

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

“That what is irritating among babies, in this perspective refers to the very suppressed own”
(Ariane Schorn)

BEING FATHER WITH BODY AND SOUL?

AFFECTIVE CONFLICTS IN PATERNAL CHILD-CARING EXPERIENCE

Fatherhood is subject to historical transformations. Furthermore, at any given time, it is a fluid and conflicting complex of ideals and real practices, culturally recognized ‘father-feelings’ as well as involuntarily affects, which may oppose them. The recent ideal of fatherhood, in contrast to former patriarchal ones, is characterized by the norm, that fathers should care for their children with emotional involvement. This implicates that they should feel responsible for child-caring activities formerly referred to as typical mother-tasks. How is this “mode of existence” (Maihofer 1995), which is ascribed to contemporary fathers, experienced by them emotionally and affectively? Which effects do these experiences have for their actual child-caring practices?

The Research Subject

Since the 1990s, the behaviors of fathers have received increased scientific attention. A pronounced discrepancy has become apparent between – in the words of psychologist Horst Nickel – “egalitarian attitudes prior to child birth and actual practices after the child is born” (cit. from Werneck 1998: 48). Especially in families from a postmodern individualized milieu a gap between egalitarian attitudes and gender-segregated practices has been highlighted e.g. by Cornelia Koppetsch and Günter Burkart in their important study *Illusion of Emancipation*. Based on their findings, Angelika Wetterer argues that there is only a “rhetorically modernization” of the division of labor among genders (cf. Wetterer 2003): With respect to empirical studies it has been shown that despite changing attitudes towards household issues, women

still spend substantially more time with their children than men do (cf. Destatis 2015: 19f.). Furthermore, on a qualitative dimension, fathers interact differently with their children than mothers do and again differently whether they have a son or a daughter. The plays of fathers are on average wilder and more exciting, but also their assertion of limitations is stricter. Fathers rather encourage the development of the child's autonomy and self-monitoring than mothers do, while the atmosphere provided by mothers is more sheltering and comforting. In principle, this difference is relevant for both sons and daughters, however, fathers are commonly more careful and gentle with their daughters (cf. Seiffke-Krenke 2001: 54).

But this unambiguous confrontation of egalitarian discourses and dichotomous practices all too easily falls into a stereotypical description that is insufficient to capture all components and conflicts of recent fatherhood: On the one hand rhetorical modernization has not been so far-reaching as Wetterer had assumed. On the other hand, paternal practices are not always as constantly 'male' as indicated in quantitative studies: Andrea Maihofer and Tomke König have noticed that discursive modernization is in no way unilinear. Instead, besides a tendency towards equalization, contradicting discourses are present that (at times with a fierce antifeminist connotation) re-ontologize the order of gender in biologist or religious ways. Diverse fragments of different and even opposing discourses are even to be found in the same interview. Thus, Maihofer and König state a "multi-layered and complexly entangled coexistence of different norms within individuals" (Maihofer & König 2004: 228). Complexity is even increased when quantitative and qualitative aspects of the normative underpinning of child-caring activities are differentiated: Whereas a balanced allocation of time for paid work and child care is increasingly being promoted for both genders, imaginations of inevitable biological determinisms of gender-specific parenting *styles* are discursively supported as well (e.g. Stiehler 2013).

Paternal practices are not determined by discourses: Situation-dependent behaviors of fathers do not always correspond to manly-paternal patterns and even fathers who steadily practice alternative, 'unmanly' styles of conduct can be found, though they are rather rare and often overseen by statistic measurements (cf. Balsam 2008; Flaake 2014; König 2012).

Many scholars have developed many approaches to explain these inconsistencies. Especially the gap between discourse and practice has gained attention: Economic rationality (if the husband's income is higher, it is reasonable that he should continue with his career instead of caring for a child), conservative company cultures (if one is expected to join evening meetings,

it is hard for him, to spend the evenings with the family) or the automatism of doing gender (not the subject, but the rules of doing gender determine the behavior – child-caring is a demonstration of femininity, so men don't do it). But all of these approaches fail to capture the complexity of the empirical findings *completely*. Therefore, I opt for taking a look on an aspect hardly being investigated yet: The paternal affective experience.

