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Introduction

“Have you read Serbouhi Dussap?” “Have you heard of Zabel Yessayan?” These are the questions I normally start the first meeting with my students taking a gender course with me. In the best scenario, one or two students in a class of 12 or more will state that they have heard of these prominent yet largely invisible literary figures. Yet, it is not so much my purpose to see what the familiarity of my audience is with the field we are about to start together. My question, and their negative response in turn, are to draw students’ attention to the fact that a part of our history and culture may remain hindered from us, and in one semester, we are to first re-discover women, add them where they belong, and then try to understand and analyze why they were left out of the mainstream.

How a given group comes to perceive its culture is not a natural given as a vast amount of literature on cultural and literary studies comes to document. It takes a systematic and systematized way of construction of “norms” and “values” which is later presented to the respective group as a natural, rather than constructed, product. The Soviet tradition of glorifying the literary figures has continued to the post-Soviet times in the Armenian schools. Through the presentation of literary authors and the selection of their writings in the curricula of courses on Literature continues to serve the purpose of educating the high-schoolers in what is perceived as the “authentic” Armenian culture. By and large presented as the glorification of Armenian past, heroic soul of Armenians and the pride for the ancient culture, gender issues even if raised by
these works, remain unnoticed or not analyzed. On the other hand, the few female authors that do appear in the curricula, stand for the same “masculine” value rather than their concern of women’s issues and women’s equality even when they do implicitly or explicitly raise these issues.

In the Armenian society, most issues related to gender are easily turned down and gender is regarded irreverent for the Armenian culture either because “we do not have a problem of equality, the Armenian women historically have been equal to men” or “gender and the issues that the Gender Studies raise are foreign to our culture, and hence, out of discussion.” And yet, the Armenian history is full of prominent women who conducted highly important activism for the nation that for centuries fought for liberation, and who raised issues of women’s emancipation and gender equality as early as in 1860s.

The purpose of my research funded by YSU Center for Gender and Leadership was to study the current state of literature textbooks in Armenian high schools to analyze how female authors could be included in the curricula. My research illustrates that female authors are practically missing from the textbooks. Women, as characters, often become under scrutiny in literary works written by men, but these readings are not theoretically informed and are blind to contemporary gender/feminist issues. The deconstruction of the Soviet canon has been followed by a post-soviet/post-independence canon, but this new approach is full of uncertainties and gender insensitivity. International practices have been illustrated in the research as to how other countries have worked toward a gender-sensitive policy-making in education. Recommendations are offered toward the end of the research report for advocating with the Ministry as the decision-maker in the field, the introduction of female authors into high school curricula of literature.
The research is based on theoretical readings of how literary canons are formed, the role of textbooks in modern-day education, and the gender dimension in them. International practices have been studied. The literature textbooks of Grades 10, 11, and 12 have been studies, and compared to their Soviet versions to understand the shifts in canonical perceptions and thinking. The Armenian education policy of the recent decade has been studies to understand the trends, and how they would allow for reform, and introduction of women.

The body of the report consists of three parts. Part 1 offers theoretical understandings of canon, textbooks and international practices in eliminating gender bias from textbooks. Part 2 concentrates on the Armenian textbooks, their review, and education policies. Part 3 offers recommendations on how women could be introduced, and made part of the literary canon.

Part I: Literary Canon and the Textbook

I.1. Literary Canon: The Rules of Inclusion and Exclusion

The literary canon of a nation or a group of people is comprised of a body of works that is regarded to have an aesthetic value and embody the perceived cultural and political values of that society. The works that enter the canon become institutionalized and become part of the core curriculum for literary study at schools. Belonging to the canon is a sign of status, social, political, economic and aesthetic status all of which are interconnected. Being part of a canon is a guarantee of quality.


