

About the Legitimation of Gender Studies in the ANPEd'

Márcia Ondina Vieira Ferreira^I

Márcia Cristiane Völz Klumb Coronei^{III}

Abstract

The trajectory of gender studies in Brazil is pervaded by struggles aimed at reaching visibility in order to legitimize gender studies in the scientific field. Several female authors affirm that this process was carried out through research groups at several institutions, particularly since the 1970's. Based on this idea, the present work aims to examine how gender studies have been included in the sphere of the National Association of Post-Graduation and Research in Education (ANPEd) by using findings of a state of the art on the subject. The work pursues to answer two questions. The first refers to the status of the process of constitution of the gender studies field in the ANPEd, with focus on the period from 2000 to 2011: are there signs of legitimation? The second question concerns the forces sustaining this field: are there research groups with a frequent, prominent work in the sphere of the ANPEd so as to ensure its development and multiplication of studies? In order to problematize this question, the analyzed period covers from 2007 to 2011. Results indicate a process of expansion of visibility – although we still cannot talk about total legitimation –, ensured by struggles carried out particularly by research groups that are members of the GT23 (Gender, Sexuality and Education).

Keywords

Gender – Sexualities – Scientific production – ANPEd – Research groups.

I- A preliminary version of this work was presented at the 37th ANPEd Annual Meeting (2015). We thank the CNPq for funding the studies that originated this text, and the members of the research teams.

II- Universidade Federal de Pelotas (UFPEl), Pelotas, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil.

Contact: marciaondina@uol.com.br

III- Universidade Federal de Pelotas (UFPEl), Pelotas, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil.

Contact: marciavolz@yahoo.com.br

Sobre a legitimação do campo do gênero na ANPEd^I

Márcia Ondina Vieira Ferreira^{II}

Márcia Cristiane Völz Klumb Coronel^{III}

Resumo

A trajetória dos estudos de gênero no Brasil é atravessada por contendas com a intenção de alcançar visibilidade, buscando a legitimação dos mesmos no campo científico, sendo que várias autoras referem que esse processo foi levado adiante por meio de núcleos de estudo e pesquisa presentes em diversas instituições, em especial desde os anos 1970. A partir dessa ideia, o trabalho busca verificar como vem ocorrendo a inclusão do gênero no espaço da ANPEd (Associação Nacional de Pós-Graduação e Pesquisa em Educação), usando para isso resultados de um estado da arte a respeito. Duas são as questões perseguidas pelo trabalho. A primeira refere-se a como está o processo de constituição do campo do gênero na ANPEd, abordando o período compreendido entre 2000 e 2011: há indícios de legitimação? A segunda questão diz respeito a quais forças sustentam o referido campo: há grupos de pesquisa com atuação frequente e preeminente no espaço da ANPEd, de forma a garantir seu desenvolvimento e multiplicação de estudos? Para problematizar essa questão o período de tempo analisado será o compreendido entre 2007 e 2011. Os resultados apontam para um processo de ampliação de visibilidade – sem que se possa falar em total legitimação –, garantido por disputas levadas a efeito especialmente por grupos de pesquisa radicados no GT 23 (Gênero, Sexualidade e Educação).

Palavras-chave

Gênero – Sexualidades – Produção científica – ANPEd – Grupos de pesquisa.

I- Uma versão preliminar deste trabalho foi apresentada na 37ª Reunião Anual da ANPEd (2015). Agradecemos ao CNPq pelo financiamento dos estudos que deram origem a este texto e aos membros das equipes de pesquisa.

II- Universidade Federal de Pelotas (UFPeL), Pelotas, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil.
Contato: marciaondina@uol.com.br

III- Universidade Federal de Pelotas (UFPeL), Pelotas, Rio Grande do Sul, Brasil.
Contato: marciavolz@yahoo.com.br

Situating the Discussion and the Study

Any field, e.g., the scientific field, is a field of forces and a field of struggles to transform this field of forces (BOURDIEU, 2003b, p. 76).

The development of gender studies does not have a long history in terms of its incorporation as a category of analysis with a recognized capacity to collaborate for interpreting inequality processes and other social phenomena. Therefore, although debates have been long going on about women's subordinate position in different societies – the origin of discussions about gender –, it was not until the movements created in late 1960's that more radical theoretical elaborations were progressively generated so as to integrate gender studies into the academic world per se.

With regard to the Brazilian context, accounts by several female authors converge in demonstrating that the ones to be credited for introducing the discussion into the field of humanities were the research groups situated in various institutions, particularly since the 1970's. As the authors describe, the struggle for legitimacy forced gender visibility into various fields of knowledge (SOUZA-LOBO, 1991; COSTA, 1994, 1996; BRUSCHINI; PINTO, 2001; BLAY, 2006) in such a way that, in the 1980's, academic discussions about gender expand, even though they were often restricted to the context of women's situation. That does not mean, however, that gender studies have found their space of legitimation. The authors also say that a process carried out by hegemonic groups in scientific disciplines was aimed at the "concession" of specific niches for gender studies, so that disciplines' traditional parameters remained intact. This is easily understandable if we consider the scientific field as a place where there is a competitive struggle for scientific authority, "defined inseparably as technical capacity and social power" (BOURDIEU, 1983, p. 122), in which a

group who wants to legitimize itself needs to dispute the monopoly of scientific competence.

Let us take the example of sociology. Souza-Lobo (1991) denounces the difficulties of sociology to incorporate gender studies by wishing to create a specific branch for investigations that take this category into account, leaving untouched the traditional analyzes about work or social movements, which would continue with sexually blind categories. Adelman (2004) uses the term "mechanisms of contention" to explain the tendency to create a space for gender as a merely descriptive variable that should not affect the sociological concepts considered more important.

In fact, as we know, this phenomenon is not only national. Kergoat (2009, p. 70), for example, in approaching the trajectory of studies about the sexual division of labor in France, narrates

[...] the decline of the subversive force [of this concept]. The term is now usual in the academic discourse of humanities, particularly in sociology. However, most times, it is hollowed of its conceptual connotation and returns to a sociographic approach that describes facts, verifies inequalities, but fails to organize these data in a coherent manner.

In sum, as it became progressively impossible to ignore the existence of studies that pointed to the relationship between men and women as constitutive of social, political and economic power relations, female and male researchers in the gender studies field managed to conquer some space. However, that did not necessarily imply modifications in the framework of scientific disciplines. In other words, as Schiebinger explains (2001, p. 24) with regard to the relationship between science and the production of knowledge by women, "women are supposed to assimilate science, rather than vice versa; it is assumed that nothing in either the culture or the content of the sciences need change to accommodate them".

