

# WHERE ARE THE WOMEN IN TEACHER TRAINING?: AN OVERVIEW FROM THE GLOBAL SOUTH

Cibele Cheron<sup>1</sup>

Cristine Koehler Zanella<sup>2</sup>

Alexandre Anselmo Guilherme<sup>3</sup>

**Abstract:** Where are the Global South women in teacher education contexts? To answer this question, this article investigates the epistemic foundation that legitimizes male power over public spaces and ranks society based on a subject/object dichotomy, personifying the subject in the European cultural/economic/political pattern and the object in the pattern colonized/aculturated/subaltern. We draw an overview of feminist struggles and feminisms in Latin America and suggest an epistemological tool, world traveling, and its relationship with the technique of cultural translation, in order to indicate the Latin American feminist contribution to give validity to other forms of knowledge and teacher education processes.

**Keywords:** Teacher education; Women; Global South.

## Onde estão as mulheres na formação docente?: um panorama desde o Sul Global

**Resumo:** Onde estão as mulheres do Sul Global nos contextos de formação docente? Para responder à pergunta proposta, o presente artigo questiona o fundamento epistêmico que legitima o poder masculino sobre os espaços públicos e hierarquiza a sociedade sobre a dicotomia sujeito/objeto, personificando o sujeito no padrão cultural/econômico/político europeu e o objeto no padrão colonizado/aculturado/subalterno. Traçamos um panorama das lutas feministas e dos feminismos na América Latina e abordamos uma ferramenta epistemológica, *world traveling*, e sua relação com a técnica de tradução cultural, a fim de sugerir a contribuição feminista latino-americana para propor a valorização de outras formas de conhecimento e de processos de formação de professores.

**Palavras-chave:** Formação docente; Mulheres; Sul Global.

---

<sup>1</sup> Professora Visitante do Instituto Federal de Educação, Ciência e Tecnologia do Rio Grande do Sul - IFRS, campus Viamão ([cibele.cheron@viamao.ifrs.edu.br](mailto:cibele.cheron@viamao.ifrs.edu.br))

<sup>2</sup> Professora do Curso de Relações Internacionais da Universidade Federal do ABC - UFABC ([cristine.zanella@ufabc.edu.br](mailto:cristine.zanella@ufabc.edu.br))

<sup>3</sup> Professor Adjunto dos Programas de Pós-Graduação em Educação, Psicologia e Filosofia da Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul – PUCRS ([alexandre.guilherme@pucls.br](mailto:alexandre.guilherme@pucls.br))

## INTRODUCTION

Where are the Women? (ENLOE, 2014, 1).

We begin this article inspired by Enloe (2014), and we ask: Where are the Global South (GS) women in the production and development of academic knowledge? We question the epistemic foundations of society, which legitimizes male power over public spaces related to decision-making and production of knowledge, hierarchising society into a subject/object dichotomy, and personifying the *subject* following the cultural/economic/political European standards and the *object* as the acculturated/subaltern/colonised. Following this, the academic universe inscribes gender references to knowledge, historically concealing and/or interiorising feminist, gender and queer studies, and portraying the GS as a place of knowledge with low reflexivity and scientificity. Combining these factors, we draw our second guiding question: Where are the GS women in the context of teacher education?

To answer these questions, it is relevant to start with observing, as argued by Anderson (2006), that the nation is a discursively constituted imagined community. The educational system organized by the State, is a discursively constituted community, plays a fundamental role in the formation of the national imaginary (GELLNER, 1993). In the colonial scenario, however, this perspective of education, in addition to being a privilege reserved for a few, is strategic for structuring asymmetries and social hierarchies. Thus, it is also necessary to analyse teacher education from the perspective of gender relations that interpret it from a relational perspective between man and woman (HYPOLITO, 2020). As such, in this paper, we address intersections that potentialize the subalternation by gender, race/ethnicity, class/occupation, and sexuality. In addition to this, we confront the epistemological barrier by employing resources formulated from the GS perspective, in which the recognition of gender intersects with other categories to foster alternatives to the construction of thought, knowledge, and political action.

Hence, this article draws a panorama of feminist and feminism struggles associated with Latin America. We highlight the specificities of systemic forces such as the construction of national identities, colonial heritages, labour market dynamics, inequality, and social structures in shaping feminist concerns, ideas, and demands in the region. Finally, we make use of an epistemological tool, the *world traveling*, and its relationship to the cultural translation technique, in order to suggest that Latin American feminism proposes an openness,

acknowledgment, and appreciation of other forms of knowledge and to teacher education.

## **FEMINISMS, A GLOBAL APPROACH**

We understand teacher training as a disputed arena in which an Eurocentric epistemology still predominates. In its current dynamics, narratives of submission and erasure of other ways of being, interpreting and making sense of the world are engendered. Several studies address the decolonization of knowledge, necessary for the construction of new curricula from different matrices, which give visibility and break with the processes of inferiorization of the populations of the Global South (WALSH, 2009).

According to Britzman (2007), when the gender perspective is considered in teacher education, relationships and power networks are also considered present, as well as the conflicts, tensions, and negotiations that permeate them. We begin the challenge of reflecting on the intersection between feminism and teacher education taking as a starting point some of the meanings that can be attributed to “feminisms”. From this perspective, education takes on a broader meaning, constituting a set of processes by which individuals are transformed or become subjects of a culture. To be a subject of a culture means assuming a posture according to which such processes are relevant from the perspective of what is considered necessary or relevant to teach, and also from the perspective of what is put on the sidelines of teaching, instituting marks, places, and positions in power games. We approach, thus, different perspectives associated with struggles, articulations, discourses, and studies of and about women, in paths with temporal and geospatial referential.