The literary value and aesthetics is not an intrinsic quality. It is an attributed quality that is the result of a consensus between members of a literary institution at a certain time. Entire groups and communities can be silenced through exclusion from the canon if they are not regarded as fitting for the cultural and political perceptions of a group/nation. Some works never make it to the canon because they are not in compliance with the perceived mainstream values. As such, the literary canon is very representative of how the process of inclusion and exclusion is structured in a society, and it is through full comprehension of works included and excluded that one can truly analyze the cultural perceptions of that society. As Mazine Greene puts it,

“For some of us, just beginning to feel our own voices are worth telling, the reminders of the ‘long dumb voices,’ the talking ‘the rights of them the others are down upon’ cannot but draw attention to the absences and silences that are as much a part of our history as the articulate voices, the shimmering faces, the images of emergence and success.”

Although not easily subjected to change, the canon is in constant process of negations, as such, it is not static. The 1980s and 1990s saw a major departure between the so-called “traditionalists” and “relativists.” While the former held that canon was formed on the underlying notions of value and quality, the latter insisted that the canon was a cultural artifact that was a matter of social agreement. The change in political discourse can trigger change in the canon. The evolution and formation of a literary canon, as Herbert Lindenberger has pointed out, is influenced by historical, political and cultural changes. Thus, the civil rights movements in 1960s and 1970s generated criticism of the white male model within academia.

---

which brought the American and English literary canons under re-examination. The works produced by women, gays and colored Americans in 1960s and 1970s found their way into the canon in 1980s. Yet, this was not a smooth or a definite process. Whether their entry was permanent or not was to be decided, a topic hotly debated both by academics and non-academics. Sela-Shelfy, on the other hand, has argued that canons do not normally entirely change: “[I]n addition to a short-term routine of shifting trends, there is a long-term process of accumulation and creation of unshakably sanctioned cultural reservoirs by societies, which reservoirs we call canon.”

I:2 Canon and Women’s Literature: Feminist Challenges

Contemporary literary theory and criticism have forced us to recognize that “literary tradition and canon formation have always involved cultural narratives, disguised as aesthetic principles but constructed upon assumptions about class, gender, language, and race.” Why have women been excluded from the literary canon? What standards have been used to judge about women’s works, and how biased are these standards in favor of men? Can women be added to the canon, and would this solve the issue of bias? These issues have been long raised by feminist critiques along with other excluded voices of ethnic, cultural and sexual groups.

---


8 Rakefet Sela-Sheffy, “Canon Formation Revisited” in Neohelicon XXIX (2002) 2, p. 145. Sela-Sheffy brings the example of German literature: “[T]he canonization of the novel as the crest of bourgeois literature in late eighteenth century German culture was doubtlessly a very dramatic manifestation of the making of a new cultural canon by the rising German speaking intelligentsia…the glorification of the novel as the apex of the contemporary literary practice certainly involved the marginalization, at least to some extent, of the previously prevailing forms. Yet, as a rule, all those canonized literary models and works which constituted the old canon were never really displaced. They continued to be celebrated by the propagators of the modern national (bourgeois) German culture for the last two hundred years, and even if some of them ceased to be practiced (as in the case of epic), they still remain most important property of the German legacy until the present day. In the same vein, despite the so-called Modernist revolution in British literature and Eliot’s attempt to revise its canon, central Romantic figures still persist as highly canonical assets in the British pantheon (and are apparently even more sanctioned today than in their own time).” Ibid.

The reasons for women authors going unnoticed is the selection process to which they get subjected. The standards for selection is both gender-biased, and one at its core. Whether women find a place in canon or not has to do in how the group, the nation in this case, imagines its identity. If the works of women do not fit into this picture, they are likely to be left out. The selection on a less intentional level is the gender bias that exists. As a reflection of the society, women are not regarded as actors, and hence female writers are considered to be as less important, therefore, not part of the canon. In addition, their works may not necessarily address the issues perceived being of national importance, or even way they do, they may not do it in the same recognizably male manner to qualify for canon. In other words, the norm and model is the male writing: anything short of it does not qualify for canon. Lilian S. Robinson has termed the process of canon formation “a gentlemen’s agreement:”