These difficulties notwithstanding, or precisely in order to remove them, we can briefly report a series of events that converged to strengthen gender studies in our country, without prejudice to so many other events that also occurred. Initially, some female authors (GROSSI, 2004; FERREIRA, 2011; SCAVONE, 2011) mention Heleieth Saffioti's associate professorship thesis defense (1979) at the Universidade de São Paulo, in 1967, as a milestone in studies about women in Brazil. It is worth saying we do not consider this the only scholarly work on the subject then, but, rather, an excellent work that managed to achieve dissemination at the time.

Moreover, according to Scavone (2011, p. 4),

In 1975, a group of feminist intellectuals connected to the Fundação Carlos Chagas' (FCC) Collective for Research on Women held the "Humanities' Contributions for Understanding Women's Situation" symposium at the 27th Annual Meeting of the Brazilian Society for the Advancement of Science (SBPC) [...]. This was one of the first occasions in which the question of women was debated in a forum at national level.

Costa (1996), in turn, mentions the Women in the Workforce in Latin America (Iuperj) seminar, the result of a working group created at the National Association of Post-Graduation and Research in Social Sciences (Anpocs), about the theme, and a call for projects conducted by the Fundação Carlos Chagas for research grants on women-related subjects, both in 1978. According to Grossi (2004, p. 213), the Fundação Carlos Chagas and the Ford Foundation had a fundamental role in promoting, from 1978 to 1998, competitive examinations for research grants concerning women and gender which supported "two hundred new researchers".

Since that period, studies and research groups replicated, and other female authors (BRUSCHINI; PINTO, 2001) remember, in the early 1990's, the Studies about Women in

Brazil: Evaluation and Perspective seminar, based on which the book *Uma questão de gênero* (COSTA; BRUSCHINI, 1992) was published. Another important milestone was the launch of the *Estudos Feministas journal*, in 1992, at the Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, transferred to the Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina in 1999.

In turn, the *Cadernos Pagu journal*, published by the Unicamp's Pagu Center for Research on Gender, was created in 1993. To Costa (2008), the emergence of this periodical and *Estudos Feministas* was the result of the demand for publishing space, given the vitality of production, which derived from the growth of courses and research groups about the subject. But we also highlight the existence of another journal, created in 1994 and called *Espaço Feminino*, which was promoted by the Center for Research on Gender, Violence and Women (Neguem), connected to the Center for Documentation and Research in History – CDHIS (UFU).

Likewise, it is worth mentioning the Doing Gender International Seminar, originated in 1994, at the Doing Gender Seminar of Studies about Women, connected to the field of literature (UFSC). Since then, this biannual, transdisciplinary event has already reached its tenth edition (in 2013), having become an international event in 2000, expanding its scope to innumerable areas and themes.

These activities express the force of debates founded on gender study groups at various Brazilian institutions, be they universities, non-government organizations or research institutions, gathering investigators with various backgrounds. But they express, moreover, forms of organization that reveal the underlying existence of informal networks based on solidarity and mutual support, and which use what Costa (1996) called *walking-on-the-tightrope strategy*. She found, from 1980 to 1990, twenty gender study centers or groups in the Brazilian territory, and she notes that, by the end of the 1980's, most of the country's

associations of research already had specialist groups dedicated to gender matters.

The author develops other significant arguments for those who wish to think about the development of research in the area in Brazil:

The advance of women-related studies in the early 1980's was more quantitative than qualitative; responding to urgent ideological issues, the products had a high opinion-leading potential, but a low degree of abstraction [...].

In the 1990's, gender studies are apparently a well-established field, but still have feet of clay; this includes extreme discrepancies [...]; gender studies are recognized as generators of pioneering research and theoretical and methodological innovation, while several of its basic infrastructure needs are still in improper conditions and remain heavily dependent on foreign resources (COSTA, 1996, p. 45-46).

However, the situation narrated by Costa with regard to the shortage of funds for gender research has changed little, as on the latest stage of the national production, we can see a series of specific calls for projects with research funds and awards dedicated to the subject from Brazilian government agencies which aim to provide means to minimally overcome the difficulties found. As Scavone (2011, p. 12) highlights,

From 2002,¹ the [Bureau for Women's Policies]/CNPq calls for projects dedicated to gender- and/or health-related issues were an important stimulus to the funding of gender research. In addition, the public notices of SPM/CNPq competitive examinations for monographs on gender in different academic categories also [stimulated] the production

of studies on gender at secondary and undergraduate levels.

In addition, the repercussion of the theme has been felt in other areas, such as the production of documents by Inep (e.g., GODINHO et al., 2006; RISTOFF; GIOLO, 2006; RISTOFF et al., 2007, 2008) in order to examine and discuss gender inequalities in education. The above mentioned Special Bureau of Policies for Women has been promoting events and publishing proceedings (e.g., BRASIL, 2006), as well as the Ministry of Education itself, by means of its Bureau for Continuing Education, Literacy, Diversity and Inclusion (e.g., MELO et al., 2006; JUNQUEIRA, 2009).

Likewise, we cannot forget the emergence and/or strengthening of organizations dedicated to the advancement of discussions on sexual diversity, certainly an important current whose action has become increasingly significant as we approach the present. From the articulations of these groups, whether organized in research associations or not, came partnerships with government agencies, such as the important Brazil without Homophobia program, dedicated to fighting the violence against and discrimination of the LGBT population (BRASIL, 2004).²

If we now turn to the academic field of education in particular, significant elaborations on gender have been expressing themselves in the National Association of Post-Graduation and Research in Education (ANPEd) as an organization that represents graduate programs in the area. But here, too, space has been slowly and painstakingly conquered as in every scientific field there is an effective "hierarchy of legitimate, legitimable or unworthy objects" (BOURDIEU, 1998, p. 35): to enter a field and participate in the struggle for an object's legitimation, it is necessary to enter the game

1- According to the current Ministry of Justice and Citizenship's webpage, the Special Bureau of Policies for Women was created in 2003, and is linked to this Ministry since May 12, 2016. See: <http://www.spm.gov.br/sobre/a-secretaria>

2- It is worth mentioning the advance of conservative fundamentalism in our country, neutralizing many victories for a society with less disrespect for human rights (e.g., disputes concerning the Family Statute, legal abortion, the introduction of themes related to gender and sexual orientation in Education Plans, the Partisanship-Free School Program – PLS 193/2016. etc.).

and “produce belief in the value of the stakes” (BOURDIEU, 2003a, p. 122).