Thus, and historically speaking, it is at the end of the eighteenth century that we find the first feminine demands for rights, consonant to the profound transformations that occurred in the social, political, economic, scientific, cultural, and legal fields of the Western world. Scientific discoveries, especially in the field of anatomy, have allowed for a better understanding of the human body and recognition of the differences between the sexes. Because of such anatomical differences, Enlightenment thinkers advocated the radical distinction between men and women, associating intellectual and moral attributes with physical characteristics. The female skull, for example, of smaller proportion, was associated with lower cognitive abilities, legitimising that women must not

participate in the production of wealth, political decisions or formal education (FOUCAULT, 1977; 1984; SCIEBNGER, 1987; LAQUEUR, 2001).

Even though natural-law theory would establish legal and political equality, the white man, a citizen of the metropolis, manage to find in nature rational justifications for the inequalities inherent to the bourgeois order. Further, the sexual difference is built and reinforced socially effectively in the power system, establishing a hierarchy between men and women (COSTA, 1995; BOURDIEU, 1999). When reflecting on the formation of the identity of subjects in the spaces of teacher education, as well as in educational institutions, it can be argued that pedagogical action is committed, to some extent, to symbolic violence with the objective of internalising certain meanings, imposing arbitrarily the culture and values of a particular group or class as the legitimate culture. The power of symbolic violence imposes meanings as legitimate and dissimulates the power relations invariably present in “actions that convert differences into hierarchically placed inequalities and asymmetries, for domination, exploitation, oppression [by which] the dominant treats the dominated not as a subject, but as an object, making it silent, dependent, and passive” (CHERON; WÜNSH, 2020, p. 6). This system of power simultaneously justifies and imposes “moral differences to the female and male behaviours, according to the demands of the bourgeois, capitalist, individualist, nationalist, imperialist and colonialist society established in European countries” (COSTA, 1995, p. 110-111). Consequently, different places for women and men are drawn in the political-economic order of capitalist states, affirming the inferiority of the characteristics and spaces destined for the feminine. In this way, “man's activities were directed to the broader social world of economics, politics, and social interactions, besides the family sphere, while his wife's activities were rigidly restricted, limited to the domestic world of her own family” (PARKER, 1991, p. 59).

Prior to the eighteenth century, the designation of public spheres to men, in special political deliberation and economic production, was already conceived in patriarchal power. The exercise of the right to occupy public spaces in a protagonist and legitimate way by men are incorporated into the logic of the social contract, reformulating the epistemic basis of society. In our modern times, civil society establishes a social order founded on the fraternal patriarchy of men, citizens, who exercise their power over women. Men are born free and equal and transform this natural freedom into the security of civil liberty, protected by the juridical affirmation of rights. By sexual differences, women are

deprived of legal equality as well as civil liberty. They become the object of a sexual contract through which men secure, under the protection of civil patriarchal right, their domination over women and their bodies (PATEMAN, 1993).

However, female inclusion in the category of rights holders is the first claim of women as a social group. Primordially, this inclusion disputes the liberal revolutionary declarations that proclaim the rights of men; that is, those affirmations of equality, liberty, fraternity and the archetype of happiness, inherent to the Declarations of the eighteenth century, built in the model of Western citizenship. However, many were excluded from the status of citizens, especially women (HUNT, 2009). By analysing this context, it is clear that those civil and political rights declared in liberal texts demand the autonomy of subjects in order to become more effective. Indeed, not all members of a society are autonomous, but only those persons who are considered capable of reasoning and independence to make decisions on their own account. Such conditions, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, excluded the mentally ill, slaves, homeless, servants, children, and women. Of these, only women were legally prevented from seeking to become autonomous and, therefore, to rise to the status of subjects of civil and political rights (PATEMAN, 1993; HUNT, 2009). We note that bourgeois revolutionary thinking is pivotal to Western societies until the end of World War II because women were taught to refuse public spaces, to privately confine themselves in their homes where they must dedicate themselves fully to their families, to whom they will devote all their natural abilities of care, devotion, and sacrifice. According to the bourgeois ideology, women have a domestic nature, focused on motherhood, while men have a public nature, focused on politics. To challenge the exercise of these social functions would be to challenge one's own nature (BADINTER, 1991).

The first claims by the ones we call "the first wave" of feminism questioned existing legal structures and sought to guarantee women political rights, in order to effect female citizenship. The demands are meant to be impersonal, universalistic, and egalitarian. The restriction to private spaces and attribution of care and maternity functions are not objects of contestation. The first wave focuses on women's participation in formal political process through access to voting and representative electoral positions. These demands do not represent a radical contradiction to the Cartesian rationality inherent to the modern paradigm, and they are the banner of what has come to compose liberal feminism (BESSE, 1999).

The epistemic direction of modernity validates only the knowledge derived from rational logic, instituted in the duality of nature/man or incivility/civility. These are opposing and dichotomous elements, which are associated with the dichotomies of body/reason and object/subject. Man, civility, reason, and subject are attached to the masculine and, in turn, nature, incivility, body, and object are connected to the feminine. From this perspective, modern epistemology elaborates on neutral male subjects, who do not need definition, but the feminine is defined as the negative of the masculine. The woman is the other, the one who is not man, defined by the body, a machine incapable of the ability of thinking: “they have ovaries, a uterus; these are the singular conditions that enclose them in their subjectivity; it is gladly said that she thinks with her glands” (BEAUVOIR, 2009, p. 16). Impossible, at this level, to conceive those women can be subjects of knowledge.