“But a gentleman is inescapably – that is, by definition – a member of a privileged class and of the male sex. From this perspective, it is probably quite accurate to think of the canon as an entirely gentlemanly artifact, considering how few works by non-members of that class and sex make it into the informal agglomeration of course syllabi, anthologies, and the widely-commented upon “standard authors…””

However, the question at heart is not only the one of inclusion/exclusion. There is a “systematic neglect of women’s experience in the literary canon” when they do appear in it. The reading of their texts is distorted and they are misread. In addition, male authors show the female characters and relations between sexes in a manner that is both representative, and reinforcing of the sexist ideology. Improvements especially in American and Western European cases have been recorded since 1980s with the introduction of more female authors

---

11 Ibid.
and application of feminist literary theory. Yet, the fundamental approach to women as authors and their works has not changed:

“Female writers are getting published in roughly equal numbers to their male counterparts, but when it comes to which books get reviewed and which books win prizes - not to mention which books are studied in schools – then books by women are clearly underrepresented.” The underrepresentation of female literature is later reflected in the decisions of school text advisory panels which in turn contributes to the reinforcement of the inequality.”

Women’s literature continues to be judged against a male model, with a double standard applied. According to Jennifer Weiner, “when a man writes about family and emotions, it is literature with capital L, but when a woman does so, it’s a beach book.” Women’s works remain underread and male literary circles still have the say on matters of inclusion and exclusion. As Pulitzer Prize-winner author Jane Smiley has rightfully pointed out,

“One of the great things for our generation of women writers if the freedom we’ve felt to write about whatever subjects we wish to write about. Are we less innovative than the guys? I don’t see that. But if men aren’t much in the habit of reading women, then it doesn’t matter how innovative we are.”

“Light,” “trashy,” “fluffy,” “breezy,” and “beach read” are very often the epithets used to describe women’s books. Such an approach to women’s literature could not have left the textbooks unaffected. The rules of canon, norms of inclusion and exclusion, and approach to female authors is reflected in the textbooks as well as the following section argues.

---


14 Ibid.

I:3 Textbook and Their Role: Implications for Gender

Textbooks are instruments of construction of identity that are applied at schools from the very first day the child enters the school. As such, the textbooks “are generally recognized as a symbol of national sovereignty, in the same way as the currency or gold, and in this sense they assume an important political role.” 16 What is taught in schools, and what is included in the textbooks is a result of a consensus among three groups of the society: the educator, the parents/families, and the state. Professionally designed textbooks reflect that consensus. 17

But that consensus can change, and those changes will have an impact on the textbooks. For example, the textbook and literary curricula have become somewhat loose in American and Western European high schools where teachers enjoy more freedom in putting together their own class syllabi. The survey conducted by Association of Literary Scholars, Critics and Writers (ALSCW) indicates that there is little consistency among assigned texts in 9th, 10th and 11th grades. Even the top three most frequently assigned works, *Romeo and Juliet*, *To Kill a Mockingbird*, and *The Crucible*, appeared in less than 25 percent of the curricula surveyed. Thirteen of the top 20 most frequently assigned titles appeared in less than 10 percent of teachers’ assignments. The survey results made University of Arkansas Professor Sandra Stotsky conclude that “There is no canon anymore. It may look like a canon, but each school is doing its own thing. And each teacher is doing his or her own thing.” 18

---


Yet, the approach to women’s literature has largely not changed as described in the subchapter above. The gender bias continues to be prevalent in literature, and the selection of it for textbooks. It starts at an earlier age than high school, with children’s literature, and continues to higher grades from representation of female characters to exclusion of female authors. Studies show that children’s literature which has gender disparities sends children the message that

“women and girls occupy a less important role in society than men and boys… The message conveyed through representations of males and females in books contribute to children’s ideas of what it means to be a boy, girl, man, or woman… The disproportionate numbers of males in central roles may encourage children accept the invisibility of women and girls to believe they are less important than men and boys, thereby reinforcing the gender system.”19