In this perspective, this article is part of a long effort to systematize the presence of gender studies in the scientific production that is selected as significant in various thematic and/or disciplinary fields of investigation within the ANPED. It records some of the results of two studies on the trajectory of gender research in the history of the association (FERREIRA, 2012; FERREIRA, 2015). The investigation methodology follows the milestones of the state of the art, mapping the production and describing it according to categories that progressively take shape from an immersion into the set of works. The selection of material implied reading the full texts of those works whose titles and abstracts seemed to indicate they approached questions related to gender and sexuality. The works we selected and classified by meeting/year had their characteristics described in tables, forming a database. For this article, a significant division between the works selected must be clarified: the works that, in our view, use gender as a primary analysis tool (PT), i.e., the ones that conceive gender as an interpretive category; and the works that use gender as a secondary tool (ST), merely describing the populations investigated (dividing them by sex) or adding gender-related aspects, without making it its main object. This separation of texts was very important in our studies in that it allowed identifying the people who, from the beginning of their investigation, aimed to collaborate to develop genders studies. Here, we will use ST texts only on a primary stage where we quantify the total production in the ANPED. The most substantial analysis will be conducted based on texts considered as PT.

In this article, particularly, we will analyze two originary questions of the reflection promoted by our immersion in the database. The first refers to the status of the constitution of gender studies in the ANPED, covering the period from 2000 to 2011. Does the field of gender studies in the ANPED give signs

of legitimation concerning its relationship with the broader educational scientific field?

The second question regards the forces sustaining this field: are there research groups with a frequent, prominent work in the sphere of the ANPED so as to ensure its development and multiplication of studies? In what institutions are those groups located? In order to problematize this question, the period analyzed covers from 2007 to 2011.

In function of this analysis, we will consider mainly the works and posters presented at Working Groups (GTs) during the annual meetings examined.

Following the Advance of Gender Studies in the ANPED

Within a strongly autonomous scientific field, a particular producer cannot expect recognition of the value of his products (“reputation”, “prestige”, “authority”, “competence”) but from other producers, who, as competitors, are the least inclined to agree without arguing or examining. (BOURDIEU, 2003b, p. 18).

In our original study, we were able to fully quantify the production on gender and sexualities in the ANPED only for the period starting in 2000 as it was not until the 23rd Meeting that all texts presented in the annual event became available online. However, prior to that date, we tried to examine the greatest possible number of sources³ so that we could at least have a preliminary vision of the presence of gender studies in the association’s production.

We could see that, from 1990 to 1999, GT 2 (History and Education) strongly expressed the presence of gender studies – understood here in the broader sense – followed by GT 6 (Popular Education), GT 3 (Social Movements and Education) and GT 12 (Curriculum). Indeed, this prominence of GT 2 at the time was confirmed to us by the researcher Guacira Lopes Louro, and it is understandable, considering the

3- Bulletins and the CD-ROM 25 anos da ANPED.

objects approached in this GT until today: the constitution of teaching as a female work, the production of masculinity and femininity by the school, the history of female educators, etc.

For the subsequent years (2000-2011), in order to provide an overview, we will first indicate the total number of works produced (all modalities of work, whether presented in GTs or in other activities), including both texts where gender was a PT and those in which it was a ST. Considering the fact that GT 23 (Gender, Sexuality and Education) was created in 2004, the increase in the production of works on gender and sexualities over the period is noticeable, peaking in 2010, with the 33rd Meeting⁴. This information is more clearly shown in Table 1.

Secondly, however, in order to understand in more detail whether gender studies have been gaining more space, it is necessary to define more precisely the characteristics of the production. Therefore, let us focus on the works and posters considered as PT – a total of 237 texts, which corresponds to 4.9% of what was presented in GTs. Of these, 132 were in GT 23, and the rest (105) corresponds to the result of all other GTs combined, which represents 2.2% of all works presented in this twelve-year period.

subject is predominantly conducted by women (ROSEMBERG, 2001; MATOS; MARQUES, 2010): 80.2% are female authors; 13.9%, are male authors; and 5.9%, male-female coauthorships. Nevertheless, the number of men has been increasing, particularly since 2004, with 45 texts presented by men or male-female partnerships for the period starting in that year; of these works, 30 were presented in GT 23. Men have, in the great majority of cases, dedicated themselves to investigate questions related to sexualities.

The institutions responsible for the production are predominantly situated in the country's South and Southeast regions, as indicated by gender studies with other document corpora (ROSEMBERG, 2001; MATOS; MARQUES, 2010; VIANNA et al., 2011) or in the study dedicated to GT23 (RIBEIRO; XAVIER FILHA, 2013): 124 texts were produced in the Southeast region, 76 in the South, 16 in the Central-West, 15 in the Northeast, and only 4 in the North region (in addition to a work originated in Portugal and another one with no indication of the author's institution). Further, the main producer institutions are public higher education institutions, with 175 works, 113 of which in the federal system, 61 in state systems, and one in a municipal system. Fifty-four works

Table 1 – Total number of works versus the number of works on gender and sexualities (G/S) using gender as a primary and secondary tool – 23rd to 34th ANPEd Meeting (2000-2011)

| | 23 rd (2000) | 24 th (2001) | 25 th (2002) | 26 th (2003) | 27 th (2004) | 28 th (2005) | 29 th (2006) | 30 th (2007) | 31 st (2008) | 32 nd (2009) | 33 rd (2010) | 34 th (2011) | Total |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------|
| Total per Meeting | 369 | 384 | 395 | 370 | 437 | 639 | 466 | 503 | 496 | 426 | 447 | 583 | 5,515 |
| G/S | 14 (3.8%) | 20 (5.2%) | 15 (3.8%) | 13 (3.5%) | 28 (6.4%) | 36 (5.6%) | 31 (6.7%) | 39 (7.8%) | 31 (6.2%) | 38 (8.9%) | 49 (11%) | 45 (7.8%) | 359 (6.5%) |

Source: The authors' own elaboration based on data collected from the ANPEd's website (www.anped.org.br).

The first comment is about the authors' sex, confirming that the research about our

were originated in private institutions and eight were conducted by persons not connected to higher education.

4- In fact, we would like to underline the magnitude of the data treatment we conducted, considering the total number of works available at the ANPEd's website during these twelve years (5,515 works of all types).

