

---

# Gender Studies: A 'Cheeky Knowledge' Renormalised?

Farinaz Fassa and Sabine Kradolfer

---

## Abstract

Our contribution investigates the institutionalisation process of gender studies in a Swiss French-speaking university, with a particular focus on its articulation with local social demands. The new academic governance has transformed the debates around such studies in a way that might have been expected to benefit gender studies, whose interdisciplinarity was initially seen as an undeniable advantage. Nevertheless, comparison with the changes that have occurred over the past 25 years in another interdisciplinary field of knowledge, area studies, suggests that the social resistances and new scientific objects offered by women's/gender studies or area studies tend to be diluted under the joint influence of new social demands, fragmentation and globalisation, paving the way for new (?) academic disciplinary definitions that bring back to normal the 'cheeky knowledge' built by these studies.

---

## Keywords

Gender Studies, Area Studies, Social Demand, Tertiary Education, Disciplines, Accountability, Switzerland, Knowledge, Institutionalisation

## 1 Introduction

Debates on the effects of the institutionalisation of studies specifically taking into account the question of women have gone on since the 1970s, when feminists brought women's studies into American and British universities. In the French-speaking world they emerged much later, not least because of a division of disciplines "that puts a brake on innovation" (Chaperon 2002, p. 54), and the low academic recognition of works on gender and/or sexualities. On the latter point, Revenin (2007, no pagination) speculates that it springs from a fear of "studies seen as too specific or too 'political' (such as feminist, queer or post-colonial studies)" owing to the links between feminist/gay or lesbian activism and research in these areas. These links, noted by all authors who have worked on the emergence of what we call a 'cheeky knowledge', have led to suspicions of weak scientificity and a lack of objectivity being associated with these works by the advocates of a 'normal science', thus reducing social demand to being no more than the demand of the dominant. Now, as Castel shows, "if there is bias, it only counterbalances another bias, that of the 'neutral' discourse of objectivism which takes *de facto* situations for granted and so ratifies them" (2002, p. 73). Pursuing Castel's point, one may ask to what extent 'normal science' and its modes of constitution have taken as their implicit reference white, middle- or upper-class heterosexual men.

The new academic governance, which goes hand in hand with marketisation, the introduction of managerialist tools into scientific organisations and the demand for scientific excellence, has transformed these debates in a way that might have been expected to benefit gender studies, whose interdisciplinarity was initially seen as an undeniable advantage. But as Joseph (2010) observes with reference to another field of interdisciplinary research (cultural studies), women's/gender studies is now faced with three dimensions of accountability, which are in tension with one another: the professional, the political and the institutional/managerial dimensions. These tensions were present from the moment when the question of the construction of knowledge on women and social gender relations first arose more than 40 years ago. They are now exacerbated by the growing recourse to accountability in new public management, especially at the intersection of its professional and its institutional/managerial dimensions. Since the criteria of scientific excellence have remained mainly rooted in a quite traditional disciplinary approach, researchers have to prove their adequacy to academia in a very definite field if they wish to pursue an academic career. This also means that they have to endorse the ways of doing 'normal science' in their epistemological and methodological choices. This happens even though the place of universities and their mode of governance have changed, together with the clientele of higher education, opening the doors of elitist institutions to a higher

proportion of the population – and although gender equality has, at least at the level of rhetoric, achieved a legitimacy that is no longer contested.

As a consequence, analysis of the history of the birth and institutionalisation of gender studies at the University of Lausanne, the first French-speaking Swiss university to have explicitly made an official place for this 'unruly knowledge' by appointing a professor of gender studies in 2000, may shed light on the logics and tensions that come into play when the knowledge that enters universities is knowledge driven by demands stemming from civil society and calling into question some power relations, such as gender, heterosexuality and coloniality. It was in this light that we considered that this history could constitute a case study as Burawoy (2003) defines it, since it seems to us to make it possible to extract the general from the particular, to be situated between the micro and the macro, and to relate the present to the past. Our aim is to define the issues around and the limits of institutionalisation of what we have chosen to describe as a knowledge that is 'cheeky' or 'insolent' with regard to other knowledges and their monopoly of legitimacy.

Comparison with the changes that have occurred over the past 25 years in another disciplinary area, area studies, suggests that the social resistances and new scientific objects offered by disciplines such as women's/gender studies or area studies tend to be diluted under the joint influence of social demands, fragmentation and globalisation, paving the way for a new (?) definition of academic disciplines, which brings the 'cheeky knowledge' constructed by women's/gender studies back into normality and subsumes the local knowledge of area studies under the term 'global studies'.

After briefly clarifying what is at stake when one takes epistemological and/or methodological choices linked either to disciplinarity or to inter-/transdisciplinarity, we first present the history of gender studies at the University of Lausanne, then review the recent situation of area studies in Switzerland, and finally examine the difficulties encountered by interdisciplinary knowledges such as gender studies or area studies, so long as the understanding of utility is exclusively economic and very short term.

We have based our contribution on analysis of the archives of the Centre for Gender Studies at the University of Lausanne and on our experience of having participated in that Centre from its creation. The documentary analysis we have made shows that they tell a rich and complex story explaining the setup and the transformations that mark this unusual academic field of knowledge. The comparison with area studies is based on the work and conclusions of an ad hoc working group on accountability and its problematic links with area studies (Künzler et al. 2016).

## 2 Inter-/Trans-, and Postdisciplinarity: What Does the Knowledge Built in Gender Studies Refer To?

We will borrow most of our definitions from the work of Darbellay's team<sup>1</sup> on inter- and transdisciplinarity (2014) as its research was carried out in Switzerland; it therefore analyses the same context as we do and thus is significant for our purpose. According to its results, academics belonging to interdisciplinary units but coming from different fields of knowledge and various Swiss universities insist on the necessity of opening dialogs with other fields of science, but they also report on the difficulties of practicing interdisciplinarity. The most common definition they give implies the adoption of a positioning that "brings into play two or more established disciplines so that they interact dynamically to allow the complexity of a given object of study to be described, analysed and understood" (Darbellay 2014, p. 165).<sup>2</sup> However, such an epistemology and methodology can be understood in two different ways. The first one, aiming to cross the "disciplinary boundaries, [...] entails a major reconfiguring of disciplinary divisions within a systemic, global and integrated perspective" (Darbellay 2014, p. 166). While this understanding of inter-/transdisciplinarity produces new 'thought styles', the second definition given to inter-/transdisciplinarity tries mainly to bridge the gap between fundamental and applied sciences. It is "more pragmatic, participative and applied and [it] can be thought of as a method of research that brings political, social and economic actors, as well as ordinary citizens, into the research process itself, in a 'problem-solving' perspective". In this view, "actors from outside the scientific field could contribute to the construction of knowledge and solution of social problems that fall outside disciplinary boundaries" (Darbellay 2014, p. 166). This was clearly the situation of gender studies at its beginning.