High school textbooks continue the same pattern of exclusion and unfavorable representation of women:

“The negative effects of assigning novels that generally focus on men are subtle, but damaging to the self esteem of the girls that are reading them. It’s a classic example of the hidden (read: sexist) curriculum in our schools, and it tells young women that men are more interesting and that what men have to say carries more value than anything a woman might want to contribute. And all of this affects boys as well…. A diverse education is the key to ending prejudice. …[T]he lack of female authors reinforces the idea that women do not have successful careers…”20

An example of the impact it could have is the fact that very few girls would complain about having to read a book narrated by a man, “but several boys would likely whine about having to read a ‘girly’ book.”21

21 Ibid.
Thus, fighting sexism in the literary textbooks is not only a matter of including women authors. In fact, in most cases women’s addition to the canon has proceeded by arguments that these women were selected because they met the accepted standards of male authors, they supported the same values, and contributed to the understanding of the mainstream culture. Fighting sexism, therefore, requires a more fundamental, systematic and organized approach on an international and national legislatives levels as international examples also show. In England, for example, the Inner London Education Authority (Ilea) that had a leftist social-democratic tendency, supported various initiatives to promote non-sexist teaching resources. Although the real impact of these initiatives is hard to access, the contemporary textbooks do make the effort to avoid gender biases. In France, in 1997 Prime Minister Alain Juppe had asked legislators to prepare a report on the representation of men and women in textbooks in an effort to fight sexism in textbooks. In Peru, on the other hand, the problem was handled through various international and local educational policies and legislation which were to eradicate “sexist content from teaching, thus favoring the transmission of coeducational values at every stage in education.”

Part II: The Armenian Literary Textbooks: The Missing Women and Education Policy

II. 1. High School Textbooks at Schools in Armenia

---

24 Ibid, pp. 9-10. The legislators had concluded that despite the initiatives undertaken since 1980s, sexist stereotypes prevailed in French textbooks. Among the obstacles to overcoming the stereotypes were identified the conservative nature of French society, the fragmented and interrupted character of various initiatives, the diversity of actors involved in the matter, and the limits of market of the textbooks.
The content of the high school textbooks of literature are constructed so as to include (1) individual chapters dedicated to an author, and (2) chapters that are a description of the literary trends and schools of a particular literary epoch. In case of individual chapters, the whole chapter is dedicated to an author, their life and works analyzed in detail, and the literary values of the works emphasized. These are the authors that have entered into the Armenian literary canon and have ensured a status that has been unchanging, by and large, since Soviet times. What has changed is the interpretation of works from socialist reading to nationalist reading, and patriotic pieces that were not emphasized or were left out in the Soviet schools, receive full attention in present-day textbooks.

In the second case, the literary period comes under scrutiny and the chapters offer a brief introduction to authors who are considered as pivotal for that period. A study of the textbooks of grades 10, 11 and 12 illustrates a complete gender-blindness when it comes to the inclusion of female authors and analysis of gender issues. In all three grades, a total of 13 names in Grade 10, 12 in Grade 11, and 18 in Grade 12, not a single female author is listed as an individual chapter.

In general, the literary analysis of the works in the textbooks follows the methods of old literary criticism and is uninformed about theories of new literary school. Works are treated as authorial self-expression or critical self-expression. The analysis concentrates on perceived “beauty” of the works, and very rare if ever, offers a critical reading. Even the collection of questions published at the end of the textbook Grade 12 that covers all three textbooks, shows that the students are expected, through questions, to self-assess how much they have been able to

26 The following textbooks have been studies for the purpose of this research: H. Bakhchichian and A. Sarinyan, The Armenian Literature: 10 (Yerevan: Arevik Press, 2014) hereinafter referred to as Grade 10; V. Kirakossyan and Z. Avetissyan, The Armenian Literature 11 (Yerevan: Sansar-Manmar, 2010) hereinafter referred to as Grade 11; and A. Yeghiazaryan, The Armenian Literature 12 (Yerevan: Sansar-Manmar, 2011) hereinafter referred to as Grade 12.
memorize. They are not invited to engage in critical thinking and critical literary analysis of the works. In this context, when women do come under scrutiny in a work, they are judged against the traditional norms of femininity and womanhood.