The institutions with the greatest number of works, by region, are the following:

in the Southeast region, the UERJ stands out with 21 works, followed by the UFMG and the USP, with twelve. In the South region, the UFRGS, with 25 texts, the Unisinos with eight, followed by the UFPR and the UFSC with six. In the Central-West region, the UFMT has five texts, and the UFMS, four. As for the Northeast region, the UFPB sent four works, and the Uneb, three. Finally, in the North region, two studies were presented by the UEPA.

This information reveals nothing but the unequal distribution of research in our country. The production on gender is more firmly settled in institutions ranked near the top among Brazilian universities, which have been receiving more research funds, and whose graduate programs have received better evaluations. The Southeast and South regions outscore the others by far, with practically half of the production situated in the Southeast. The quantitative difference between the Southeast and South and the other regions is such that two former GT 23 coordinators made the following comment in a text commissioned to the 36th ANPED Meeting where they evaluated the GT's 10 years of existence:

The majority of works and posters submitted and approved over the last 10 years were by professionals from the Southeast region. Many questions could be raised concerning the absence of the North, Northeast and Central-West regions. Distance? Funding difficulties? Presentation of works in regional scientific meetings? (RIBEIRO; XAVIER FILHA, 2013, p. 4).

In addition, we must consider that some non-university institutions indicated by the author(s) are the institutions to which they are professionally related, yet their works were actually conducted at graduate level in academic institutions. In other words,

we used as a basis the institution indicated by the author, which is not always the one in which the study was conducted, but if we were to track down whether a work was conducted in a graduate course, figures would likely increase for the academic field.

With regard to funding – a sign of recognition of researchers and their institutions –, 103 of those works were funded, which corresponds to 43.4% of the production. Of the 132 works produced in GT 23, 59 (44.7%) were conducted with the support of some research or post-graduation funding agency. These figures are significant and can express an increase in the number of studies on gender that obtain funding, a hypothesis whose confirmation is out of the scope of the present work.⁵ In any case, it seems to us that gender researchers have been actively participating in disputes in the scientific field so as to make their object of study legitimate.

However, other features of the production are more revealing about the types of advance that have been occurring in the association, which may be seen in the analysis shown in Table 2. Firstly, three GTs never had, from 2000 to 2011, studies that use gender as a category of analysis: GT 11 (Higher Education Policy), GT 15 (Special Education) and GT 17 (Philosophy of Education). In another six groups, the number of works for this period was irrelevant: GT 5 (State and Educational Policy), GT 10 (Literacy, Reading and Writing), GT 13 (Fundamental Education), GT 22 (Environmental education) and GT 24 (Education and Arts) had one work each (though we must consider that this last was only created in 2007); and GT 20 (Psychology of Education) presented two works.

5 - We should also remember that, for the purposes of this text, Master's and Ph.D. grants were included as funded research, although we are aware that such grants do not occur in function of the theme approached in the students' projects.

Table 2 – Total number of works versus the number of works on gender and sexualities (G/S) using gender as a primary tool* by GT – 23rd to 34th ANPEd Meeting (2000-2011)

| GT ^{1,2} | TOTAL WORKS 2000/2011 | ANNUAL MEETINGS/WORKS ON G/S | | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL WORKS ON G/S BY GT |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | 2000 (23 rd) | 2001 (24 th) | 2002 (25 th) | 2003 (26 th) | 2004 (27 th) | 2005 (28 th) | 2006 (29 th) | 2007 (30 th) | 2008 (31 st) | 2009 (32 nd) | 2010 (33 rd) | 2011 (34 th) | |
| 2 | 233 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 16 (6.9%) |
| 3 | 179 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 10 (5.6%) |
| 4 | 210 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 (1.4%) |
| 5 | 271 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.4%) |
| 6 | 213 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 7 (3.3%) |
| 7 | 242 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 14 (5.8%) |
| 8 | 359 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 (1.7%) |
| 9 | 219 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 (1.4%) |
| 10 | 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.5%) |
| 11 | 206 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 12 | 278 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 8 (2.9%) |
| 13 | 241 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 (0.4%) |
| 14 | 169 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 10 (5.9%) |
| 15 | 217 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 16 | 274 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 (1.8%) |
| 17 | 178 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 18 | 220 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 (2.7%) |
| 19 | 215 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 (1.4%) |
| 20 | 194 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 (1%) |
| 21 | 177 | X | X | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 (4%) |
| 22 | 139 | X | X | X | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 (0.7%) |
| 24 ³ | 99 | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 (1%) |
| Subtotal | 4749 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 4 | 12 | 17 | 13 | 105 (2.2%) |
| 23 | 132 | X | X | X | X | 18 | 21 | 16 | 17 | 14 | 14 | 17 | 15 | 132 (100%) |
| TOTAL | 4881 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 25 | 31 | 21 | 25 | 18 | 26 | 34 | 28 | 237 (4.9%) |

* Figures include full works and posters.

1 GTs' names: GT 2 - History of Education; GT 3 - Social Movements and Education; GT 4 - Didactics; GT 5 - State and Educational Policy; GT 6 - Popular Education; GT 7 - Early Childhood Education; GT 8 – Teacher Education; GT 9 - Work and Education; GT 10 - Literacy, Reading and Writing; GT 11 - Higher Education Policy; GT 12 – Curriculum; GT 13 - Basic Education; GT 14 - Sociology of Education; GT 15 – Special Education; GT 16 – Education and Communication; GT 17 - Philosophy of Education; GT 18 - Education of Young and Adult Persons; GT 19 – Mathematics Education; GT 20 - Psychology of Education; GT 21 - Education and Ethnical-Racial Relations; GT 22 - Environmental Education; GT 23 – Gender, Sexuality and Education; GT 24 - Education and Arts.

2 The letter "X" means inexistence of the group in the year indicated.

3 At the 30th and 31st Meetings, GT 24 was simply denominated a Study Group (GE).

Source: The authors' own elaboration based on data collected from the ANPEd's website (www.anped.org.br).

Secondly, all the other groups have at least one work in the period, with four of them having ten or more works: GT 2 with 16 works; GT 7 (Early Childhood Education), with 14 works; and GTs 3 and 14 (Social Movements and Education and Sociology of Education, respectively) with 10 works. Subsequently, GT

23 reaches 132 works, as we considered all its studies as belonging in the PT category.