The radical criticism comes with the so-called second wave of feminism. In the 1960s and 1970s, this wave complained about women’s oppression, facing patriarchal premises, and acknowledging the importance of the gender category. This period also coincides with the struggle for access to formal education and validation of knowledge produced by women. As the locus of formal education, the school is responsible for the production and reproduction of differences and inequalities, including those related to sex and gender. Since its genesis, this institution has separated individuals, using classification mechanisms: adults and children, rich and poor, male and female. Many studies were conducted involving women in science, technology, and academic fields; and research and analysis began to incorporate the gender category, in search of cultural and political redefinitions for what was, until then, determined by sex (KELLER, 1996).

The construction of discourses exalts the difference, focusing on themes still confined to the private sphere, such as domestic violence, and circumscribing the “oppression of women as the devaluation and repression of their experiences by a masculinist culture that exalts violence and individualism” (YOUNG, 1990, p. 73). The passage from the assertion of equality to the one of difference denotes structural transformations in feminist thinking, which ceases to be univocal. Likewise, political and social action presents plurality and divergences. The growing diversity in the period can be related to the emergence of new social movements, new lines of thought and displacements, the consolidation of struggles, and by mere acknowledgment (GILLIGAN, 1991; CHODOROW, 1990).

Hence, the androcentric bias of intellectual and scientific production is denounced by second-wave feminists. This bias refers to the modern liberal rationality, transcends all areas, and materialises both in the invisibility of women and in the distorted representations of the feminine universe. Attempts to legalise the knowledge formulated by and related to women, during this period, faced the resistance of the precepts and methods that forged traditional theories, based on Cartesian logic. According to this logic, the knowledge of/about women lacked epistemic authority, objectivity, and neutrality. Therefore, it is not scientific (SARDENBERG, 2002).

The construction of a pluralistic epistemology aimed at breaking with the universalist rules of thought and with the binary notion of gender encompasses the third wave of feminism. In this phase, intra-gender divergences stand out, amplifying the plurality and the diversity of what contains the term feminism. It is possible to identify this period, which corresponds, approximately, to the 1980s and 1990s, as diffuse feminism (PINTO, 2003), of post-feminism, which is understood as “close to the post-modernism discourse, inasmuch as both postmodernism and post-feminism aim at deconstructing, destabilising gender as a fixed and unchanging category” (AMARAL; MACEDO, 2005, p. 153). As such, the centre of discussions and claims of the period is in the deconstruction and questions of identity and difference, bringing feminism closer to contexts of post-modernism, poststructuralism, and postcolonialism (GAMBLE, 2006). As a consequence of this, the formation of political agendas aimed at the reconfiguration of institutions and the resumption of public spaces is part of the proposed “fourth feminist wave”. This phase would correspond to the most recent period in which sections of the women’s and feminist movements are able to join governments and institutionalise their demands through gender-focused public policies (SIMÕES; MATOS, 2008).

## **SUBALTERN FEMINISM AND THE LATIN AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE**

Feminism is concomitantly constituted of theoretical formulation and social movement. Because of its combined nature of the political and reflexive practice, feminism requires a diligent look at its role as a political theory. Indeed, in the trajectory that runs from Modernity to the present, feminism is outlined as a transverse political chain, whose ideas end up not belonging specifically to a particular group or place (GARGALLO, 2009). However, the epistemic field remains challenging to feminism, given the repeated need to

affirm it ontologically in the production of knowledge and in theoretical reflection. The importance, the validity, or even the existence of feminist thought is constantly questioned, even though this thought emerges from an elaborate set of debates, dialogues, experience and learnings proper to action and reflection. Not rarely, the feminist theory is reduced to a simple conviction (FRAISSE, 2012; SILVA, 2013).

In contexts where there was colonial domination, the hierarchical relationship between men and women and the delegitimization of feminism is even more evident (HIRATA; KERGOAT, 2007). In these contexts, the category of gender adds up to other categories, such as race/ethnicity, class/work, and rural/urban, which, articulated a conditional and unequal status in the structures of society. Combined, these elements are important elements to the inferiority and maintenance of the subaltern condition of black, native, rural, and poor women as creatures without speech and power (SPIVAK, 2012).

In colonial thought, black women and men are intrinsically linked to manual, subordinate, servile work. Native men and women are represented as indolent and incapable. The idea that nature has not forged them for intellectual activities is normalised and widespread. The pattern of domination instilled by colonial tradition fuses ethnic/racial identities with hierarchies, status, and opportunities. Moreover, women are destined for reproduction and invisible tasks, whereas to men it is the production (of decisions, wealth, or knowledge). To think over feminism in contexts such as the Latin American one, at this level, means thinking in an intersectional way (HIRATA; KERGOAT, 2007; TELLES, 2013). It is to think about gender and concomitantly about other categories such as race/ethnicity, class/work, and rural/place.