- 
- 1 Sixty-six academics involved in interdisciplinary research were interviewed and surveyed through the research project *Analysing Interdisciplinary Research: From Theory to Practice. Case Studies in the Swiss University Context*, funded in 2013–2014 by the Swiss National Science Foundation by a committee specialised in interdisciplinary research. The project leaders were Frédéric Darbellay (main applicant), Pasqualina Perrig-Chiello, Anne-Claude Berthoud and François Höpflinger (co-applicants). The members of the research staff were Ayuko Sedooka, Theres Paulsen and Gabriela Steffen.
  - 2 Thus, inter-/transdisciplinarity contrasts with pluri-/multidisciplinarity, as these approaches respect the "idea of the institutionalised and standardised nature of teaching and research practices, both socially and historically, which are governed by compartmentalised scientific paradigms" and offer only a mere addition of "disciplinary viewpoints, in succession and in isolation without any real interaction between them" (Darbellay 2014, p. 165).

The development of gender studies and other areas of teaching and research classified under the heading of 'studies' and their relative institutionalisation during the past 40 years change the place given to these outsiders, especially when these hybrid bodies of knowledge cannot show their immediate utility. To compensate for their difficulty in responding to such a demand, they have to look for other justifications than efficiency (managerial and political accountabilities) to justify their existence. They tend to emphasise professional accountability, which is even more than previously guided by the criteria of normal disciplinary science, as the quest for so-called 'scientific excellence' has been amplified by commodification and competition in an academia ruled by neo-liberal policies.

Therefore, the paradox that surrounds interdisciplinarity, as noted by one of Darbellay's interviewees, is particularly relevant to gender studies; it is officially praised as it may increase the body of knowledge and respond to new thematic problems, but it also makes careers difficult for young researchers who are fighting to have their areas of knowledge recognised as ordinary fields of teaching and searching in academia:

"Officially there is an open discourse on interdisciplinarity but it is not serious about interdisciplinarity. It is makeshift. And when a professor is appointed, he cannot be appointed on the basis of his interdisciplinary qualities because that comes later. There you have it. If we recruit someone who is young, he must be highly specialised, highly disciplinary." (Darbellay 2014, p. 168)

The tension between the individual goal of making a career and the collective and emancipatory aims of developing hybrid knowledge that answers social demands linked to feminist/gay or lesbian activism and research in these areas is especially important. Gender studies, which rooted itself in social contestations of an unfair gender order and included a very unruly epistemology (e. g. 'situated knowledge' – Haraway 1991; Harding and Norberg 2005) that paid attention to social demands emanating from activists, is nowadays being pushed to withdraw into academia. Thus, it is under pressure to accept the dominant order that it fought at its beginning and to break off the dialogues it was prone to have with civil society.

The same analysis can be made for any studies whose main research theme is constituted by a social group that is dominated, e. g. gay and lesbian studies, post-colonial studies, or cultural studies, when related to areas that do not count for much within the new competitive (knowledge) economy. But it certainly does not apply as such to tourism studies, Darbellay's field, so his plea for a postdisciplinarity "that can both capitalise on the contributions of disciplines while transforming them into new theoretical, methodological and practical frameworks" (2016, p. 371) cannot be directly transposed to gender studies. For all the reasons given above and

because this area of knowledge is suspected of being too political, in gender studies one may have doubts about whether the “emergence and development of these new profiles of researchers, who release disciplinary anchors and who are able to transform disciplines in a dialogical perspective in order to analyse and understand the complexity of tourism practices, are perhaps now possible” (Darbellay 2016, p. 370).

---

### **3 Social Demands, Indiscipline and Discipline: LIEGE and Gender Studies at Lausanne**

The institutional place assigned in Switzerland to knowledge on women and social gender relations cannot be understood unless it is integrated into a context marked by intellectual influences and career management. However, geographical proximity (to Germany or France) does not always mean intellectual proximity, because the ideas and knowledge at the heart of disciplines circulate and are retranslated locally.

#### **3.1 A Complex Social Demand**

It should be added that the articulation of Swiss policies on gender equality in education and training with the international or national agenda is far from accidental. Switzerland’s signature of a number of international treaties (the 1990 UN *International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families*, the 1979 UN *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*, etc.) which bear on women’s rights, and the development of structures to promote gender equality in the cantons and higher education institutions (Fassa 2016b), should also not be neglected; likewise the reorganisation of Swiss higher education and the development of the *Hautes Écoles Spécialisées* (Universities of Applied Sciences, i. e. higher education establishments whose teaching and training are more immediately vocationally oriented) since 1995.

As regards higher education, the first Federal Equal Opportunities Programme, *Gender Equality in Universities (Federal Equal Opportunities Programme 2000–2004)*, came shortly after Switzerland signed the Bologna Declaration and was integrated into what is now referred to as the European Research Area. The exhortations of the European Parliament in 1988 urging states to create professorial chairs and set up specialised courses on women (ANEF 2014), followed by those of the European Commission, which has funded several studies on the situation of women in universities and research, in which Switzerland has sometimes participated (e. g.

in the framework of the *Helsinki Group* [Rehmann 2004]), catalysed the process of institutionalisation of gender studies in the academic world. Like gender equality, it also benefited considerably from the reorganisation of the universities at the turn of the century. The 1999 law on the universities (*Federal Law of 8 October, 1999 on Financial Aid to Universities*) redefined the objectives and means of Swiss science policy, one of the most significant features of this reform being the delegation of more power to university executives through the *Swiss University Conference*,<sup>3</sup> which served as “a common strategic organ of the confederation and the cantons, empowered to take binding decisions for the sector” (Joye-Cagnard 2008, p. 39).

In this framework, the birth of the Swiss University Conference contributed both to the development of gender studies and to the permanent incorporation of gender equality in the governance of universities. Under its aegis, three nationwide programmes were set up, two of which very directly concern our subject: the *Federal Equal Opportunities Programmes* and the *Cooperation and Innovation Programmes*<sup>4</sup> (the third programme was for the setup of a ‘virtual campus’) which aimed to restructure the organisation and teaching activities of the universities and reduce their fragmentation. It was with the aid of this instrument that the *Network Gender Studies Switzerland* was set up and teaching posts on gender could be financed in some universities.

- 
- 3 The management of this specific programme was initially in the hands of the *Swiss Conference of Universities' Rectorates* (2000–2004). The *Swiss University Conference* then took over until the implementation of the *Law on the Encouragement and Coordination of the Swiss Higher Education Sector* on 1 January 2015. At that time, the *Swiss University Conference* was replaced by *Swissuniversities*, a conference which brings together all higher education institutions, both universities and vocational institutions.
  - 4 The *Cooperation and Innovation Programmes* favour “project-based, competitive funding. This instrument is limited in time (but renewable), and oriented towards the provision of particular services, conditional on matching funding. It is fundamentally conceived as an impulse-giving measure: the projects selected must respond to a specific interest – at a given time – relating to the policy of Swiss higher education institutions” (Joye-Cagnard 2008, p. 41). The *Network Gender Studies Switzerland* figures among the projects selected, which since 2004 have associated all Swiss universities (with the exception of the University of Italian Switzerland) to develop a network of complementary and distinctive courses and degree programmes (BA and MA). This specific programme became one of the sub-projects of the *Swiss University Conference-Programme P-4 Equal Opportunities for Women and Men at Universities/Gender Studies 2013–2016*. In this respect, and others, this last programme can be seen as a period of transition between a top-down mode of governance and a bottom-up mode of governance, the mainstreaming and institutionalising of gender equality and gender teaching being more clearly affirmed as from this fourth *Federal Equal Opportunities Programme* (cf. Fassa 2016a).