Finally, an horizontal reading of the table provides us with more significant information to compare the production of GT23 with the others. Starting with GTs 2, 3, 7 and 14, we can see that, except for GT3, the

others show regularity, as there is hardly a year with no production at all. These GTs seem to be receptive to the theme, and/or there are gender researchers who keep a connection to them over time. Moreover, before 2004, (the year GT23 was created), GTs 2 and 7 predominated in terms of production. And we can see, year after year, a considerable proportion between the texts of all groups but GT 23 combined and those of GT 23. This is clearer in the last three years, and even more so in 2010, when GT 23 had exactly the same number of texts (seventeen) as the other groups combined.

Therefore, we wish to underline that, although the space that emerged with the creation of GT23 is evident, apparently some of the members who were already studying gender were not attracted to the group. In other words, we can see that production regularity was maintained in other GTs which had already been giving space to gender studies, which may indicate the permanence of the people who studied gender in their own GTs, without migrating to GT23. This group, in contrast, ended up receiving a restrained demand of authors who apparently had nowhere to present their studies, if we consider that, from 2004 to 2011, GT23 received 132 works, while all other GTs received, during the same period, only 76 works on gender.

In sum, the advance of gender studies has been significant in the ANPEd, as in addition to the information above, the theme has also a greater presence in events' general activities (special sessions, panels), thus actually increasing visibility. However, on the other hand, there are places where gender does not exist, does not matter, is of no interest. Old GTs, some of them in existence practically since the ANPEd was organized in the form of working groups, have not been offering space to gender, with two plausible hypotheses: an absence of investigations in the national context, or, if works are submitted to the groups at all, they cannot compete with the ones that have been approved for presentation at meetings.

Documents from GT 23⁶ describe an undeniable gain of space and the recognition that there must be a GT to host gender studies. However, this is not the same as the legitimation of gender as a useful category of analysis in all areas of education. One might suppose that, in some of them, in the struggle for monopoly of scientific competence, producers could use conservation strategies, as well as strategies of exclusion (BOURDIEU, 2003a) of others who plead entrance with objects related to gender and sexualities.

Discussing the Influence of Research Groups on the Advance of Gender Studies and Education

In the scientific field as in the field of class relations, no arbitrating authority exists to legitimate legitimacy-giving authorities; claims of legitimacy draw their legitimacy from the relative strength of the groups whose interests they express. (BOURDIEU, 2003b, p. 22).

A panorama of the information collected – which agrees with the enquiries of other authors (VIANNA et al., 2011) – allows reporting a great dispersion in the production found from 2000 to 2011. By dispersion, we mean that the objects studied and areas of knowledge in which studies originate vary greatly, making it difficult to see at first glance an accumulation of knowledge and a subsequent investment in new themes. In this respect, we believe we can apprehend the articulation between studies by observing the production brought by research groups.

Nevertheless, to be sure and more accurate about the impact of research groups – as a source of quality production and a guarantee of multiplication of discussion and intervention in educational policies on gender and sexual diversity – it would be necessary to examine post-graduation working groups and advisors. In other words, it would be necessary

6- See, for example, *Proposição de passagem do GE 23 a GT*. Available at: <http://www.anped.org.br/grupos-de-trabalho-comite-cientifico/grupos-de-trabalho/grupos-de-trabalho/gt23>. Accessed on: January 25, 2016.

to look into the articulation between the studies of both advisors and students and the syllabi of research areas of post-graduation programs and research groups.

Here, we present a preliminary analysis, in part due to methodological difficulties in collecting data, as the ANPEd does not require specifications on the type of originary study (i.e., dissertation, thesis or a study of another nature) nor whether the work had an advisor, a detail of interest to us, as studies on gender are not necessarily advised by somebody who also studies the subject. It was not possible to track advisors down, so we were satisfied to search the Lattes CV platform for the authors' academic rank at the time their works were presented at the ANPEd, to find out whether they were graduate students. Moreover, to examine authors' belonging to research groups, we could only be accurate in the cases of ongoing connection to groups, as there was no history of belonging to groups in which people were no longer participating.⁷ To this we can add the fact that such belonging can vary: some people were, at the time they attained their degrees, connected to groups they no longer belong to in the present; others changed institutions and formed other groups, etc.

Therefore, given the amount of data and their lack of uniformity, we created for our analysis a few scenarios. In the first, we target PT works presented in GTs which indicated funding in the period from 2007 to 2010 – as that information does not appear in texts recorded on the website for 2011 –, and examined first authors' current belonging to some group connected to the CNPq Directory of Research Groups. Because one can continue connected to various groups, we used alternate criteria: recording the group that was led by the author and/or recording the group whose syllabus suggested a closer approach to gender

and sexualities studies and/or recording the group officially mentioned by the institution the author was connected to; in sum, a complex selection of reference groups.

Then, by focusing on all GTs, except GT 23, we found that only four research groups, in a total of 30 texts, presented more than one text from the 30th to the 33rd meeting. These groups are: Education in Dialogue: Narratives of Teachers, Curriculums and Cultures, at UERJ (31st and 32nd Meeting), with both texts presented in GT 4 (Didactics); Innovating, at UFMG (31st and 32nd Meeting), with both works in GT 14; Work, Education and Knowledge, at Unisinos (32nd and 33rd Meeting), both works in GT 6 (Popular Education); and the Research Group on Curriculums and Cultures (GECC), at UFMG (33rd Meeting), with both works in GT 12. It is noteworthy that these groups are situated in institutions in the Southeast and South regions and that, of the GTs mentioned, only GT 4 is not among those with a significant production on gender, as exposed in the previous section. Moreover, both works presented by the Education in Dialogue group were submitted by the same first author; both works presented by the Innovating group were also submitted by the same two co-authors; and the two works conducted at Unisinos have different authors, the same occurring to the GECC.

Another detail concerns the productivity grants⁸ of persons (first authors) who presented studies funded in the period from 2007 to 2010. We identified only five persons, three⁹ of whom with works in 2007, and two¹⁰ with works in 2010. At these meetings, the groups participated in the following GTs: GT 5 and GT 14 (two works); and GTs 19 (Mathematics Education) and 22 (Environmental Education). As we can see, the fields of knowledge in which the studies were submitted are varied, which differs, moreover, from the configuration found for

7- Information collected prior to the new version of the CNPq Directory of Research Groups, launched on April 23, 2014 (Available at: <www.cnpq.br/web/guest/noticiasviews/-/journal_content/56_INSTANCE_a6MO/10157/1851256>. Accessed on January 25, 2016).