The most significant mediating joint between discourse and practice is the affective experience. For fathers, affective child-caring experiences are a double-edged sword: Pleasurable and tempting as well as irritating, at times even repulsive. This experience is shaped by the discourses, but, nonetheless, is not always in line with them. Is here a point to explain the gaps between and within paternal practices and discourses? Following this path, the aim could not be to construct a mono-causal explanation, but to find a very new piece of the puzzle.

Theoretical Conceptualization

For fielding the question, as a first step it is necessary to develop a theory of paternal experiences, that is able to get in view its inconsistencies. This allows in a second step to explore it empirically. The inductive power of the obtained empirical findings will surely modify and specify the theoretical considerations in return, what will be reflected in a third step. Of course in the actual research proceeding these three aspects will be strongly interwoven and not as separated as in this schematic presentation.

I have already used a large part of an one year bridging scholarship of the *Bielefeld Young Researchers' Fund* for the theoretical work. The result is outlined in the following (cf. Winter 2014): The starting point of my consideration is the critical interrogation of the dualism between constructivism and essentialism while analyzing gender-specific emotional life. With the separation of a material substrate, 'sex', from its cultural expression, 'gender', bodily and affective perceptions beyond cultural representations have often been ignored or delegated towards biology. This dualism has been attacked by the constructionist perspective (e.g. Butler 1990): The explanatory power of biological approaches has been denied altogether, resulting in a scholarly inability to say anything about a non-discursive existence of the body at all; the body has been declared as non-existent in terms of efficiency and activity (cf. Maihofer 1995: 48; Villa 2013: 61).

But with the so called ‘affective turn’ and ‘body turn’ in the social sciences this bodily-affective obstinacy is again receiving increasing attention (Clough 2010; Gugutzer 2002). Also Pierre Bourdieu postulates beside the conscious “theoretical” meaning that social agents attach to practices, a latent and hidden prereflexive “practical” sense existing in their practices as well. This practical meaning expresses itself in involuntarily bodily-affective reactions and, momentarily, contradicts the reflexive self-perception. As a consequence, for example, hierarchical (gender) relations can be reproduced at the level of practical sense and being contradicted at the level of declared intention at the same time (cf. Bourdieu 1998: 72). The practical sense is deeply anchored in the “hexis”, the somatic dimension of the “habitus”, and reaches far into the structure of desire and passion (ibid.: 41). As a kind of “second nature”, it is the product of socializing experiences of interactions in early childhood, that have been incorporated. Once incorporated, they organize the grammar of the body as a “kind of psychosomatic remembrance of the body” (Rehbein 2011: 90) that is much harder to change than discursively constituted thought on the conscious level.

However, the mechanisms of hexis-development and its resistance to discursive consciousness remain under-investigated in Bourdieu’s work as well as in the affective turn (cf. Maihofer 2002: 20; Jäger 2004: 189ff.). To clarify this desideratum Bourdieu suggested the development of a “psychoanalysis of society” (Bourdieu 1979: 138), an ambitious project which, unfortunately, he was not able to conclude. In general, body-sociological approaches pay only limited attention to psychoanalytic concepts and often put them aside after screening only a handful of authors (e.g. Gugutzer 2002: 21ff.; cf. for a more differentiated integration of psychoanalysis Abraham 2006, Maihofer 2002, Krüger-Kirn 2010). The center of my own theoretical work is to revisit the impulses given by Bourdieu and the affective turn and tie them up to the socialization theory of the Frankfurt sociologist and psychoanalyst Alfred Lorenzer, who undergoes at the moment to some degree a revival in psychoanalytic social psychology (cf. Brunner et al. 2013: 431f., 448f.).

The general basic assumption of psychoanalytic approaches to the study of paternity is that during the process of becoming a father and while interacting with the babies, bodily-affective remains of the own childhood experiences are reactivated and corresponding anxieties, desires and conflicts are emerging. This is resulting into the existence of autonomous, male grown-ups finding themselves in the situation to deal with (re)awakenings of feelings like dependency, helplessness and intimate closeness.