The colonial period meant to Latin America the eradication and denigration of native and black cultures, trying to eliminate subaltern pasts (BIDASECA; LABA 2011). Thus, a tradition of abuses and exploitations based on dichotomous opposition between subject and object arises. The subject is personified by the European, cultural, economic, and political standard, an active producer of knowledge, wealth, and decisions. In turn, the object is embodied in the colonised, acculturated, exploited, and subaltern people (MIGNOLO, 2003; QUIJANO, 2005). In the colonial world system of Modernity, the social hierarchies were erected over the dichotomised structure of subject/object, colonizer/colonised, so that the “dominated population, in the

new identities that had been assigned to them, were also subjected to the Eurocentric hegemony as a way of knowing” (MIGNOLO, 2003, p. 85).

As a result, like other colonised places, Latin America is not considered a locus of production of knowledge but one of a subjugated, inferior, of low sophistication, low reflexivity and lack of scientific validity knowledge (SPIVAK, 2012). In order to secure control over the knowledge produced by the colonised, the so-called coloniality of power is constituted. It is assumed that the European paradigm is the normative one, which makes all the others subaltern. This control acts potentially on three levels: i. as to power, in economy and politics; ii. as knowledge, in the arts and humanities as well as the sciences; and iii. as being, in the subjectivities, bodies, and roles socially attributed to the genders (QUIJANO, 2005). Cultural differences are converted, thus, into values that guide systems of power and discrimination against subjects, cultures, and peoples. Contemporaneously, these systems are maintained in political and economic hierarchies and in cultural discourses produced about the colonised regions, Latin America among them, constituting and perpetuating relations of domination and oppression of people in their heterogeneity (MOHANTY, 2003).

It follows that the categories gender, race/ethnic and class/work are inseparable to the analysis of Latin America (BIDASECA; LABA, 2011; COSTA, 2013). The existence of coloniality of power cannot be separated from the coloniality of gender, because “if, in the context of colonial production, the subaltern subject has no history and cannot speak, the female subject is even more deeply in obscurity” (SPIVAK, 2012, 85). Once this is admitted, the coloniality of gender constructs a new epistemology, and bringing Global South women into teacher education policies can encourage the school to educate for diversities respect, changing teacher education policies to policies for social relations democratisation. In this sense, teacher education policies, as indicators of guidelines, have been incorporating Global South women demands for the recognition of their different ways of being, interpreting and represent the world (WALSH, 2009). It is, therefore, a matter of developing

a work that aims to dismantle the constellations - psychic, social, epistemic, ontological-existental - installed by modernity and its hidden side, which is coloniality; pedagogies that stimulate new forms of political action, insurgency and rebellion, while building alliances, hopes and “other” visions of being in society, giving substance and legitimacy to the ethical-political dream of

overcoming the unjust reality, and build “other” paths (WALSH, 2009, p. 38).

Its goal is to recognize the diversity of subjects and objects and seek the complex thought from the protagonist, transposing the borders between the knowledge of Great North and colonised peoples. There is a clear detachment between hegemonic feminism, which mirrors the reality of heterosexual white women from the Global North, and the subaltern feminism practiced by black, mixed races and native women, LGTBTI, from the colonised, peripheral spaces of the Global South. Despite this, it is only at the end of the twentieth century that hegemonic feminism is challenged for having assumed the universal representation of all women, ignoring the sociocultural and identity differences between them (MOHANTY, 2003). In this perspective, teacher education processes incorporate the construction of teacher identity, potentially challenging hegemonic feminism. On account of this,

[d]ealing with teaching identity means being attentive to the representation policies that establish the discourses conveyed by groups and individuals who dispute the academic space or who are in the management of the State. It is also to consider the practical effects and the politics of truth that the discourses carried by the press, television and cinema are helping to shape. Teaching identity is negotiated between these multiple representations, among which, and in a relevant way, the identity policies established by the official educational discourse. This discourse talks about the management of teachers and the organisation of school systems, the objectives and goals of teaching and teaching work; it also speaks of the ways in which they are seen or spoken, of the discourses that see them and through which they see themselves, producing an ethics and a certain relationship with themselves, which constitute the experience they can have of themselves (GARCIA; HYYPOLITO; VIEIRA, 2005, p. 47).

Hegemonic feminism draws, for what it understands as the developing world, a monolithic woman, who needs to be tutored, since she is incapable of political praxis, and also represented, since she cannot speak for herself (ANZALDÚA, 2005; BIDASECA; LABA, 2011). The subaltern woman is presented as poor, ignorant, morally and sexually repressed, limited by family, religiosity, and traditions, and devoid of psychic, economic, and intellectual autonomy. In contrast, hegemonic feminism outlines the Western woman as educated, autonomous, free, conscious, and apt to control her body, her behaviour, her destiny, and produce knowledge. In this approach, Latin

America is the place where a homogeneous group lives, a monolithic group where women are victims of domination and violence of men and, therefore, universally dependent, without conditions of being a subject by themselves (MOHANTY, 2003; ANZALDÚA, 2005).

The deconstruction of this monolithic representation made by hegemonic feminism implies that Latin American women must question the pretension of universalising their history and generalising the conditions of their subordination by Western feminists. It also goes against the discourse by Western feminism about the negation of diverse and plural identities, possible strategies of resistance and confrontation, and the construction of subjectivities of Latin American women (ANZALDÚA, 2005).