The activities of the *Network Gender Studies Switzerland* were initially aimed at promoting teaching and programmes in gender studies at the national level. They developed in two areas: designing courses and coordinating them among the various universities, and setting up study programmes in the universities concerned. This project very directly responded to the recommendations of the *Swiss University Conference*, since it involved the networking of partial projects already running in the universities themselves, and required – as in Lausanne – posts to be specifically dedicated to gender teaching and/or its coordination.

Alongside these elements it should be added – as shown by the research project led by one of the present authors on compulsory education and equality (Fassa et al. 2014) – that the few advances observed in the legal texts on compulsory schooling are, by contrast, earlier and should mainly be attributed to events linked to women's statuses in Swiss society and/or major feminist mobilisations. It was not until women won the right to vote in 1971 that the question of equality in education was raised; it was only after the introduction of an article on equality in the *Federal Constitution* (Article 8) in 1981 that the attitude of the cantons began to be questioned, and it was not until the women's strike of 1991 – more than half a million women went on strike to demand that the 1981 article be applied – that the differential socialisation performed by the school system was challenged (Fassa et al. 2014).

### 3.2 Campaigning and Mobilisation to Demand the Creation of an Interfaculty and Interdisciplinary Structure

Rather than exhaustively retracing the trajectory followed by the “specialised knowledge with a hybrid character” (Perrig-Chiello and Darbellay 2004, p. 35) that is at the heart of gender studies, the aspects that we shall discuss will make it possible to observe that interdisciplinarity has been at the heart of the Lausanne project from its inception and that has been bound up with the need for a strong institutionalisation “that corresponds to the necessity of structuring the scientific field of gender issues” (LIEGE 1998, p. 2). The same concern, according to Panatier and Roux (2006), marked the creation of the Chair in Gender Studies at the University of Basel (2001), but in that German-speaking region it was more directly set in a form of interdisciplinarity already implemented in other interdisciplinary gender research centres.<sup>5</sup> This was most probably due to the vigour of the German

---

5 The *Kompetenzzentrum Gender Studies* was founded in Zurich in 1998; a professorial chair in gender studies was not created until 2009 – half time, since its holder also worked half time in Islamology.



academic feminist movement and its involvement with issues related to diversity or post-feminism. Mostly for cultural reasons, the French-speaking part of Switzerland was much more under the influence of the debates that were prominent in the French universities, these being mostly organised around topics emerging from materialist feminism. Another difference between these two regions has mainly to do with the academic and cultural world they broadly share; the proximity to Germany, and the radicality of the reforms its academic world had to go through, organised contestation in a different way than in the French part of Switzerland, in which it was closer to the anti-liberal stances promoted by numerous researchers, among whom Dardot and Laval (2009) constitute a prominent example.

For lack of space, only a few markers will be laid down to give an understanding of how gender studies was established at the University of Lausanne and the strategic options it has taken between 1998 and 2016. December 1998, as the starting point, was the date of the request made to the Rectorate by a group of people mainly from the various echelons of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences<sup>6</sup> for the creation of an *Interfaculty Laboratory for Gender Studies (Laboratoire Interfacultaire en Études Genre*,<sup>7</sup> in French, with the acronym *LIEGE*; see *LIEGE* 1998).

The events we have highlighted make it clear that two of the three dimensions (professional, political and institutional/managerial) that Joseph (2010) distinguishes with regard to accountability were central to the *LIEGE* project from its inception, with the professional dimension mainly emerging after the institutionalisation and disciplinisation of gender studies with the creation of the *Centre for Gender Studies [Centre en Études Genre]-LIEGE* in 2008 (cf. section 3.4). For Dardot and Laval (2009), this 'accounting' is one of the key elements of new public management and it gives rise to the alignment of public institutions with those of the private sector, with the benefits and costs of every decision becoming amenable to a managerial approach that takes little account of advances in terms of the common good. They also show clearly that gender studies at the University of Lausanne has been able to draw on very different references in order to construct itself in a context marked by a major transformation of the academic arena and its modes of governance and by social movements that condemn these same political choices as those of neo-liberal policies exclusively driven by the interests of the market and/or of greater efficiency

---

6 Seven of the eight signatories (one of them a man) belonged to the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences; only one had the title of professor, and two of the women also declared their membership of a student organisation (the *CLOU - Collectif de Lutte contre Orchidée* à l'Université de Lausanne) campaigning against the austerity measures and public spending cuts imposed by the canton administration.

7 After its creation *LIEGE* became an inter-university centre and its official name in French was *Laboratoire Interuniversitaire en Études Genre* with the same acronym: *LIEGE*.

in the public sector. The special feature of the Lausanne project is that it can be understood both as a result of changes in science policy – and its implementation from a ‘managerial’ perspective – and as a result of the response given locally to a social demand inspired by the struggle against the austerity policies applied in the public administration of the canton of Vaud. This dual parentage has marked the history of gender studies in Lausanne and has the interesting feature that it invites one to try to understand how the ‘cheeky knowledge’ that underlays women’s/gender studies in the English-speaking world had to ‘behave itself’ in order to survive and develop in the Swiss university environment.

The project presented in December 1998 stressed the need to “create an inter-faculty institutional cluster for teaching and research” (LIEGE 1998, p. 1). This positioning was justified by the nature of gender studies, which “requires an integrated, cross-cutting approach which constructs relationships between different domains and disciplines, [since it cannot] be confined within a single discipline. On the contrary, the knowledge has so far made it possible to accumulate leads one to question the pertinence of the current division of disciplines, which are at least partly based on gender differences or similarities.” (LIEGE 1998, p. 2)

In this context, *LIEGE* set out a ‘twofold strategy’ that would make it possible to sensitise the university community to the question of social gender relations “both through interdisciplinary teaching and research centred on gender and through the integration of these inquiries in all faculties and disciplines” (Pannatier and Roux 2006, p. 116). The first strategy aimed to develop gender studies itself through the creation of professorial chairs in this area, and the second aimed to promote teaching by networking researchers active in the field. In more practical terms it was proposed:

- to offer a number of courses to form the core of a programme integrating social gender relations – the other courses being chosen within the faculties and remaining discipline-based;
- to give greater visibility to courses already dealing in one way or another with this issue (43 lecture courses and seminars are identified in the three faculties designated by the *LIEGE* project to take part in such a laboratory: *Lettres* [Arts], Social and Political Sciences, Theology and Science of Religions) and to create synergies capable of establishing this interfaculty laboratory as a gender studies research cluster in French-speaking Switzerland (LIEGE 1998, p. 5).