The previous common psychoanalytic paternity studies have recognized this as an inner conflict between 'male' and 'female' connotated emotions, but usually they adhere nonetheless to normative imaginations of symbiotic 'dyadic mothering' and delimited 'triadic fathering'. Despite the well-accepted fact that fathers may contribute their 'female' shares to child-caring activities, and in turn mothers may contribute 'male' ones as well, the essence of the two genders seems to be self-evident and the structural hierarchy of their relation, which is precipitated in male subjectivity as Bourdieu has highlighted, is recognized, if at all, only as an insane wrong way of psychic development. The underlying normative idea is a harmonic integration of 'male' and 'female' aspects under the umbrella of a sane and stable masculine identity (e.g. Dammasch 2012; Metzger 2006; cf. Pohl 2006). This argumentation contradicts the basic conflict orientation of psychoanalysis, backs widely the actual gender stereotypes and is unsatisfying when applying 'transthematically' findings about connections between repulsion of femininity, or even misogyny and sexist violence, and just "normal masculinity" (Pohl 2004: 297).

Based on the approach of Lorenzer I aim for another theoretical option which should be less affirmative towards 'stable masculinity', maintains a focus on the conflictual setting of masculinity in general and exposes its femininity-repulsing momentum. It shall combine a constructivist perspective with the Freudian theory of the vicissitudes of the corporeal drive.

Like the affective turn and similar to the concept of "embodying" in the body turn (cf. Schmitz & Degele 2010: 24ff.), Lorenzer regards bodily-affective motivating forces (that what Sigmund Freud had called "drive") as being settled in the traces of elapsed pre- and proto-subjective experience of the baby. These are sedimented as "sensual-motoric organismic formula" (Lorenzer 1981: 86) and neuronal channels (cf. Lorenzer 1986: 99ff.; see for the connectivity of Lorenzers approach with current neurophysiology and its discussion on the body-soul nexus Leuzinger-Bohleber 2002), which build the founding structures of the sensuality and erogeneity of the infant body that will finally result in its affects (cf. König 2014: 67ff.).

Emotions are, according to Lorenzer, symbolically represented affects: Bodily memorized forms of interactions may find their shifted appearance in "presentational and discursive" symbolic expressions, understood as representative 'as if' practices (Langer 1942: 79ff.). Symbolization evokes affects and makes them at the same time manageable as emotions. By this means it allows the child to gain a "personal emancipation" out of the "primitive present" (Schmitz 1980: 12ff.; see further for the potential contribution of body-phenomenology to

body-sociology Gugutzer 2002: 88ff., 2004: 150ff.; Lindemann 1993: 31ff.; Villa 2011: 211ff.), but it is also a subjugation under the hegemonic culture, which is providing the systems of symbolic expression – and obtrudes them.

Via practicing the verbal symbolic forms (gender discourse) and the sensuous-presentational symbolic forms (doing gender) the (gendered) habitus and hexis are emerging, equipped with schemes of thinking, feeling and practicing. But Bourdieu has overlooked that there is a layer of the hexis which is pre-discursive and stubborn. The subject-generating active symbolization – and not the direct, conditioning education via reward and punishment – is the most important link between the cultural order and the subjective psychodynamic, but also the point where the appropriation of culture may show subversive momentums. The body provides a resistant matrix, contra which the consistent systematics of the symbolic order requires the elimination of specific forms of stirrings: Some of the satisfying or frustrating experiences, corporeally inscribed in early pre- and protosubjective times, cannot find a socially acceptable, intelligible symbolic expression (Lorenzer 1981: 91). They are required to remain desymbolized in order to sustain the subject (in its own eyes) as not being potty, ill or criminal. Herewith they are suppressed, unconscious and present only in the mode of “indecent corporeal desires” (Lorenzer 1984: 196).

How can these abstract considerations be substantiated with regard to the concrete situation of growing up as a boy and the later experience of becoming and being a father – a subject not mentioned by Lorenzer at all? The binary of gender is a key structure in the symbolic order. For becoming a self with intelligible emotions a child has to learn to position itself, however, eventually even ‘queer’, within the structure of the symbolic order of gender. A performative “recoding of early interaction experiences under the impression of gender differences” (Rohde-Dachser 1991: 225) occurs and the corporeal desires become translated and, herewith, canalized according in line with the binary of gender. The strained entanglement of distance and identification from proto-subjective experience is being binarily and hierarchically separated in the light of the gender order (cf. Butler 1993: 328f.): Feelings of dependence, of being held and sheltered, and attached symbiotic phantasies are becoming constituted as ‘female’ experience, and as such are reenacted in plays, being presented in gestures of doing femininity and are verbally symbolized. In contrast, distance, freedom and impulses of dominant desire are interpreted as ‘male’ and demonstrated in doing masculinity.