Thus, it is important to think about teacher education as proposed by Walsh (2009), simultaneously contemplating pedagogies that: i) following Fanon, potentiate a “thinking from” the ontological condition of the colonised, fostering new understandings of the coloniality of power, knowledge and being; and ii) encourage a “thinking with” diverse social groups that encourage awareness and concern about the effects of colonial power patterns still in force. In this way,

[...] teacher education has the challenge of contemplating other subjects, other pedagogies and in the perspective of proposing other questions, such as the one that opens our text, and also other possible ones for old and new problems, of education, of school and teachers, is that we move the imaginary as a potent field that enables another look and another thought, which is produced from the challenge of complexity against reductionism (BRANCHER; OLIVEIRA, 2017, p. 31).

To challenge the coloniality of power and gender, an emerging epistemological proposal comes from Latin America, so to contemplate the differences within feminism. And a non-hegemonic feminism is thus elaborated. The ontological category emerging, in this proposal, is a place of constant transit where multiple identities (cultural, sexual and linguistic) and epistemic approaches intertwine. At the same time, the frontier between these multiple identities becomes a dense space of conflict and power relations, where the categories gender, race/ethnicity, class/work and sexuality intersect, revealing multifaceted and simultaneous forms of domination and submission (ANZALDÚA, 2005; BITU; MAGYARI-VINCZE, 2012).

In this sense, decolonising education means, among other things, recognising that women from the Global South enter university not only to learn, but also to teach. The decoloniality of education is achieved to the same extent that the validity and importance of “other” knowledge that was not made official by the colonial matrix are recognised. From this point of view, it is understood that processes and policies of teacher education must contemplate the diversity, the plurality of subjects that are epistemologically constituted on the border, the situated knowledge, the pedagogical practices aimed at the instituted and instituting Global South subjects.

This emerging frontier epistemology, through intersectionality, demonstrates that discriminations are polyvalent and interact with one another (CRENSHAW, 2002). Through this bias, it is understood that chauvinism, racism, class oppression, and discrimination by sexual orientation, for example, act in a systemic way. With the intersectionality proposed by the counter-hegemonic feminism it is possible to broaden the understanding of complex phenomena, such as discriminations, with dialogic and dynamics mechanisms, without resorting to the reductionist rationality of the universalising paradigm (KOZCE; RELUCA, 2009). The knowledge produced from this proposal is situated, it has belonging, place, history, memory, and aims at the autonomy of those who produce it, women-subjects (MOHANTY, 2003; BIDASECA; LABA, 2011; SPIVAK, 2012).

## THE WORLD TRAVELLING EPISTEMOLOGICAL TOOL

María Lugones (1990) defines world-travelling as the ability to access or get to know constructions about oneself or the “I” of the other, which are plural and complex. Lugones' proposition illuminates an urgency and conceptual scope to envision the transformation of society through love, learning, coalition, and resistance. In this perspective, we can think that teacher education, as well as other formative paths, moves between worlds. It does not suggest a feeling of belonging to a home, but a feeling of experiencing to be different in each of these various worlds, on a frontier in which the self becomes plural:

The change from being one person to being a different person is what I call 'traveling' [...]. The displacement of the journey (of the self) thus allows the encounter with the other person in their cultural, racial, sexual difference. This possibility of crossing subjectivities and their places of enunciation is central in decolonial feminist praxis, in the co-creation of a pluralistic and inclusive interdependence sense (BIDASECA, 2021, p. 42).



To build a situated knowledge does not mean to simplify thoughts (black, indigenous, labourer), but to structure critical and divergent thoughts from the universal hegemonic, where progressive strands can be included. The counter-hegemonic feminism does not relegate knowledge situated to the category of mere experience or conviction. On the contrary, it declares its political character, fomenting the connection between several and plural own thoughts that are integrated into a critical, ample, and multifaceted project (WALSH, 2007).

Counter-hegemonic feminism that emerges in the Global South allies itself to the decolonisation movements of knowledge, bringing to the discussions – and here we highlight the academic field – issues such as the geopolitics of knowledge. The feminism of difference, especially in Latin America, points to the need of conceiving cosmologies and epistemologies that depart from other places of enunciation. These other places are understood as spaces of theorisation, interpretation and intervention in the Latin American geopolitical scenario that validate the history, struggles, trajectories, and knowledges that people, in their diversities, live in the midst of relations of power (ANZALDÚA, 1999; WALSH, 2007; BITU; MAGYARI-VINCZE, 2012).

The construction of knowledge from and for the South, from a critical perspective, proposes a transdisciplinary action, with socio-historical approaches, compared to and aimed at social transformation. The frontier, space of transit and plurality, is a viable locus for the manifestation of knowledge shaped by multiple worldviews, originating emancipatory epistemic proposals within the diversities (CABNAL, 2014). Inherent to the criticism, Latin American feminism uses cultural translation as a practice focused on understanding and enunciation. In this practice, ideas, knowledge, and thoughts are translated, that is, they go through a continuous and forever incomplete process in which culture itself is revised in its reference systems, norms, and values. Thus, “ambivalence and antagonism follow each act of cultural translation, for negotiating with the ‘difference of other’ reveals a radical insufficiency of our own systems of significant and signification” (BHABHA, 1996, p. 14-15).

The practice of translation in Latin American feminism is a practice of transience, in which the one who translates leaves, temporarily, their place as a subject, so that the meanings of those who are translated can occupy them. It

implies in the coming and going, in the world-traveling, in the dis-locate themselves to inhabit the in-between. Discourse, experiences, knowledge, and questioning travel and, thus, are transmuted into interpretative paradigms of the categories of gender, race/ethnicity, class/work, sexuality, and regionality (ALARCÓN, 2003). Besides, questioning notions of universality, objectivity, and neutrality of the hegemonic paradigm, and denouncing the standards of scientific normativity for its Euro and androcentric values, Latin American feminists show the production of knowledge as a place of relations of power. In this place, which can be described as an arena of tensions, diverse, divergent, and conflicting positioning are debated, even within feminism itself (SARDENBERG, 2002).