It is possible to occasionally come over a female author in the chapters covering a literary epoch, albeit very rarely. The reasoning behind the selection of women authors for these sections is unclear. In entire epoch may proceed without any woman included although that epoch was especially marked by women’s entry into the literary sphere, namely, 1870-1890s. The textbook of Grade 10 engages in a lengthy discussion on the development of periodical publications and novel writing among Armenians (pp. 116-19) without any notice to as remarkable an event as the publication of the first women’s journal in 1861, the Guitar. In this section Serbouhi Dussap’s novel Mayta (1881) is mentioned only in the definition of “composition” as a literary genre. Silva Kapoutikyan is the only woman that gets covered in the textbook of Grade 12, and not as a separate title, but rather, among the poets of the modern period. Her patriotic works are emphasized.

The problem is not just about the exclusion of women. It is also about how women’s question is ignored in these textbooks. Among the topics covered in the late 19th century, issues of national awakening, literary movement, passage to vernacular language are mentioned, but there is not a single statement about the rise of women’s question, a topic that predominated in the progressive press mentioned by the textbook (Grade 10). Interesting enough, the authors of the textbook are aware that women’s movement and women’s liberation were important questions in the course of the 19th century. Serbouhi Dussap with her groundbreaking feminist novels gets briefly mentioned for her feminist ideas. But even so, she is refused a separate

27 Grade 12, pp. 169-81.
28 For example, see the description of female heroes in the Armenian epic “Sassna Tserer” in Grade 10, pp. 55-7.
chapter, and is mentioned only in the discussion of Alexander Shirvanzade’s works, in an effort to elaborate his dedication to the theme of women’s liberation. Dussap’s work, and the more radical male author Shirvanzade, get subtly criticized for the brave ideas. They get compared to their male counterparts who raised woman’s question without shaking the traditional understanding of family and women’s role:

“The topic [of women, family and morality] was just entering the Armenian literature in the 1880s and was related to the women’s emancipation and feminist movement of the century, which had become a whole new literature worldwide after George Sand. The first echoes in the Armenian literature were novels of Serbouhi Dussap entitled Mayta, Siranoush and Araksia or the Governess, which put forward the principle of absolute equality between the sexes. It is interesting that the outstanding authors of the period (Aghayan, Raffi, Mouratsan, Nar-Dos, Paronyan, Zohrab) offered solutions to the question of women and family in the context of unshakable grounds of the Armenian traditional family.”

The authors of the textbook feel the same discomfort when analyzing Alexander Shirvanzade’s radical-for-the-period play entitled “Did She Have the Right?” in which the wife and mother abandons the family to pursue her dream of becoming an outstanding musician. Shirvanzade gets cautiously criticized by the authors of the textbook, and again compared to Nar-Dos this time who “solved the issue of battle between morality and nature with the victory of morality, whereas Shirvanzade prioritizes the voice of nature.”

Statements that are entirely based on stereotypical simplistic analysis are common throughout the textbooks. For example, Grade 11, p. 12, in referring to Sarah’s character in Nar Dos’ short story “The Killed Dove,” the textbook authors write: “It is a known fact that women of this type feel more in love with the man that refuses them. That impossible love, consciously

29 Grade 10, p. 223.
or unconsciously, brings out in the woman the wish to kill the object of her love.”

When Hrant Matevosssian’s protagonist Aghoun reminds her mother-in-law of the poverty she married into, the authors of the textbook call it a “revenge in a woman’s style.”