For the boys – the later fathers – this is resulting into the “dilemma of masculinity” described by Rolf Pohl: Under the self-positioning as ‘male’ the emphasis is laid upon an autonomous identity, while symbiotic desires are de-symbolized. This identity remains fragile and vulnerable, because the (female) objects, of which one considers himself to be independent, continue to be subjects in reality. They may withdraw themselves, withhold satisfaction and therefore the dependency upon them stays inescapable (cf. Pohl 2004: 19ff; 134ff.). Attempts of denying this by trying to take possession of the object may be a reaction. The dependency is then covered by practices and/or imaginations of dominance, contempt and repulsion of femininity. Pierre Bourdieu has described the “severe games of competition” within the adolescent homo-social male peer groups as the place where this posture is practiced (Bourdieu 1997: 203): Trials of courage, running races and schoolyard rumbling forge the male habitus and the respective “libido dominandi” is anchored in the body (Bourdieu 1998: 100, 140 f.; cf. Hafeneger 2010: 207ff.). These prereflexive aspiration to be the dominator over other men, but especially over women, is part of the “kathexis”, the structure of desire associated with “hegemonic masculinity” (Connell 1999: 74ff.). Central for this posture is the self-detachment from the female connotated home.

Two distinct masculinities have to be differentiated in the further progress of life, separated by the biographic step of becoming a father: Initially the demonstrative rejection and alienation of the family occurs as outlined above, then, by becoming a father, a comeback to the family world takes place (cf. Helfferich et al. 2005a: 82) – a “transformation of ‘free masculinity’ in ‘bounded paternity’” (Helfferich et al. 2005b: 95). During the process of family foundation and becoming a father, men find themselves re-entangled into the female sphere and may respond to this situation with emphasizing their job and highlighting their role as family breadwinner to continue being away from home, and thus, deny dependency upon ‘their’ wives. Or they may try, particularly if they want to be emotionally involved ‘new fathers’, to remain at least the ‘wild one’ also in family issues.

The transformation of free masculinity into bounded fatherhood always is partly questioning and irritating the male hexis. By trying to become a non-patriarchal involved father, who takes responsibility even for the ‘unmanly’ tasks of child caring, this conflict is intensified. The empirical studies of Ariane Schom (2003) and Karin Flaake (2014) have already unveiled this process to a certain extent: A loving and close affective contact with children is creating an “adaptive regression” (Schorn 2003: 336), a revivification of early childhood and the pre-male

quality of experiences, which lay far behind the adolescent games. These, which for a long time have been symbolized as female, de-symbolized with respect to the own male identity and thus suppressed, are now in their unavoidability irritating the masculinity and could produce anxiety and repulsion towards the child: “That what is irritating among babies, in this perspective refers to the very suppressed own” (ibid.: 203).

However, this irritation is seldom openly named, often not even consciously recognized. In psychoanalysis the phenomenon of rationalizing is well-known: An irritation is desymbolized and then masked with a verbal mask (cf. Lorenzer 1984: 112ff.). Neither the adaptive regression nor the associated fear and discomfort are becoming conscious. Instead, the child is consciously experienced as a mere ‘enrichment’ and one can imagine oneself as a trouble-free father. Furthermore re-ontologizing ideas may take over the rationalizing, pushing forward into the gap of explanation and allow to express the discomfort in a legitimate way: It is presented then as a manifestation of gender-specific genes or the will of god, which cannot be overcome.

In summary three phases can be distinguished with regard to the male socialization:

1. The pre- and proto-subjective experience is stored bodily (baby, infant).
2. The bodily-affective remembrance is undergoing a gendered recoding while being symbolized and transformed into consciously experienced emotions and the according doing gender (childhood, adolescence).
3. The recurrence of family life and the exposure to the own children facilitates an adaptive regression back into early experience – and their defense (becoming father).

The outlined theoretical draft allows to focus the situational alternating interplay between both tempting as well as irritating, even repellent aspects of the paternal experience while dealing with children. This perspective gets also in its view the affective attractiveness of the paternal withdrawal from child-caring activities.

Empirical Exploration

The second part of my research project aims for empirical experience, which should be used in a third step for supporting, specifying, modifying and revisioning the outlined theoretical tillage of the field. Data will be gained by methodological triangulation via conduction of

narrative interviews and focus group discussions with young fathers. Findings are supplemented by participatory observation of their daily family routine.