Thinking about teacher education from this perspective implies, as well, recognising that teacher education constitutes a resistance act, as Lugones affirms:

Resistance is also an active state from which it is possible to seek collectivity and coalition. Resistance rarely manifests itself in direct public presence. Instead, it has its duplicities, ambiguities, even its tricks. But it is also almost always masked and hidden under structures of meaning that support and constitute domination. "Reading" the resistance is crucial to achieve an alternative conception of the realities of the oppressed. And that reading is done from inside fences and intersections that testify to a need for company. "Traveling" to worlds of meaning that are not given as part of the daily "teachings" of the dominant structures of meaning is one of the techniques, one of the arts, of moving from resistance to liberation (LUGONES, 2021, p. 15 ).

Hence, Latin American feminists have understood that it is impracticable to elaborate a feminist epistemology in a simple and singular way. In the same way, they discuss the different ways of treating the constitutive elements of the identity of the woman subject in the imaginary and social structure. Thus, they propose that subjects should no longer be taken as starting points and be considered as dynamic effects of the cultural complex interconnections in which they are inserted - ethnic, social, sexual:

I am cultureless because, as a feminist, I challenge the collective cultural/religious male-derived beliefs of Indo-Hispanics and Anglos; yet I am cultured because I am participating in the creation of yet another culture, a new story to explain the world and our participation in it, a new value system with images and symbols that connect us to each other and to the planet. Soy un

amasamiento, I am an act of kneading, of uniting and joining that not only has produced both a creature of darkness and a creature of light, but also a creature that questions the definitions of light and dark and gives them new meanings (ANZALDÚA, 1999, p. 102-103).

Nevertheless, in the academic field, feminist ideas have undergone trajectories in other directions. Although feminist perspectives have reached an important space in academia, this is notably in smaller proportions than constructivist and poststructuralist contributions, which emerged in the same period. This absence has somehow become naturalised and standardised. As such, female authors have sought to make visible that universities produce gendered knowledge, disciplined by an androcentric epistemic matrix (TICKNER, 1997). Hence, since the 1990s, most relevant feminist contributions can be identified as belonging to two strands, classified as alternatives: the feminist and the postmodern (ZALEWSKI; ENLOE, 1995; SYLVESTER, 1996).

From the first perspective, one seeks, through mechanisms of deconstruction and reconstruction, “to include gender issues in power issues” (NOGUEIRA; MESSARI, 2005, p. 225), articulating another view of the world. The lives and daily lives of those traditionally excluded from the interest of the academic world would be addressed in this perspective. As for postmodern feminists, they would occupy themselves with the disarticulation of duality inherent to the hegemonic modern epistemology, seeking to break the fixed and hierarchical patterns based on gender or other categories (SYLVESTER, 1996; NOGUEIRA; MESSARI, 2005). Also, it is important to note that the entry of feminism in most academic areas caused destabilisation, ruptures and permanence, since it is an epistemological field of male domain. The premises of Western hegemonic feminism, though associated with postmodern and, to some extent, postcolonial approaches, have not proven effective in addressing the specificities and singularities of Latin America. We believe that the gap not filled so far has to do with an approach that considers categories of analysis in isolation, as if they were not interlaced and did not interact with one another, and not acknowledging that their interaction potentializes their effects and turns subjects into transient entities that are permanently under construction.

## FINAL REMARKS

The epistemological perspective presented here, as a way of conceiving education and as a foundation for teacher education policies and practices, is a proposal that respects the limits and possibilities inscribed by concrete reality. Thus, it assumes the role of promoting the critical awareness of teachers and students, so that it can intervene in a more qualified way in reality and social issues, aiming, in principle, to improve the living conditions of the Global South women.

We sustain that overcoming the Western hegemonic feminism ineffectiveness in addressing the singularities of Global South's needs and demands is possible from the emerging, frontier epistemology and the use of intersectionalities, as proposed by the Latin American feminists, together with the practice of cultural translation and the "world-traveling" epistemological tool. To think about Global South, and more specifically about Latin America, in this proposition means, to our understanding, to see it more as a cultural and relational elaboration and less as a geographically delimited territory. In this trans-local sense, we claim the condition of protagonist subjects not only to question certainties and epistemic paradigms, but to propose openness, acknowledgment, and appreciation of other forms of knowledge and humanity.

We conclude by summarising that the current hegemonic way of thinking is binary in its terms. In order to enable the flourishing dynamics, realities, and knowledge that have been hidden by dominant Western-based epistemology, we could make use in our teaching and research activities, tools such as the world-traveling and cultural translation, which allow us to live in, shed light on spaces in-between, and observe from the perspective of the frontiers. Also, continuous education and socially geared activities could foment processes emphasising autonomy and female protagonists.

## REFERENCES

ALARCÓN, N. Anzaldúa's Frontera: Inscribing Gynetics. In: ARREDONDO, G.; HURTADO, A.; KLAHN, N.; NÁJERA-RAMIREZ, O.; ZAVELLA, P. (org.). **Chicana Feminisms: a critical reader**. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003, p. 354-369.