Since gender studies constitutes a body of specific knowledge, the development of gender studies also involved the institutionalisation and recognition of academic programmes in this area. A first qualification in gender studies was set up between

the Universities of Geneva and Lausanne in 1998 (a *DEA – Diplôme d'Études Approfondies*, a postgraduate diploma). A doctoral school session was organised in 1999, bringing together researchers from the Universities of Basel, Bern/Freiburg, Lausanne/Geneva and Zurich and laying the foundation for doctoral schools in gender studies, both French-speaking and German-speaking, constituting a 'pilot project' co-financed by the universities and the *Swiss University Conference* (Widmer and Schulz 2005).

Collaborating in all these structures, the project was thus clearly set in the line of work on gender (Scott and Varikas 1988) and not that of the 'women's issues' that are at the heart of women's studies. The latter paradigm was nonetheless the one invoked when the constitution of such a laboratory was justified by the requests made, from 1995 – the year of the *Fourth World Conference on Women* in Beijing (4–15 September) – by the Women's Committee of the Rectorate for the creation in the University of Lausanne of "an interfaculty department for teaching and research on the men-women issue" (LIEGE 1998, p. 1). The demands of the students and lecturers in the mobilisations of 1997 for teaching in gender studies (Pannatier 2005, p. 10) were also mentioned in this project but they stress the more political dimension of such an interfaculty laboratory.

### 3.3 The Creation of *LIEGE*: Between Bottom-up and Top-down Action

*LIEGE* (*Interuniversity – and no longer Interfaculty – Laboratory for Gender Studies*) was finally created on 1 May 2001 with the aid of funding from the first *Federal Equal Opportunities Programme 2000–2003*, and its history was marked from the outset by the tension between feminist activism and the need to play the academic and institutional game. Its birth was thus the result of a local configuration not only favourable to the establishment of such courses but also to the new awareness at a national level. It does not, however, entirely follow the same chronological logic as that which marked the institutionalisation of gender studies in other European countries, where "everywhere women's studies have been a bottom-up initiative, in contrast to equal opportunity policies, which have resulted from top-down public policies" (ANEF 2014, p. 20). In Switzerland, the question of women in science came late to the agenda, and it was precisely this delay in observing the rarity of women in professorial posts (fewer than 7 per cent in 2000), combined with a strong internationalisation of higher education, that had the effect of generating very active policies to improve the Swiss situation.

The first *Federal Equal Opportunities Programme* drove forward a series of actions to increase the number of women among academic staff, in particular by offering support individually to certain women (mentoring, nursery places, funding, etc.) to counter what was still primarily seen as the result of “the problem of women in science” (Garforth and Kerr 2009, p. 391). This perspective ignored the organisational aspect (Fassa and Kradolfer 2010; Marry 2010) and attributed the low numbers of potential women academics (students and assistants) to their ‘delay’, to unfamiliarity with the academic milieu and its rules, and to the problem of the work-life balance. At the local level, the clear will of the Rectorate of the University of Lausanne responded to the pressure of the feminist movement that had emerged in the student demonstrations of 1997 and had organised debates leading to the demand for a “chair in feminist teaching” (Pannatier and Roux 2006, p. 112). Presented as a “*collective mentoring* project bringing together people interested in gender questions across the whole of Switzerland” (Pannatier 2005, p. 9, original emphasis), *LIEGE* made clear its determination to maintain its links with a social movement strongly critical of the university institution and the neo-liberal turn of public policies in the late 1990s. Gaël Pannatier, the coordinator of *LIEGE* from the start, and Patricia Roux, a professor of gender studies from 2000 and the initiator of this interconnecting of feminist researchers, present this network as the site “of other modes of operation and [the opening up] of other spaces for discussion and reflection than those usually practiced in universities. In principle, therefore, *LIEGE* had an ambitious aim, which was to play a part in reducing the social inequalities produced in and by the hierarchical relations that structure the academic world.” (Pannatier and Roux 2006, p. 113, authors’ emphasis)

At the outset *LIEGE* constituted just under 100 people; in 2005 it had more than 450 members. *LIEGE* responded to the initial objectives of bringing together in a network people interested in the problematic of social gender relations, whether or not they belonged to the academic world, and providing a research cluster in gender studies in French-speaking Switzerland. The community group approach adopted by the creators of *LIEGE* thus seemed to be inspired by the experience of British feminists and aimed to establish a gender studies research cluster based on a broader collective of women interested in thinking and research on social gender relations.

### 3.4 The Institutionalisation of Gender Studies at the University of Lausanne and the End of the *LIEGE*<sup>8</sup> Interuniversity Network

In 2008, *LIEGE* merged with *Gender Campus*<sup>9</sup> as regards the gender studies research and information network. This is now national and open to the more vocational *Hautes Écoles Spécialisées* (Universities of Applied Sciences). In parallel, a new teaching and research entity of the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, the *Centre for Gender Studies-LIEGE*, was set up in the framework of a faculty reorganisation, “the main mission of the Centre [being] to stimulate, promote and host research integrating a gender perspective in the University of Lausanne”. This stabilisation, decided in February 2008 by the Directorate of the University of Lausanne, had both good and bad consequences. On the one hand, it strengthened gender studies because it made clear the recognition given to the professional accountability of the academic members of the network. In line with this good appraisal, it transformed this area of studies into a quasi-discipline in which the management of the university could show some exceptional skills compared with other tertiary institutions, thus complying with the rules of competitiveness of the knowledge economy. But on the other hand, this move was accompanied by a clear disciplinisation that made it impossible to respond to the social demands of the external members to the academic world in a participative way. Thus, willingly or not, this governance transformed the openness of gender studies to civil society.

---

8 The term *LIEGE* now designates the “interactive platform for members of the *Haute École Spécialisée de Suisse occidentale* [University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Western Switzerland] interested in gender studies and questions of equality” (Gender Campus 2017a, authors’ emphasis). Although it shares the database of the national network *Gender Campus*, this platform only addresses people working in the *Hautes Écoles Spécialisées* – a sector of higher education differentiated from the universities by its directly vocational dimensions. It has experienced the same movements that we have observed in the University of Lausanne: an attempt to institutionalise teaching on gender in specific places and branches of education and the networking of researchers in this area. It should be noted that the funding of its activities is no longer assured for the future.

9 *Gender Campus* describes itself on its website as “The platform for information, communication and networking of gender studies and of equal opportunities at Swiss universities” (Gender Campus 2017b). This platform also gives a national dimension to the theme of gender studies and aims to bring interested knowledge-workers together at a national level. A regular (bilingual) newsletter is sent to its members, with news about national and international events, calls for papers, and professional and training opportunities.