8- Information collected on May 2014.

9- Ângelo R. Souza, Marília Pinto de Carvalho and Alceu Ravanello Ferraro.

10- Gelsa Knijnik and Isabel Cristina de Moura Carvalho.

groups with a higher production rate. In other words, we could not find a correlation between research groups, productivity grant holders and constant publishing about gender in specific GTs (except for the case of Marília Pinto de Carvalho, who usually participates in GT 14).

However, if we focus exclusively on GT 23, the situation changes substantially as there is, in this GT, the predominance of a few research groups who repeatedly participate in several meetings. In this case, only two authors with funded works at the meetings in question hold productivity grants – Maria Eulina Pessoa de Carvalho and Márcia Ondina Vieira Ferreira –, and here, we are talking about a total of 37 works¹¹. By focusing on participants' academic ranks, we can see that most of them were students (14 teachers versus 23 students), which most likely means that the funding indicated refers to postgraduate grants.

These 37 works were sent by people connected to seventeen groups, six works of which being submitted by people who are not listed in the Directory of Research Groups. The group that appears most frequently is the Geerge (UFRGS) – with researchers who have already completed their postgraduate programs and others who still have not – but, nevertheless, in terms of number of groups, the Southeast region outnumbers the others.

In a second scenario, considering the meetings in the period from 2007 to 2011, we found other important facts. Some of the groups who took the lead in creating GT 23 in 2004 have also become key in sustaining it in terms of coordination and representation in the ANPEd's scientific committee. Thus, the Geerge, the Gepsex (UFMS), and the Relationship between Philosophy and Education for Sexuality in Contemporaneity: The Problematics of Teacher Education group (UFLA) have been taking turns in occupying the coordinator and vice-

coordinator positions in the GT. In addition to these groups, the Education, Diversity and Inclusion group (UFPB), the Labin – Laboratory of Investigation on Body, Gender and Subjectivity in Education (UFPR) and the Nudisex – Center for Studies on Sexual Diversity (UEM), have been occupying the role of representative for the GT in the scientific committee. The elections are biannual, and we find cases of reelection or alternation in office (i.e., the former vice-coordinator becomes the coordinator in a new election).

For the third scenario, we needed to use as a basis the total of 77 works and posters presented in GT 23 that were published at the five meetings examined (2007 to 2011). In this case, we were faced with the fact that there are people with studies at various meetings: one person published her studies at four meetings, five people published at three meetings, while nine people have two texts published at the five meetings as a whole. Combined, these make up almost 50% of total works. Thus, in the period analyzed, there is little variation of authors, which might be considered a case of academic endogeneity, a hypothesis that cannot be verified at first sight, considering that the selection process of works is not public, making the quality of competing works unknown¹². An alternative to explore this aspect could be to examine the differences and similarities between the works presented by the same people, in order to find out whether advances in their production would justify their selection. However, such a study is not within the scope of this article.

Finally, it is necessary to add further comments. It has become evident that research groups, rather than just individuals, have been sustaining the studies on gender and sexualities presented in the ANPEd. This is clearer regarding GT 23, as it concentrates most of the

11- Other three productivity grant holders presented works, but since they did not indicate funding, they were not included in the count: Anderson Ferrari (30th Meeting), Maria Rita de Assis César (31st Meeting) and Edvaldo Souza Couto (33rd Meeting).

12- The amount of works received, albeit public (highlighted at meetings' opening sessions), is not indicated in a uniform, customary manner, as can be seen by consulting the ANPEd's website. See particularly <<http://www.anped.org.br/biblioteca/722/Relat%C3%B3rio>>.

production on these subjects. In the other GTs, this intervention of groups is not as strong, although a more exhaustive conclusion would require expanding the criteria used to construct the information.

We can also see that most groups originate in the field of education, although others originated in the field of anthropology, psychology and physical education, indicating the interdisciplinarity that is characteristic of gender studies.

Likewise, it seems that the Directory of Research Groups has boosted the formation and consolidation of groups in our country, considering that not only were most of the groups mentioned created after the launch of the directory (1992), but also the period of foundation of groups varies greatly, probably depending on the graduate education process of faculty members involved who teach at higher education institutions. Of the groups with works funded in the period from 2007 to 2010, we found only four that were formed in the 1990's. The oldest one is the Geerge (1990), followed by the Focus – Unicamp (1994), the Interdisciplinary Center for Gender Studies group – UFV (1996) and the Teaching Work Process group – UFPel (1999). The other fifteen groups were created after 2000, four of which from 2010 onwards. On the other hand, in relation to the date of foundation of GT 23, we found eleven groups created after 2004, some of which with a strong presence in the GT, as expressed, for example, by the number of times that people connected to such groups had their works approved (as with the Research Group on Gender, Sexuality and Sex in Education – GSS, at UFMG).

It was evident, moreover, that some people who were graduate students at the time their work was published migrated to or created new groups, further feeding the production on gender and collaborating to expand research groups in our country. By way of illustration, the Youth, Education and Social Interactions group, at UEPA, and the Gender, Body, Sexuality and Education group, at UFU, were founded in

2013, i.e., two years after the authors connected to them presented their works at the 33rd ANPEd Meeting.

Finally, it is worth noting that the latest version of the Directory of Research Groups may in the future allow a more detailed tracking of some of the developments highlighted here. For instance, a tool that is now available refers to the registration of graduates, which allows to better track the training of human resources in research.

Final Considerations: Are Gender Studies Legitimized at the ANPEd?

Scientific capital is a particular kind of symbolic capital (which, as we know, is always based on knowledge and recognition) which consists of the recognition (or credit) given by the set of competitor-peers within the scientific field. (BOURDIEU, 2003b, p. 79).

Although the two questions approached in this text show relations between each other, they could be independently discussed. From this point of view, our aim in the first question was to problematize our own previous convictions, as we realized that, even considering the huge advances of gender studies at the ANPEd – and which express, to some extent, the status of the discussion at postgraduate level, and the status of research on the subject –, it seems that its growth is owing to the creation of a niche, as indicated in the references presented at the beginning of this work, rather than to a real acceptance of the category's analytical relevance at the institution as a whole. In sum, in the whole history of the ANPEd, there are areas in which gender still has not entered, and in the GTs it has – besides GT 23, obviously –, we can see but a small number of works over the years, as though there were again a niche in some of them. However, to confirm this hypothesis, it would be necessary to expand data collection concerning the authorship of works presented in the other GTs, which is exemplified here

through the PT works that indicated funding in the period from 2007 to 2010, a task to be tackled in a future study.

