu26@gmail.com