The changes concerned the nature of the relationship it had with feminists outside academia and its proximity with the social problems it formerly addressed. As a consequence, the external members of the network soon deserted it because of its now exclusive setting in the world of higher education.

The historical and obsolete reference to *LIEGE* disappeared with a new faculty reorganisation in 2015, and the *Centre for Gender Studies* is now linked to only one faculty. To this clear movement of institutionalisation – and relative closure of the *Centre for Gender Studies* on itself and the faculty to which it is attached – corresponded a movement in the opposite direction which testified to the determination to retain the inter-, trans- or antidisciplinary<sup>10</sup> vocation of gender studies, since the actors of the creation and development of a new interfaculty platform focused on gender were also mostly members of the *Centre for Gender Studies*, a disciplinary research unit entirely comparable to other research units organised around a specific field of knowledge.

Thus in 2013, an interfaculty platform in gender studies, the *PlaGe (Plateforme en Études Genre)*, was (re)created in the University of Lausanne to revitalise the networking activities that had lost some of their vigour with the creation of the *Centre for Gender Studies-LIEGE*. Interdisciplinary reflection remains its objective and the construction of synergies at a local and purely university level. It aims to go beyond inter- or transdisciplinarity and manifest the vivacity of the gender perspective and its potential for insolence in the face of the established disciplines. In November 2016, the site had a membership of 105 researchers and reported 69 courses (33 at the bachelor's level and 36 at the master's level) given in the various faculties, which had at least a partial perspective on gender studies. This panoply was, however, not uniformly spread across the faculties: most of these offers came from just two faculties (Social and Political Sciences and Arts and Humanities). Analysis of the annual reports of the *Plateforme en Études Genre* shows that it is mainly focused on the visibility and fertility of the gender perspective, and that it has only been able to play a secondary role in the development of research and the setup of interdisciplinary courses in gender studies. It seems, however, to be able to some degree to reconnect with the 'cheekiness' of the initial proposals of the *LIEGE* network, since it recently enabled a working group to create synergies among researchers working on sexualities. Perhaps it can be the starting point

---

10 Darbellay (2016, p. 370) depicts this last positioning as highly questionable; he describes it as throwing "the production of knowledge into the abyss and into the antidisciplinary chaos. Chaos is still the most favorable ground for the resurgence of new disciplinary tribes and is more rarely the sign of the birth of a new and peaceful world between disciplines". Nonetheless, his point shows the disruptive and innovative dynamics that 'cheeky knowledge' can bring into a sometimes too quiet and too respectful realm.

for a new process of production of 'cheeky knowledge', given that some works on social gender relations have been strongly toned down to meet the demands of an academic world in which the norms of excellence – at least those that provide the basis for academic careers – remain cast in the modern division of knowledge. It is too early to say, just as one cannot know whether this initiative will or will not lead to the institutionalisation of a specific academic structure.

It can thus be concluded that the initial balancing of gender studies between activism and discipline remains relevant nowadays, since there is still a need today on the one hand to present credentials of the disciplinary scientificity of knowledge about social gender relations and on the other hand to develop 'insolent' knowledge, whose insolence is only measured with reference to other fields of knowledge.

---

#### **4 Feminism, Social Demand and the Disciplinisation of Gender Studies**

The few markers we have laid down so far show that while the courses set up in some faculties, mainly social and political sciences and arts, have enabled the students to complement the teaching in their major discipline by choosing a colouring linked to the study of social gender relations, the reorganisations imposed by the Bologna process have required gender studies to assert its scientificity and its conformity with the disciplinary fields. It seems, however, that the process of disciplinisation and institutionalisation is now being held back by a change in social demand, which approaches knowledge in gender studies as a welcome complement to other knowledge, but one that is unlikely to lead to a vocational opportunity. Because of the growing competition among universities, the number of major options for the master's in social science has been reduced and the gender major has disappeared; the teaching inspired by this perspective is now offered in a broader way. The students enrolled in the gender studies doctoral programme of the *West Switzerland University Conference* are often also enrolled in another doctoral programme more directly attached to a conventional discipline. It seems to us that these new configurations are akin to the reasons given to explain the decline in the number of people following the gender courses of the Open University (Kirkup and Whitelegg 2013).

So, however strong the inter-, trans-, or even antidisciplinarity aspiration that lay behind gender studies, it has to be observed that the traditional discipline-based organisation of the university has helped to partially neutralise the initial intention, and it may be thought that while doing a master's in gender studies still sometimes leads people to question the relevance of disciplinary divisions, this happens more

rarely than in the past, with this self-critique not always readily extending to gender studies itself. This difficult reflexivity was central to the debates – both programmed and unexpected – that took place during the organisation in September 2012 of the 6th International French-speaking Feminist Studies Congress, an event which brought together in the University of Lausanne more than 600 researchers from four continents. The topic chosen for the conference concerned one of the currently most-debated issues in gender studies, the intersectionality of relations of domination. The title, *Intertwining of Power Relations: Discrimination and Privileges of Gender, Race, Class and Sexuality*, and the call for papers reasserted the strong relationship that has existed between feminist social movements and academic research. Overall the conference was a success since it allowed many in-depth exchanges on the theoretical and activist questions linked to this topic. But it also saw contestation of the ‘white-washing’ of intersectional thinking as an effect of the institutionalisation of gender studies and of what Bilge (2016) describes as the annexation by gender studies of a question that incorporates an activist praxis and so lies on the margin of academic feminism.

---

## 5 Comparison with Other ‘Studies’: Area Studies and Cultural Studies

The new academic governance that we are now experiencing, with the growing recourse to “institutional and public accountability with regard to money and productivity” (Joseph 2010, p. 332) lowers political accountability with regard to more social justice. This is the case not only for gender studies, but also for other fields such as area studies or cultural studies, as will be seen below with the examples of area studies in Switzerland and cultural studies at the University of Arizona (Joseph 2010).

Like gender studies, area studies is in general weakly institutionalised as such in Swiss universities, but it has to be noted that the number of teachers and researchers active in these fields is much higher than the small number of structures dedicated to them. The strength of the disciplinary anchorage thus tends to mask the extent of the work produced and the number of people engaged in these fields of research. Before starting our analysis, we must recall that the importance of area studies for military and defence issues has not been as central in Switzerland (with its long tradition of neutrality and development aid) as in the US. Nevertheless, the significant budget cuts in area studies all around the world during the past 20 years, and



the reconfiguration of this field into other structures (global studies, international studies, etc.), has also had an impact in Switzerland.

## 5.1 Area Studies

The distinction between area studies and discipline-based studies is inherited from divisions of the world that date from the colonial era: area studies was then understood as covering everything that was 'exotic' or different.<sup>11</sup> As a consequence, being interested as a researcher in European regions implied pursuing a career in economics, sociology, etc., whereas the study of extra-European topics in Africa, Latin America, etc., led to a career in area studies. It follows that area studies generally appeals to inter- or transdisciplinarity, or at least requires knowledge of the methods and mobilisation of knowledge derived from several disciplines in order to approach the region studied (Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education 2008). It is moreover widely accepted that area studies helps call into question a dominant disciplinary thinking constructed on the model of the Western world being taken for granted (Bates et al. 1993) and that the specificities that characterise it influence both the practice and the results of research.