AMARAL, A. L.; MACEDO, A. G. Feminismo/feminismo. In: **Dicionário da crítica feminista**. Porto: Afrontamento, 2005, p. 76.

ANDERSON, B. **Imagined communities**: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. London: Verso, 2006.

ANZALDÚA, G. **Borderlands**: the new mestiza = La frontera. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1999.

ANZALDÚA, G. La conciencia de la mestiza. Rumor a uma nova consciência. **Revista Estudos Feministas**, v. 13, n. 3, p. 704-19, set./dez. 2005. Available at <https://www.scielo.br/j/ref/a/FL7SmwjzjDJQ5WQZbvYzcb/?lang=pt> Access on 7 jul. 2022.

BADINTER, E. **Palavras de Homens (1790-1793)**. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 1991.

BEAUVOIR, S. **O Segundo Sexo**. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 2009.

BESSE, S. Feminismos e (anti)feminismos no Brasil. In: BESSE, S. **Modernizando a desigualdade**: reestruturação da ideologia de gênero no Brasil, 1914-1940. São Paulo: Edusp, 1999, p. 182-220.

BHABHA, H. The voice of the dom: retrieving the experience of the once-colonised. **Times Literary Supplement**, n. 4923, p. 14-15, aug. 1996.

BIDASECA, K. Peregrinas del mismo mar. María Lugones: aportes para una poética erótica de la relación. Sentipensar con María Lugones. Una reflexión desde el intersticio. **Boletín Grupo de Trabajo CLACSO Epistemologías del sur**. Poética erótica de la relación, Buenos Aires, v. 1, n. 4, p. 26-44, 2021. Available at <https://www.clacso.org/boletin-4-poetica-erotica-de-la-relacion/>. Access on 22 jul. 2022.

BIDASECA, K.; LABA, V. V. Mujeres blancas buscando salvar a las mujeres color café de los hombres color café. Reflexiones sobre desigualdad y colonialismo jurídico desde el feminismo poscolonial. In: BIDASECA, K.; LABA, V. V. **Feminismos y poscolonialidad**: descolonizando el feminismo desde y en América Latina. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Godot, 2011, p. 95-118.

BITU, N.; MAGYARI-VINCZE, E. Personal encounters and parallel path toward romani feminism. **Signs**, v. 38, n. 1, p. 43-46, sep. 2012. Available at <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/665955>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

BOURDIEU, P. **A dominação masculina**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 1999.

BRANCHER, V.; OLIVEIRA, V. **Formação de professores em tempos de incerteza**. Imaginários, narrativas e processos autoformadores. Jundiaí: Paco Editorial, 2017.

BRITZMAN, D. Curiosidade, sexualidade e currículo. In: LOURO, G. L. (org.). **O corpo educado: pedagogias da sexualidade**. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 2007, p. 83-112.

CABNAL, L. Acercamiento a la construcción de la propuesta de pensamiento epistémico de las mujeres indígenas feministas comunitarias de Abya Yala. In: Asociación para la cooperación con el Sur - ACSUR (ed.). **Feminismos diversos: el feminismo comunitario**. Las Segovias: ACSUR, 2010, p. 10-25. Available at <https://porunavidavivible.files.wordpress.com/2012/09/feminismos-comunitario-lorena-cabnal.pdf>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

CHERON, C.; WÜNSCH, G. Assimetrias de gênero e indignidade na sucessão hereditária. **Revista Estudos Feministas**, v. 28, n. 1, e58569, 2020. Avaliabel at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/ref/a/Q4Z3rFWcMt7sJFzTZRK5DcD/?format=pdf>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

CHODOROW, N. **Psicanálise da maternidade: uma crítica a Freud a partir da mulher**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Rosa dos Tempos, 1990.

COSTA, C. L. Feminismos e pós-colonialismos. **Revista Estudos Feministas**, v. 21, n. 2, p. 655-658, 2013. Available at <https://www.scielo.br/j/ref/a/grtz9X9Z7FwYMYMBWHmcbzj/?lang=pt>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

COSTA, J. F. **A face e o verso: estudos sobre o homoerotismo II**. São Paulo: Escuta, 1995.

CRENSHAW, K. Documento para o encontro de especialistas em aspectos da discriminação racial relativos ao gênero. **Revista Estudos Feministas**, v. 10, n. 1, p. 171-188, jan. 2002. Available at <https://www.scielo.br/j/ref/a/mbTpP4SFXPnJZ397j8fSBQQ/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.



ENLOE, C. **Bananas, beaches, and bases: making feminist sense of international politics.** Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.

FOUCAULT, M. **História da Sexualidade - a vontade de saber.** v.1. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1977.

FOUCAULT, M. **História da Sexualidade - o uso dos prazeres.** v.2. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1984.

FRAISSE, G. **La Fabrique du Féminism.** Textes et entretiens. Paris: Le passager clandestin, 2012.

GAMBLE, S. Postfeminism. In: GAMBLE, S. (ed.). **The Routledge companion to feminism and postfeminism.** New York: Routledge, 2006, p. 36-45.

GARCIA, M.; HYPOLITO, A.; VIEIRA, J. As identidades docentes como fabricação da docência. **Educação e Pesquisa**, São Paulo, v. 31, n. 1, p. 45-56, jan./abr. 2005. Available at <https://www.scielo.br/j/ep/a/h98PzLy4947pWTcYgFpNL7P/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

GARGALLO, F. **Ideas feministas latinoamericanas.** México: Universidad de la ciudad de México, 2009.