In other instances, works that are classical pieces for feminist analysis and critique, are either not included among the author’s works, or are analyzed very superficially so that the intent of the author to critique the society with its patriarchal norms is very vague. Instead, the authors have chosen to provide a detailed analysis of the system of rhyming used in the poem.

Supplemental books to the literary textbooks likewise are completely oblivious to the literary heritage produced by women. “The Anthology of Poems” includes not a single poem by a female author. In the teacher’s manual of “Questions and Answers” covering the three high school years, in a 400-page volume only three women appear (Maro Margaryan, Silva Kapoutikyan and Alicia Kirakossian), while the illustration on the cover of the book speaks for itself as far as absolute gender blindness is concerned (Illustration 1).

Thus, the “gender problem” with the literature textbooks is two-fold: exclusion of female authors, and representation of women in the works of male authors.

31 Grade 11, p. 12.  
32 Grade 12, p. 112.  
33 E.g. Grade 11 could have selected Zohrab’s novella “Postal” which criticizes the sexual vulnerability of a working woman.  
34 See Hovhannes Toumanyan’s “Anush” in Grade 11, pp. 36-43.  
II.2. Textbook, Classroom and Education Policy

Despite the transition to the standards-based education which gives teachers the freedom to use various resources and materials in the classroom other than the textbook, study shows that textbooks continue to be the fundamental, and in fact, the only instrument in teaching at Armenian schools:

“All expectations are placed on the textbook since it continues to be perceived as the most important instructional tool, almost the only source of teaching. The overall instructional process relies almost exclusively on the textbook, while within the standards-based education, instruction should rely on a diverse set of educational resources and materials, of which the textbook is only one, even if the most fundamental.”

The textbook is considered to be “sacred.” When asked about the importance of textbooks in education, 58.9% of students noted that the textbooks were the most important source of knowledge. Only 3.1% of the respondent students mentioned that they acquired knowledge from other sources. To this small percentage, the textbooks did not play a key role in education.

With the importance attributed to textbook, and the key and sole role they continue to play was source for knowledge, the need to improve the textbooks becomes even more crucial, and selection of “right” authors a tougher thing to achieve. Studies show that textbook authors are very often experts, scholars and/or academic of the field for which they produce the textbooks. However, they are not informed about educational policies and reforms that the State

38 Ibid, p. 28.
envisions and aims to implement. This may be a major drawback, and one that will require closer collaboration between the textbook authors and education policy makers.

Major milestones in education reform have been achieved through the Education Quality and Relevance Loan Program implemented in 2003-2009 and in 2009-2014 which aimed at curricula improvement, teaching personnel trainings and professional development. To date, the only professional development for teachers is trainings organized by the National Institute of Education. In some instances, international and local NGOs have significantly contributed to teacher trainings through support of translation and development of several manuals and modules. Although the Law on General Educations entitles teachers to make recommendations to textbooks and curricula, teachers continue to be as agents for transferring knowledge, rather than decision-makers or initiators in the area. The education reforms and decisions in Armenia are entirely based on the top-down principle. Although a number of teachers in Armenia’s schools carry out interesting projects, bottom-up communication is non-existent.39

According to Educational Development Plan of 2011-2015, favorable conditions were to be created to engage creative educators in the reform process. However, reports show that it is unclear what has been done in this direction. The Plan also affirms that that technical support is needed for the improvement of quality of textbooks, with again, unclear picture as to what has been done toward this end to date.40

39 Ibid.
40 Ibid, p. 10
Part III: Conclusions and Recommendations

Gender-blindness and gender-insensitivity are phenomena that are not limited to Armenian textbooks online. For several decades already, a conscious movement has been in progress by education policy makers to eliminate gender biases from education. These efforts have not always brought about fully satisfactory results:

“Issues of gender have received much attention in response to anti-gender discrimination movements that seek gender equality in society. As a result, some gender-fair practices have been implemented. For example, many elementary school teachers have adopted a practice of organizing rosters in alphabetical order. This procedure avoids student selection for various activities to be based solely… Despite increased gender-fair practices, gender differences remain prominent throughout students’ learning environments. Gender-specific roles and gender-biased values are implicitly or explicitly depicted in textbooks. For example, most of the main characters in moral education textbooks are men, and when women appear they are typically introduced as mothers. In addition, Japanese reading textbooks tend to include more works by male authors than female authors.”