As regards area studies in Switzerland at the institutional level, for a short time the Geneva Centre for the Training of African Managers, created in 1962 and renamed the African Institute of Geneva the following year, offered training centred on Africa. When it became the Graduate Institute of Development Studies in 1973, its African focus shifted to development in general, but for a long time it remained the main centre for African studies in Switzerland. After an attempt in the late 1990s to create a *Curriculum of African Studies*, consisting of two coordinated multidisciplinary networks, one for German-speaking and the other for French-speaking Switzerland, the Swiss Science Council abandoned this coordination project for area studies, and African studies was not mentioned in the *Message of 25 November 1998 on the Encouragement of Training, Research and Technology in the Period 2000–2003* (Conseil Fédéral 1998, no pagination) because of its institutional and structural weakness. Like African studies, Latin-American studies was a subject of great interest especially in the 1970s, but did not develop as an institutionalised field of research. However, since the turn of the century, various structures have been created or reactivated. Thus, the *Swiss Latin-American Centre* of the University of Saint Gallen, after ceasing its activities in 1992, reopened in 2007. More recently, since the academic year 2009–2010, the *Center for Global Studies* of the

---

11 This section takes over some elements of the text published by Künzler et al. (2016).

University of Bern has offered a master's in Latin-American studies. The University of Zurich set up a *Centre of Competence on Latin America* in 2016. There was also a new impulse in African studies in the same period, leading to the positioning of Basel as a centre of competence in this area and the creation of an interdisciplinary master's in African studies in 2002. Since 2012, a similar ambition has emerged at the University of Geneva (Mayor et al. 2013), and a master's in African studies, based in the *Global Studies Institute*, is being developed.

So it seems that the interest in and development of global studies at the turn of the century, in line with the need for a better understanding of globalisation and internationalisation processes, have enabled area studies to regain relevance at the institutional level. The redefinition of 'areas' – and of the paradigm of area studies – in the new context of globality happened at the cost of changes that neglected some regions or (re)configured the research questions. Regrouped under the banner of globality/globalisation, it has enjoyed a degree of revitalisation: "The first college programmes to be called 'global studies' were formed in the mid-1990s, and within a decade there were hundreds." (Juergensmeyer 2014, p. XIV) As in other countries, at the University of Bern, the University of Geneva, the École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, etc., the work produced in area studies in the framework of global studies seems more in tune with the *zeitgeist*, since it reinserts research that previously appeared localised to a single region into the phenomena of transnationalism, multiculturalism, networks and international flows (of goods, people and knowledge). And it has to be noted that not all area studies arouse the same interest, since while BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India and China) have become essential countries to study, Africa and Latin America, like other Asian or Oceanic regions, are little studied. The need for new knowledge also shows clearly that research and teaching are profoundly linked to developments in international politics and economic exchanges and the increased competition among universities due to the new forms of the academic governance. If area studies developed during the Cold War as a 'strategic' field to acquire knowledge (largely financed in the US through the federal government) about 'other' regions of the world, today the new political order affects researchers in area studies by asking them to shift the focus of their research onto global and transnational issues (Berger 2006).

## **5.2 Cultural and Gender Studies at Arizona in the Face of Managerial Demands**

Joseph's (2010) thorough and reflexive analysis of the place of cultural studies in her institution helps us understand why gender studies, which was seen as a pioneer

in interdisciplinarity, does not benefit from the supplement of legitimacy that is now attached to practices of interdisciplinary research. Having been appointed to the committee in her university which decided on budget allocations, she analysed the demands made on academics, observing that in the framework of the new conditions of the production of science, interdisciplinarity implies applied research whose products can be easily commodified and its outputs entered into balance sheets. This distance taken from the nostalgic positions that we have described earlier makes it possible to understand how the Bologna process valorises interdisciplinarity differently depending on whether it is practised in the 'hard' or life sciences or is articulated with the new "domains of specialised hybrid knowledge" (Perrig-Chiello and Darbellay 2004, p. 35) of cultural studies or gender studies. It also explains how the integration of work stemming from gender studies by equality policies, particularly through mainstreaming, is not always accompanied by valorisation of the modes of knowledge acquisition proposed by gender studies (a situated position), and still less by the 'insolence' they have imposed in the face of the established disciplines. On this point she concurs with the conclusions of Perrig-Chiello and Darbellay (2004, p. 36) on the difference between specialised fields depending on whether they are or are not close to the now recognised sciences:

"These aggregated disciplines present states of development that are differentiated in terms of their disciplinary self-definition, their academic institutionalisation, and their scientific and social recognition, above all for reasons of economic priorities and training policy."

But Joseph's (2010) conclusions are more self-critical and optimistic and her analysis is less internalistic as regards the capacity for insolence of inter-, trans-, or even antidisciplinarity studies, since she proposes nothing less than to take seriously the necessities of accountability and push them to their limits. Adopting the tools of new public management so as to make visible the goods created by education for the benefit of communities would, in her view, make it possible to turn them against the people who propose a development of knowledge driven purely by the need to transform knowledge into economic gain.

Her heterodox position is refreshing because it proposes to pervert the instruments that managerial power imposes on universities and their researchers in order to show to what extent the accounting process now under way (systematic measures of the performances of institutions and researchers) neglects what is produced by researchers who work in fields that have no immediately applied perspectives. In addition, she sketches some cross-paths (Fassa 2013) through which the actions of the 'femocrats' (Bereni 2009; Jacquot 2009), of feminism – academic or not – and of social movements challenging the organisation and management of higher educa-

tion (cf. for example the *Maple Spring* in Quebec) can be reconciled. Nevertheless, this policy requires researchers in these hybrid fields to practice self-reflexivity and abandon a nostalgic position that prevents them from “engag[ing] in a broader contestation over the scope and goals of higher education” (Joseph 2010, p. 343).

---

## 6 Difficult Validation and Institutionalisation of Inter- or Transdisciplinary Knowledge

From its inception, the institutionalisation of gender studies has articulated different kinds of tensions, which for some people stem from the relationship of universities with the outside world and for others from the organisation of higher education itself:

1. a tension between an activist social demand aimed at the emancipation of women as a dominated group, and the construction of ‘scientific’ knowledge on specific situations of domination;
2. a tension between knowledge already established in disciplines and based on specific methodologies and questioning of those same disciplines as factors of reproduction of the relation of domination between men and women;
3. a tension between a traditional pedagogy which prolongs the scholastic form (Vincent 1994), the hierarchical relations that it vehicles and underpins, and the aim of constructing more democratic relations at the heart of the university teaching relationship.