For interviewing, I have chosen fathers, who live in heterosexual couples with babies or infants (up to the age of 36 months) and are part of the postmodern individualistic milieu. To recruit such interviewees, I posted posters in day nurseries of an academic-alternative quarter in a German major city. Furthermore, I contacted fathers in two other major cities in Germany via the snowball system, which guarantees milieu-homogeneity to a certain extent as well. Six exploratory interviews I have already conducted.

My mode of conducting interviews is inspired by the model of “narrative interviews” according to Ivonne Küsters (2009), in which narration-generating questions allow interviewees to emphasize certain aspects on their own, without being restricted by my provisional assumptions. In addition, the “theme-centered and guideline supported interview” according to Ariane Schorn (2003) is included too, in order to guarantee that the denomination of conflictious subjects cannot be avoided completely. At last I adopt the interviewer’s sympathetic-mimetic posture from the “understanding interview” according to Jean-Claude Kaufmann (1999). The interviews are usually conducted at the father’s home and last one to one and a half hours.

While in the interviews conscious individual self-representations and attitudes are documented (and, negatively, also that what remains de-symbolized and hidden), in group discussions collective orientation patterns are obtained. The latter define the discursive scope of what is intelligibly communicatable: The common sense which is appropriated by individuals. The construction of this scope and the dealing with thereby emerging conflicts can be observed quasi ‘live’ in a group discussion. As initial stimulus for the group discussion I have chosen a provocative and controversially discussed part of the sexual education brochure *Körper, Liebe, Doktorspiele* [Body, Love, Playing Doctors] (Phillips 2000). The brochure was published in 2000 by the *Bundeszentrale für gesundheitliche Aufklärung* [Federal Office for Health Education]. Its distribution, despite being advocated by leading sexual-scientific institutes, was ceased in 2007 due to massive public disgust over its content (cf. Hannemann 2012: 246). In the selected passage the sexual-pedagogic importance of a paternal loving contact to the child’s body is highlighted of which the genital area should not be anxiously excluded (cf. Phillips 2000: 26f.). This argument was attacked by conservative voices as a seduction of the fathers into pedophilia. It will be very interesting to see, how the fathers in my

focus group discussions will handle this point, where a too close relationship with the child is imagined as dangerous and perverted.

Finally, by participatory observations, the modes of every day interactions between father and child beyond the symbolic presentation in interviews and group discussions should be captured. Casual observations of this kind have already allowed highly interesting insights during the exploratory phase.

In sight of the intensity of the egalitarian discourse, Carsten Wippermann et al. have raised concerns for the qualitative science with fathers: Contradictory attitudes are “often articulated only behind closed doors among like-minded men – and never at all at the presence of women” (Wippermann et al. 2009: 23). Here it may help that I have the possibility to introduce myself to the interviewees as a father of a daughter and a stepson, thus signaling familiarity with their problem and conflicts.

Due to my research interest the interpretation of the collected data is a rather exceptional and demanding task. In order to not solely capture the conscious discursive fragments in the father’s narratives, but as well the unconscious, latent level, a hereon specialized approach is required: In a first interpretation step I will reconstruct the presented narrative identities in the way Gabriele Lucius-Hoene and Arnulf Deppermann have described it (2004). As a result I will achieve the in the interview situation presented conscious self-interpretation of the interviewed fathers. Because not all of the paternal experiences of interest for my project are captured by conscious self-perceptions and presentations, but become visible partly only in bodily-affective stirrings, which bemuse the narratives here and there, a second interpretation level is required. Here, I will employ the depth hermeneutics according to Alfred Lorenzer (cf. König 2000, Bereswill et al. 2010). This method allows to evaluate the affective experience which is merely shining ‘through the lines’ and is only perceived when the symbolic order becomes irritated in its use.

Guiding Suppositions

Based on the theoretical considerations as well as the empirical impressions from the exploratory interviews, I have developed the following suppositions on the entanglement of affects, emotions, rhetorical modernization, re-ontologization, symbiotic desires and the

paternal fear of the child. These will guide my further research until being modified by contradictory findings (cf. for the following Winter 2015).