This struggle, though, needs to continue, and textbooks should be the place to begin. As illustrated above, socialization through textbooks has a crucial impact on how a child’s gender perceptions and gender culture are formed. Textbooks is the fundamental tool for transferring knowledge, and its role does not seem to be dying out any time soon:

“Textbooks and ancillary materials will remain an instrument of extraordinary power. They may, in fact, be the most effective of educational technologies yet invented, and there is no reason to imagine a modern educational system where textbooks do not play a central role. It is therefore fitting and proper to pay attention to their role and function, their content, cost and finance.”

Introduction of female writers in a classroom has to start with their entry into a textbook. Female authors cannot be introduced as a secondary and supplemental resource by teachers.

---


42 “The Role of Textbooks…,” p. 36
Doing so, will further reinforce the students’ perception that female authors are not important, therefore, they are not in the textbook. By now, students know that only “valuable” literary works make it to the canon. Anything on the additional list may be regarded as not valuable enough. Thus, all efforts should go toward new gender-inclusive textbooks. As mentioned earlier, a successfully written textbook is a result of consensus between the educator, family and the state. Yet, it is possible for the textbook to be ahead of this “consensus, and may lead the local intelligentsia to accept new and important new concepts.”

With the gender bias and demonization of anything related to gender in Armenia, the literary textbooks may actually be the place to break the anti-gender movement, and force the “local intelligentsia accept new concepts.”

Recommendations that follow are based on the understanding of the following aspects of education policy-making:

- Top-down principle prevails in education reform – the Education Ministry plays the central role;
- Trainings remain the only opportunity for professional development of teachers – training designed by National Institute of Education;
- Although it has been 10 years since Armenia made a transition to standards based education, the teaching at schools remains grounded in the prevalence of the textbooks.
- Important legislative provision in 2011-2015: “favorable conditions will be created for identifying, promoting and developing professional and creative educators, and engaging them actively in the reform process.”

---

• International and local NGOs have participated in the past in education reform in Armenia.

Based on this information, I believe the following steps could be taken to achieve the introduction of female authors into high school curricula:

• Work with Ministry of Education using international experience, talking the Ministry into setting up a working group to analyze current textbooks, and create a new canon;

• Organize training for teachers that will widen their horizon of contemporary literary analysis of gender, and its application;

• Increase teacher’s capacity to be involved in the process as reformers, rather than passive transmitters of knowledge;

• Have NGOs and educators work closely with teachers;

• Identify and those teachers who succeeded in the classroom due to their participation in professional development programs, and roll out their experience;

• In addition to training courses, introduce opportunities for the educators to share experience through conferences, group discussions, etc.

• Have special trainings for the textbook authors so that they are better informed of the state policies, and gender sensitive writing.
Հասմիկ Խալափյան

Հետազոտությունն նպատակն է ուսումնասիրել Հայաստանում ավագ դպրոցների գրականության դասագրքերի բովանդակությունը և վերլուծել, թե ինչու են կին գրողների ընդգրկումը (Հայերեն համառոտագիր) Հետազոտությունը նպատակն է ուսումնասիրել Հայաստանում ավագ դպրոցների գրականության դասագրքերի բովանդակությունը և վերլուծել, թե ինչու են կին հեղինակների բացակայումը գրականության դասագրքերից և ինչպես կարելի է նրանց ընդգրկել ուսումնական ծրագրում:

Հետազոտությունը վկայում է, որ կին հեղինակները բացակայում են գրականության դասագրքերից և ինչպես կարելի է նրանց ընդգրկել ուսումնական ծրագրում:

Զեկույցը հիմնված է գրական հիմնացանկի (canon) ձևավորման տեսական սկզբունքների ուսումնասիրություն, ժամանակակից կրթության մեջ դասագրքերի դերի վերլուծության վրա:

Ուսումնասիրվել է միջազգային փորձը:

Վերլուծվել են գրականության 10, 11, և 12 դասարանների դասագրքերը, ինչպես նաև մայրության պետության քաղաքականության վրա:

Զեկույցի բաղկացուցակ է երեք մասից:

Մաս 1-ը ընդգրկում է տեսական հասկացություններ, դասագրքերի և պատմաշրջանակների կողմնակերպչությունը դետալայն ընդլայնված տեսանյութի համառոտագիրներից: Մաս 2-ը հիմնված է դասագրքի ֆիրմական և պատմաշրջանի տեսանյութի անցկացվածքի դասակարգմանը վրա: Մաս 3-ը նաև ընդգրկում է զեկույցի ընդգրկված գրականության հիմնացանկը և տանկարարակերպչությունը:

Հետազոտությունը ցույց է տալիս, որ գրական հիմնացանկի բաղկացուցակն ու այդ աշխատանքների, որոնք հանդիպում են գրականության սարդեր նստալեյթ կոմունիտետներում:

Ամբողջ խմբեր և համայնքներ կարող են մնալ առանց արտահայտության, եթե նրանք չեն համապատասխանում միջազգային և ազգային համագործակցությանը տվյալ խմբի և ազգի ընկալումներին: Քաղաքական դիսկուրսում փոփոխությունները, սակայն, կարող են ազդել հիմնացանկի վրա:

Այս երեք մասերը կարող են կազմակերպվել երկու գրական հիման համաձայն: Այս գրական հիման համաձայնությունը կարող է կազմակերպվել երկու գրական հիման համաձայնությունների փոփոխությունների խմբի վրա: Ուրիշների կողմնակերպչության կազմակերպիչների քաղաքական տեղականությունը, ինչպես նաև պետությունը և համագործակցությունը պատմաշրջանի դասագրքեր։
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Ավագ դպրոցի դասագրքերը ունեն հետևյալ կառուցվածքը:
(1) առանձին գլուխներ նվիրված որևէ հեղինակի, և (2) գլուխներ, որոնք նկարագրում են այն պատմական ձևաքից մերկուր, որոնք են՝ 10, 11 և 12 դասարանների դասագիրքերի պատմականությունը, որը կոչվում է կրկնօրինակվել, որպես հեղինակի և նրանց ստեղծագործությունների նկատմամբ չի փոխվել:

Ավագ դպրոցի դասագրքերը կանգնեց սերտыով, իսկ նրանց առաջարկվող քայլերից են՝

- աշխատել ԿԳՆ-ի հետ՝ օգտագործելով միջազգային փորձը
- ստեղծել աշխատանքային խմբի, որը կվերլուծի ընթացիկ դասագրքերը և կառաջարկի նոր՝ ներառական հիմնացանկ
- կազմակերպել դասընթացներ ուսուցիչների համար
- կազմակերպել հատուկ դասընթացներ դասագիրքի հեղինակների համար
- կազմակերպել հայաստանյան հանրակրթական համակարգի անցկացնել գիտաժողովներ, խմբային քննարկումներ, եւ այլն
- կազմակերպել հատուկ դասընթացներ դասագրքի հեղինակների համար այդպիսով պահպանելու վերականգնման ձևակերպում: 

Սա այն դեպքում, երբ Հայաստանի հանրակրթական համակարգը կրթությունը դասագիրքակենտրոն է, Դասագիրքը համարվում է «սուր»: Դասագիրքի կարևորության մասին հարցազրույցը պատմվում է, որ իրականում դասարանների համար 58.9% է կոչվում է, որ դասարանների ընդհանուր միջի օրենքը ենթադրում է, որ իրականում դասարանների հեղինակների կազմությունն է կոչվում է.
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