Examining the place of gender studies in universities therefore seems to be an interesting way into understanding to what types of social demands interdisciplinary approaches now respond, and how. Inspired by the sociology of education, in particular British studies of the relationship between curricula and the sociology of knowledge (Bernstein 1971; Young 1971), we have tried in this article to examine the ways in which the institutionalisation of gender studies translates various social demands in Castel’s (2002) sense and intervenes on curricula to disturb them, but ultimately takes away some of their potential for subversion and opening onto a future that does not reproduce the present and its inequalities. Based on the Lausanne example, we have tried to articulate the transformations linked to the changes in demands for gender equality and those that can be attributed to changes in the universities themselves. We have drawn on this example to reflect on these tensions and sketch the beginnings of some answers as to the place that can be occupied by knowledge that disturbs the traditional modes of operation in

an institution that is subjected to the logics of the market (Dardot and Laval 2009) and which must demonstrate its transparency and its good governance (Paradeise and Thoenig 2011; Musselin 2009).

In comparison, area studies, which also generally appeals to inter- or transdisciplinarity, seems harshly judged when it comes to the evaluation of quality and performances:

“Ironically enough, even though it is precisely collaboration between different fields that can lead to astonishing breakthroughs, multidisciplinary research only gets moderate scores on traditional quality indicators.” (Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences 2013, p. 16)

It is also observed that area studies is subject to pressures aimed at restricting its research to ‘applied’ questions, or, in other words, to make a “Nietzschean shift away from philosophy (scholarship) into technology (practical relevance)” (Macamo 2014 quoted in Künzler et al. 2016, p. 64). And yet area studies, as the *Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft* has also observed, has “the essential function of developing competences in cultural diversity, otherness and intercultural understanding” and therefore has as its “main challenge the development of fundamental research in phase with society” (Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft 2016, p. 47).

Joseph’s (2010) reflexive reading of the changes demanded of her cultural studies department at the University of Arizona has served as an anchorage point for reflection on the institutionalisation of ‘cheeky knowledge’ and on the changes that the standardisation of degree courses implied by the Bologna reform has imposed on “specialised domains with a hybrid character” (Perrig-Chiello and Darbellay 2004, p. 35). Comparison among these different inter- or transdisciplinary domains suggests that social resistance and the new scientific objects that are proposed are now tending to be weakened under the joint influence of the fragmentation of social demand and the process of globalisation, paving the way for a return to normal of the definition of the academic disciplines.

Thus, gender studies at Lausanne – which were part of and which was driven by the social contestation in 1997 and challenged in 2012 by another mode of social contestation – has followed an itinerary which, throughout its short history, has been marked by the fundamental tension which articulates knowledge for emancipation – set, according to Crenshaw (1991), in individual and collective experience of domination and struggle against that oppression – with institutionalisation as an academic quasi-discipline of knowledge-derived reflections and those contextualised practices. We are thus faced, to paraphrase Stacey (2000, p. 1190), with a glass that is both half empty and half full. Full, because institutionalisation has brought recognition of reflections on the oppression of women as ideas that cannot

be ignored in the production of knowledge. Empty, because that same institution-alisation has partly neutralised the radical political impact of the feminist practices – since all practice bears knowledge – that gave rise to those reflections, and has helped rigidify categories that gender studies sought to deconstruct and question.

## Acknowledgement

We are grateful to Damien Michelet, coordinator of the *Interfaculty Gender Studies Platform (PlaGe)* at the University of Lausanne and of the French-speaking Swiss network *Gender Campus*, for his attentive reading and his constructive, informed and positive comments.

All the translations from French were done by Richard Nice, whom we would like to thank very much for doing a wonderful job.

## References

- Association Nationale des Études Féministes (ANEF). 2014. *Le Genre dans l'Enseignement Supérieur et la Recherche. Livre Blanc*. Paris: La Dispute.
- Bates, Robert Hinrichs, Valenti-Yves Mudimbe and Jean O'Barr. 1993. *Africa and the Disciplines. The Contributions of Research in Africa to the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bereni, Laure. 2009. Quand la Mise à l'Agenda Ravive les Mobilisations Féministes. *Revue Française de Science Politique* 2 (59): 301–323.
- Berger, Anne. 2006. Traversées de Frontières: Postcolonialité et Études de “Genre” en Amérique. *Labyrinthe* 24 (2): 10–37.
- Bernstein, Basil. 1971. On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge. In *Knowledge and Control: New Directions for the Sociology of Education*, ed. by Michael F.D. Young, 47–69. London: Collier-Macmillan.
- Bilge, Sirma. 2016. Plaidoyer pour une Intersectionnalité Critique Non-Blanchie. In *L'Intersectionnalité: Enjeux Théoriques et Politiques*, ed. by Marta Roca i Escoda, Farinaz Fassa and Éléonore Lepinard, 75–102. Paris: La Dispute.
- Burawoy, Michael. 2003. L'Étude de Cas Élargie. Une Approche Réflexive, Historique et Comparée de l'Enquête de Terrain. In *L'Enquête de Terrain*, ed. by Daniel Cefai, 425–464. Paris: La Découverte, MAUSS.
- Castel, Robert. 2002. La Sociologie et la Réponse à la Demande Sociale. In *À Quoi Sert la Sociologie?*, ed. by Bernard Lahire, 67–77. Paris: La Découverte.