GELLNER, E. **Nations and nationalisms.** Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993.

GILLIGAN, C. **Uma voz diferente: psicologia da diferença entre homens e mulheres da infância à idade adulta.** Rio de Janeiro: Editora Rosa dos Tempos, 1991.

HIRATA, H.; KERGOAT, D. Novas configurações da divisão sexual do trabalho. **Cadernos de Pesquisa**, v. 37, n. 132, p. 595-609, set./dez 2007. Available at <https://www.scielo.br/j/cp/a/cCztcWVvvtWGDvFqRmdsBWQ/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

HUNT, L. **A invenção dos direitos humanos: uma história.** São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2009.



HYPOLITO, A. **Trabalho docente, classe social e relações de gênero**. São Leopoldo: Oikos, 2020.

KELLER, E. F. Feminism and Science. In: KELLER, E. F.; LONGINO, H. (org.). **Feminism & Science**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996, p. 28-40.

KOZCE, A.; RELUCA, M. P. **Missing intersectionality**: race/ethnicity, gender and class in current research and policies on romani women in Europe. Budapest: Center for Policy Studies, 2009.

LAQUEUR, T. **Inventando o sexo**: corpo e gênero dos gregos a Freud. Rio de Janeiro: Relume-Dumará, 2001.

LUGONES, M. **Peregrinajes**: Teorizar una coalición contra múltiples opresiones. Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires: Del Signo, 2021.

LUGONES, M. Playfulness, world-travelling, and loving perception. In: ANZALDUA, G. (org.) **Haciendo caras, making face, making soul**: creative and critical perspectives of feminists of color. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Press 1990, p. 390-402.

MOHANTY, C. T. Under western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. In: MOHANTY, C. T. **Feminism without borders – decolonising theory, practicing solidarity**. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003, p. 17-42.

NOGUEIRA, J. P.; MESSARI, N. **Teoria das Relações Internacionais**: correntes e debates. Rio de Janeiro: Elsevier, 2005.

PARKER, R. G. **Corpos, prazeres e paixões**: a cultura sexual no Brasil contemporâneo. São Paulo: Best Seller, 1991.

PATEMAN, C. **O contrato sexual**. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1993.

PINTO, C. R. J. **Uma história do feminismo no Brasil**. São Paulo: Editora Fundação Perseu Abramo, 2003.

QUIJANO, A. Colonialidade do poder, eurocentrismo e América Latina. In: LANDER, E. (org.) **A colonialidade do saber**: eurocentrismo e ciências sociais. Buenos Aires: Clacso, Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencia Sociales, 2005, p. 107-30.

SARDENBERG, C. M. B. Da crítica feminista à Ciência a uma Ciência Feminista?. In: COSTA, A. A. A.; SARDENBERG, C. M. B. **Feminismo, Ciência e Tecnologia**. Salvador: Rede Feminista Norte e Nordeste de Estudos e Pesquisa sobre Mulher e Relações de Gênero (REDOR), Núcleo de Estudos Interdisciplinares sobre a Mulher (NEIM), Universidade Federal da Bahia, 2002, p. 89-12. Available at <http://www.neim.ufba.br/wp/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/feminismociencia.pdf>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

SILVA, C. O desafio das publicações feministas. **Revista Estudos Feministas**, v. 21, n. 2, p. 625-35, ago. 2013. Available at <https://www.scielo.br/j/ref/a/rT4ZmDc4wHpjstJqDcscxZL/?lang=pt>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

SIMÕES, S.; MATOS, M. Modern ideas, traditional behaviors, and the persistence of gender inequality in Brazil. **International Journal of Sociology**, v. 38, n. 4, p. 94-110, 2008. Available at <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.2753/IJS0020-7659380405>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

SPIVAK, G. C. **Pode o subalterno falar?**. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 2012.

SYLVESTER, C. The contributions of feminist theory to International Relations. In SMITH, S.; BOOTH, K.; ZALEWSKI, M. (org.). **International theory: positivism and beyond**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996, p. 254-78.

TELLES, L. F. S. **Libertas entre sobrados: mulheres negras e trabalho doméstico em São Paulo (1880-1920)**. São Paulo: Alameda, 2013.

TICKNER, J. A. You just don't understand: troubled engagements between feminists and IR theorists. **International Studies Quarterly**, n. 41, p. 611-632, 1997. Available at <https://www.amherst.edu/system/files/media/1230/Tickner.pdf>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

WALSH, C. Interculturalidade, crítica e pedagogia decolonial: insurgir, reexistir e re-viver. In: CANDAU, V. M. (org.). **Educação intercultural na América Latina: entre concepções, tensões e propostas**. Rio de Janeiro: 7 Letras, 2009, p. 12-42.



WALSH, C. Shifting the geopolitics of critical knowledge: decolonial thought and cultural studies 'others' in the Andes. **Cultural Studies**, n. 21, p. 224-38, 2007. Available at

<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09502380601162530>. Access on 7 jul. 2022.

YOUNG, I. M. **Throwing like a girl and other essays in feminist philosophy and social theory**. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1990.

ZALEWSKI, M.; ENLOE, C. Questions about identity in International Relations. In: BOOTH, K; SMITH, S. (org.). **International Relations theory today**. University Park: The Pennsylvania University Press, 1995, p. 279-305.

*Recebido em 08 de julho de 2022*

*Aprovado em 27 de julho de 2022*