Is it possible to affirm, then, that gender studies are legitimized within ANPEd? This is a provocation we bring to debate, although in our opinion they are not fully legitimized, if we are to adopt the criteria used by the author quoted in the epigraph to this text:

A legitimate philosophical (or scientific) problem is the one that philosophers (or scientists) recognize [...] as such – because it is inscribed in the logic of the history of the field, as well as in the field's dispositions historically constituted for and by belonging to the field – and which, because of the specific authority they are recognized to have, is highly likely to be widely recognized as legitimate (BOURDIEU, 2003a, p. 123-124).

The other side of this discussion – i.e., a gain of space, the acceptance of its relevance (*legitimation...*) – resides in the male and female actors who have advocated the inclusion of the subject as a relevant, *legitimate* problem, i.e., male and female researchers who, as we have tried to demonstrate, have been using the artifice (a *legitimate* one, i.e., according to the force of groups, under the rules of the field) to advance knowledge of the subject by means of research groups recognized by the institutions that organize the scientific production in our country. Research groups are no doubt the drivers of production and struggle for legitimation, particularly within GT 23, in which they usually invest in a constant manner. That is not what seems to take place in the other ANPEd GTs, in which little can be found in terms of production on gender by different people connected to the same research groups. In other words, in the case of GT 23, the research groups distribute their scientific capital between their members – a fact that, by itself, makes an interesting object of investigation.

We may rather think of an increasing visibility of gender studies within the ANPEd, or, using the concepts popularized by Fraser (2009) in the field of gender studies, an expansion of both representation and recognition dimensions, which are more specifically expressed by the consolidation of GT 23.

Finally, a remark of a qualitative nature. In terms of the studies' contents, GT 23 seems to show a predominance of the pre-structuralist perspective, particularly concerning the concurrence of differentiated perspectives on gender and sexual diversities. This connection is a potent feature of this GT, while hardly anything can be found in other GTs with regard to sexual diversities from 2007 to 2011, with a predominance therein of works – which are equally relevant – about women's condition, feminization in teaching, gender relations in the school environment, curriculum and evaluation processes, etc.

Again, it is possible to raise a few questions here: has GT 23 become a niche for works on sexuality? And why is it that the GT attracts authors linked to post-structuralism and, to a lesser degree, other perspectives and themes? Are conservation and exclusion strategies also being used in this space?

Considering the transdisciplinary aspect of gender as a category of analysis, the prevalence of one orientation may provide basis for further studies in that direction. However, our understanding of the object may grow narrow. From this point of view, it would be important to see, in operation and in debate, the various forms of working on gender. By way of illustration, a contribution that is almost absent from the record of works produced at the ANPEd (as a whole) concerns the so-called *social relations of sex* associated to research on the sexual division of labor, which is quite significant when it comes to understanding professions primarily engaged in by women, like teaching (HIRATA; KERGOAT, 2007; KERGOAT, 2009).

In sum, advances also depend on disputes between different theoretical currents,

the expansion of what we know, and an immersion in differentiated ways of viewing the same object. Perhaps, it will take a little more struggling to cause gender studies to advance even further at the ANPEd, thus ensuring greater visibility and legitimacy to the field.

References

- ADELMAN, Miriam. Um lugar ao sol? A teoria feminista e seu lugar no campo das ciências sociais. In: LAGO, Mara C. de S. et al. (Org.). **Interdisciplinaridade em diálogos de gênero**. Florianópolis: Mulheres, 2004. p. 165-175.
- BLAY, Eva. Núcleos de Estudos da Mulher X Academia. In: BRASIL. Presidência da República. Secretaria Especial de Políticas para as Mulheres. ENCONTRO NACIONAL DE NÚCLEOS E GRUPOS DE PESQUISAS – 2005, 2006. **Pensando gênero e ciência**. Brasília, DF. Brasília, DF: Secretaria Especial de Políticas para as Mulheres, 2006. p. 63-71.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. **Campo de poder, campo intelectual**. Buenos Aires: Quadrata, 2003a.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. **Los usos sociales de la ciencia**. Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión, 2003b.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. Método científico e hierarquia social dos objetos. In: NOGUEIRA, Maria Alice; CATANI, Afrânio (Org.). **Pierre Bourdieu: escritos de educação**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1998. p. 33-38.
- BOURDIEU, Pierre. O campo científico. In: ORTIZ, Renato (Org.). **Pierre Bourdieu: sociologia**. São Paulo: Ática, 1983. p. 122-155.
- BRASIL. Presidência da República. Secretaria Especial de Direitos Humanos. **Brasil Sem Homofobia: Programa de combate à violência e à discriminação contra GLTB e promoção da cidadania homossexual**. Brasília, DF: Secretaria Especial de Direitos Humanos/Ministério da Saúde, 2004.
- BRASIL. Presidência da República. Secretaria Especial de Políticas para as Mulheres. In: ENCONTRO NACIONAL DE NÚCLEOS E GRUPOS DE PESQUISAS – 2005, 2006, Brasília, DF. **Pensando gênero e ciência**. Brasília, DF: Secretaria Especial de Políticas para as Mulheres, 2006.
- BRUSCHINI, Cristina; PINTO, Céli R. Introdução. In: BRUSCHINI, Cristina; PINTO, Céli R. (Org.) **Tempos e lugares de gênero**. São Paulo: Fundação Carlos Chagas: Editora 34, 2001. p. 7-13.
- COSTA, Albertina de O. O campo de estudos da mulher no Brasil – período de formação. In: BRANDÃO, Margarida Luiza R.; BINGEMER, Maria Clara L. (Org.). **Mulher e relações de gênero**. São Paulo: Loyola, 1994. p. 161-169.
- COSTA, Albertina de O. O campo de estudos de gênero e suas duas revistas: uma pauta de pesquisa. **Revista Estudos Feministas**, Florianópolis, v. 16, n. 1, p. 131-132, jan./abr. 2008. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0104-026X2008000100014>. Acesso em: 25 jan. 2016.
- COSTA, Albertina de O. Women's studies in Brazil; or the tightrope-walking strategy. In: BARRETO, Elba; ZIBAS, Dagmar (Org.). **Brazilian issues on education, gender and race**. São Paulo: Fundação Carlos Chagas, 1996. p. 36-47.
- COSTA, Albertina de O.; BRUSCHINI, Cristina (Org.). **Uma questão de gênero**. Rio de Janeiro: Rosa dos Tempos, 1992.
- FERREIRA, Márcia Ondina Vieira. A ANPEd e a produção sobre gênero e sexualidades: a contribuição dos grupos de pesquisa do CNPq. Pelotas: UFPel, 2015. **Relatório de Pesquisa Bolsa de Produtividade/CNPq**.
- FERREIRA, Márcia Ondina Vieira. Pesquisando gênero e sindicalismo docente: à procura de um referencial para uma temática transdisciplinar. In: DAL ROSSO, Sadi (Org.). **Associativismo e sindicalismo em educação: organização e lutas**. Brasília, DF: Paralelo 15, 2011. p. 29-46.
- FERREIRA, Márcia Ondina Vieira. Relações de gênero e sexualidades no campo da educação: uma análise a partir da produção da ANPEd (delineamento quantitativo e qualitativo). Pelotas: UFPel, 2012. **Relatório de Pesquisa Bolsa de Produtividade/CNPq**.
- FRASER, Nancy. Reenquadrando a justiça em um mundo globalizado. **Lua Nova**, São Paulo, n. 77, p. 11-39, 2009. Disponível em: <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ln/n77/a01n77.pdf>>. Acesso em 25 jan. 2016.