- Chaperon, Sylvie. 2002. L'Histoire Contemporaine des Sexualités en France. Vingtième Siècle. *Revue d'histoire* 75 (3): 47–59.
- Conseil Fédéral. 1998. *Message relatif à l'encouragement de la formation, de la recherche et de la technologie pendant les années 2000–2003 du 25 novembre 1998*, FF 1999 269. Berne: Conseil Fédéral.
- Crenshaw, Kimberle. 1991. Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review* 6 (43): 1241–1299.
- Darbellay, Frédéric. 2014. Rethinking Inter- and Transdisciplinarity: Undisciplined Knowledge and the Emergence of a New Thought Style. *Futures* 65: 163–174.
- Darbellay, Frédéric. 2016. From Disciplinarity to Postdisciplinarity: Tourism Studies De-disciplined. *Tourism Analysis* 21: 363–372.
- Dardot, Pierre, and Christian Laval. 2009. *La Nouvelle Raison du Monde. Essai sur la Société Néolibérale*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Fassa, Farinaz. 2013. La Recherche en Suisse: Quand le Genre Interroge les Critères de l'Excellence Scientifique. *Mouvements* 4 (76): 156–169.
- Fassa, Farinaz. 2016a. *Filles et Garçons Face à la Formation. Les Défis de l'Égalité*. Lausanne: PPUR.
- Fassa, Farinaz. 2016b. Politiques d'Égalité des Chances dans les Universités Suisses. Bilan Provisoire d'un Pilotage Décentralisé. In *Les Femmes dans le Monde Académique. Perspectives Comparatives*, ed. by Rebecca Rogers and Pascale Molinier, 167–179. Rennes: PUR.
- Fassa, Farinaz, and Sabine Kradolfer. Eds. 2010. *Le Plafond de Fer de l'Université. Femmes et Carrières*. Zurich: Seismo.
- Fassa, Farinaz, Valérie Rolle and Chiara Storari. 2014. Politiques de l'Égalité à l'École Obligatoire. Des Ambivalences qui Diluent les Rapports Sociaux de Sexe. *Swiss Journal of Sociology* 2 (40): 37–52.
- Garforth, Lisa, and Anne Kerr. 2009. Women and Science: What's the Problem? *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State and Society* 3 (16): 379–403.
- Gender Campus. 2017a. *Policy of the University of Applied Sciences and Arts*. <https://www.gendercampus.ch/fr/hochschulen/netzwerke/liege-hes-so/über-uns>. Accessed: February 15, 2017.
- Gender Campus. 2017b. *Welcome*. <https://www.gendercampus.ch/EN>. Accessed: February 15, 2017.
- Haraway, Donna. 1991. Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575–599.
- Harding, Sandra, and Kathryn Norberg. 2005. New Feminist Approaches to Social Science Methodologies: An Introduction. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30 (4): 2009–2015.
- Jacquot, Sophie. 2009. La Fin d'une Politique d'Exception. *Revue Française de Science Politique* 59 (2): 247–277.
- Joseph, Miranda. 2010. Accounting for Interdisciplinarity. In *Interdisciplinarity and Social Justice: Revisioning Academic Accountability*, ed. by Joe Parker, Ranu Samantrai and Mary Romero, 321–352. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Joye-Cagnard, Frédéric, Raphaël Ramuz, Philippe Sormani, Martin Benninghoff, Gaële Goastellec and Jean-Philippe Leresche. 2008. *Évaluation de l'Instrument "Projets de Coopération et d'Innovation" (2004–2007). Rapport Final*. Berne: Conférence Universitaire Suisse.
- Juergensmeyer, Mark. 2014. *Thinking Globally: A Global Studies Reader*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Kirkup, Gill, and Elizabeth Whitelegg. 2013. The Legacy and Impact of Open University Women's/Gender Studies: 30 Years On. *Gender and Education* 25 (1): 6–22.
- Künzler, Daniel, Anne Mayor, Sabine Kradolfer and Thomas Herzog. 2016. Prise de Position sur les Area Studies de la Société Suisse d'Études Africaines, la Société Suisse Moyen-Orient et Civilisation Islamique et la Société Suisse des Américanistes. In *Swiss Academies Reports* 11 (2): 57–70.
- Laboratoire Interuniversitaire en Études Genre (LIEGE). 1998. *Projet de Création d'un Laboratoire Interfacultaire en Études Genre (LIEGE), Lausanne*. [Document addressed by the Gender Studies Working Party to the Rectorate of the University of Lausanne, 21 December 1998]. (unpub.).
- Macamo, Elísio. 2014. *Solving Problems or Raising Issues: Area Studies and the Problem of Relevance*. Paper presented at the Workshop *Assessing Quality and Performance in Area Studies* at the University of Freiburg on 14 November 2014. Ms. (unpub.).
- Marry, Catherine. 2010. Le Plafond de Verre dans le Monde Académique: l'Exemple de la Biologie. In *Le Plafond de Fer de l'Université. Femmes et Carrières*, ed. by Farinaz Fassa and Sabine Kradolfer, 173–193. Zurich: Seismo.
- Mayor, Anne, Daniel Künzler, Didier Péclard, Yvan Droz and Veit Arlt. 2013. *Les Études Africaines dans les Universités de Suisse Romande et de Bâle. Rapport de la Société Suisse d'Études Africaines (SSEA-SGAS)*. [http://www.sagw.ch/dms/africa/publikationen/Rapport-Etudes-africaines\\_final](http://www.sagw.ch/dms/africa/publikationen/Rapport-Etudes-africaines_final). Accessed: September 13, 2016.
- Musselin, Christine. 2009. Les Réformes des Universités en Europe: des Orientations Comparables, mais des Déclinaisons Nationales. *Revue du MAUSS* 33 (1): 69–91.
- Pannatier, Gaël. 2005. *Réseau de Mentoring Collectif en Étude Genre. Rapport d'Activités et Perspectives (2001–2005)*. Lausanne: LIEGE-Université de Lausanne, Conférence Universitaire Suisse.
- Pannatier, Gaël, and Patricia Roux. 2006. Institutionnalisation des Études Féministes en Suisse. Le Défi de l'Intégration et du Maintien d'une Dimension Critique. In *Transmission: Savoirs Féministes et Pratiques Pédagogiques*, ed. by Soline Blanchard, Jules Falquet and Dominique Fougeyrollas, 105–117. Paris: Cahiers du CEDREF.
- Paradeise, Catherine, and Jean-Claude Thoenig. 2011. Réformes et Ordres Universitaires Locaux. In *Gouverner l'Éducation par les Nombres?* ed. by Georges Felouzis and Siegfried Hanhart, 33–52. Bruxelles: De Boeck.
- Perrig-Chiello, Pasqualina, and Frédéric Darbelley. 2004. La Vieillesse est Féminine – Qui s'en Soucie? La Recherche en Études Genre et en Gérontologie entre Auto-Définition Disciplinaire et Exigence Interdisciplinaire. *Nouvelles Questions Féministes* 1 (23): 31–42.
- Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education. 2008. *Area Studies*. Gloucester: QAAHE.
- Rehmann, Irene. 2004. *Helsinki Group: Women and Science – Review of the Situation in Switzerland*. Berne: Office Fédéral de l'Éducation et de la Science.
- Revenin, Régis. 2007. Les Études et Recherches Lesbiennes et Gays en France (1970–2006). *Genre & Histoire* Automne (1). <http://genrehistoire.revues.org/219>. Accessed: February 7, 2017.
- Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences. 2013. *Towards a Framework for the Quality Assessment of Social Sciences*. Amsterdam: KNAW.
- Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft. 2016. Leistungs- und Qualitätsevaluation in den Asien- und Orientwissenschaften. In *Swiss Academies Reports* 11 (2): 41–48.
- Scott, Joan, and Eléni Varikas. 1988. Genre: une Catégorie Utile d'Analyse Historique. *Cahiers du GRIF* 37 (1): 125–153.



- Stacey, Judith. 2000. Is Academic Feminism an Oxymoron? *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 25 (4): 1189–1194.
- Vincent, Guy. 1994. *L'Éducation Prisonnière de la Forme Scolaire? Scolarisation et Socialisation dans les Sociétés Industrielles*. Lyon: Presses Universitaires.
- Widmer, Maya, and Patricia Schulz. 2005. *Les Études Genre en Suisse*. Berne: Fonds National Suisse, Bureau Fédéral de l'Égalité entre Femmes et Hommes.
- Young, Michael F.D. Ed. 1971. *Knowledge and Control*. London: Collier-Macmillan.