- GODINHO, Tatau et al. (Org.). **Trajatória da mulher na educação brasileira: 1996-2003**. Brasília, DF: INEP, 2006.
- GROSSI, Miriam P. A revista Estudos Feministas faz dez anos. **Estudos Feministas**, Florianópolis, n. 12, p. 211-221, set./dez. 2004. Disponível em: <http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0104-026X2004000300023>. Acesso em: 25 jan. 2016.
- HIRATA, Helena; KERGOAT, Danièle. Novas configurações da divisão social do trabalho. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 37, n. 132, p. 595-609, set./dez. 2007. Disponível em: <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/cp/v37n132/a0537132.pdf>>. Acesso em 25 jan. 2016.
- JUNQUEIRA, Rogério D. (Org.). **Diversidade sexual na educação: problematizações sobre a homofobia nas escolas**. Brasília, DF: MEC: Unesco, 2009.
- KERGOAT, Danièle. Divisão sexual do trabalho e relações sociais de sexo. In: HIRATA, Helena et al. (Org.). **Dicionário crítico do feminismo**. São Paulo: Unesp, 2009. p. 67-75.
- MATOS, Marlise; MARQUES, Danusa. Caminhos das discussões acadêmicas sobre o tema de gênero, mulheres e política: em que momento estamos? In: BRASIL. **Observatório Brasil de Igualdade de Gênero**. Brasília, DF: SPM, 2010. Disponível em: <<http://www.observatoriodegenero.gov.br/menu/publicacoes/outros-artigos-e-publicacoes/caminhos-das-discussoes-academicas-sobre-o-tema-de-genero-mulheres-e-politica-em-que-momentos-estamos>>. Acesso em: 25 jan. 2016.
- MELO, Hildete P. de et al. (Org.). **Olhares feministas**. Brasília, DF: MEC: Unesco, 2006.
- RIBEIRO, Cláudia M.; XAVIER FILHA, Constantina. Trajetórias teórico-metodológicas em 10 anos de produção do GT 23. In: REUNIÃO NACIONAL DA ASSOCIAÇÃO NACIONAL DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO E PESQUISA EM EDUCAÇÃO – ANPEd, 36., 2013, Goiânia. **Anais...** Rio de Janeiro: ANPEd, 2013. p. 1-21. Disponível em: <http://36reuniao.anped.org.br/pdfs_trabalhos_encomendados/gt23_trabencomendado_claudiaribeiro.pdf>. Acesso em: 25 jan. 2016.
- RISTOFF, Dilvo et al. (Org.). **A mulher na educação superior brasileira: 1991-2005**. Brasília, DF: INEP, 2007.
- RISTOFF, Dilvo et al. In: SIMPÓSIO GÊNERO E INDICADORES DA EDUCAÇÃO SUPERIOR BRASILEIRA, 2008, Brasília, DF. **Simpósio...** Brasília, DF: INEP, 2008. p. 31-62.
- RISTOFF, Dilvo; GIOLO, Jaime (Org.). **Trajatória da mulher na educação superior brasileira: 1991-2004**. Brasília, DF: INEP, 2006.
- ROSEMBERG, Fúlvia. Caminhos cruzados: educação e gênero na produção acadêmica. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 27, n. 1, p. 47-68, jan./jun. 2001. Disponível em: <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/ep/v27n1/a04v27n1.pdf>>. Acesso em: 25 jan. 2016.
- SAFFIOTI, Heleieth I. B. **A mulher na sociedade de classes: mito e realidade**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1979.
- SCAVONE, Lucila. Ciência e militância: os estudos de gênero no Brasil. In: ENCONTRO ANUAL DA ASSOCIAÇÃO NACIONAL DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO E PESQUISA EM CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS - ANPOCS, 35., 2011, Caxambu. p. 1-18. Disponível em: <http://portal.anpocs.org/portal/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_details&gid=992&Itemid=353>. Acesso em: 25 jan. 2016.
- SCHIEBINGER, Londa. **O feminismo mudou a ciência?** Bauru: Edusc, 2001.
- SOUZA-LOBO, Elisabeth. **A classe operária tem dois sexos: trabalho, dominação e resistência**. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1991.
- VIANNA, Claudia et al. Gênero, sexualidade e educação formal no Brasil: uma análise preliminar da produção acadêmica entre 1990 e 2006. **Educação & Sociedade**, Campinas, v. 32, n. 115, p. 525-545, abr./jun. 2011. Disponível em: <<http://www.scielo.br/pdf/es/v32n115/v32n115a16.pdf>>. Acesso em: 25 jan. 2016.

Received on: February 17th, 2016

Approved on: August 23rd, 2016

Márcia Ondina Vieira Ferreira holds a Ph.D. in sociology from the Universidad de Salamanca (Spain), and teaches for the graduate program in education at the Faculdade de Educação da UFPel; she is a research productivity grand holder (CNPq) and coordinates the Teaching Work Process Research Group.

Márcia Cristiane Völz Klumb Coronel is a Ph.D. student in education at the graduate program in education at the Faculdade de Educação da UFPel and holds a Master's degree (2014) from the same institution; she teaches at the EMEF Presidente Floriano Peixoto primary school (Novo Hamburgo) and is a member of the Teaching Work Process Research Group.