1. The male hexis, developed during the severe games of masculinity, is – according to Lorenzer – no irrevocable character of personality. When the bodily remembered atmosphere of early infantile interactions is reactivated during the process of becoming a father, the male hexis is seriously endangered to corrode. When (again) no symbolizing of the ‘unmanly’ body response is possible, uncontrolled and surprising reactions may follow. These can range from the *couvade-syndrome* (psychosomatic symptoms of father’s, particularly arising during pregnancy, cf. Schom 2003: 30ff.; Brennan et al. 2007) to the father’s escape into his job after birth as a compulsive-defensive mode of sustaining the doing masculinity (cf. Metzger 2006: 326ff.).

2. During the development crisis associated with the process of becoming a father, the dilemma of masculinity is intensively being re-experienced by the affective revivification of own experiences of dependency as a young child. This pertains anger at the sexual dependency upon ‘their’ wives, when the child is urging between the two with its intimate relationship with the mother. Envy of the mother’s competences and jealousy of the child, which is allowed to enjoy the situation, is even pronounced when the child is a boy (cf. Pohl 2006: 178ff.; Schon 2000: 37f.; Schorn: 308ff.). I have not found support for this these, which is mentioned very often in the literature, in my interviews until now.

3. What I have found is a disturbing anxiety to be perceived as pedophile, that has up to now been entirely underestimated in sociological and pedagogic writing on fathers. For the fathers, child caring activities may result into precisely the same unconscious symbiotic desires, which are mothers allowed to become aware as ‘motherly love’. But in contrast, fathers may develop anxieties concerning pedophilia, because the intensive feeling of being enamoured with the child and his body is incompatible with a male paternal attitude and therefore not intelligible in a different way. This may has consequences upon father’s practices: They may retreat from this weird child-caring activities (cf. Balsam 2008). In all exploratory interviews hitherto conducted by myself this topic was touched, at times more centrally at others more as a side aspect.

4. To romp with kids is more compatible with the hegemonic male habitus, than to cuddle and comfort them. The fun playing ‘wilder’ games can be called into consciousness without difficulty. But the underlying wishes of closeness and body contact remain masked – especially

when the child is a son: Homophobia is an essential part of the male kathexis (cf. Flaake 2014: 236ff.; Pohl 2005). In many cases my interviews have become very vivid and pleasurable when the topic was romping. In contrast, cuddling was nearly not mentioned at all, by son-fathers even rarer than by daughter-fathers.

5. The male hexis, equipped with its incorporated doing masculinity, pushes affectively towards a re-traditionalization of the segregation of domestic work among the genders. Here, the discrepancy in current fatherhood between attitude and practice has a foundation. Spending more time on the job than with the baby at home becomes an affectively attractive option. In my interviews these wishes to flee the familie's tightness are very obvious.

6. The postmodern discourses about 'involved fathers' are in front of this phenomenon not only helpless, but they tend to conceal the corporeal dynamics by their rhetorics of 'voluntariness' and 'enrichment', instead of lifting them to consciousness. The explanatory gap concerning the body experience can be filled by re-ontologizing discourses serving as rationalizations. They declare the strange urging within oneself to be complete the impact of the genes or the will of god, they deny the conflicting character of the history behind, thus legitimizing an according manly-paternal posture. Regularly the interviewed fathers, but not all of them, refer at times to such ontologizations which conflict with their postmodern and gender-equality promoting stances.

TEACHING CONCEPT

I have already been teaching for nearly a decade at several universities (*Leibniz University Hannover, University of Applied Sciences and Arts Hannover, University Bielefeld, International Psychoanalytic University Berlin* and *Goethe-University Frankfurt*) in various fields of study, including gender studies, sociology, social work, social psychology and psychology. Beside basic seminars to give introductions on specific thematic subjects and disciplinary schools, I very much appreciate to conduct transdisciplinary lectures by focusing on the comparison of different theoretical approaches.

Over the period of the Freigeist-Fellowship I would continue the teaching of courses and seminars as part of the study program *MA Gender Studies* in Bielefeld, with which I have paused during the preparation for this application. I am planning to perform four hours per week and semester with theoretically founded lectures on 'Psychoanalysis and Deconstructivism', 'Doing Gender', 'Affect Theory in Sociology, Psychology and History' as well as specialized thematic lectures on 'Transformations of the Division of Domestic Labor', 'New Fathers' and 'Popular Gender Discourses between Deconstruction and Reontologization'. In consideration of the unforeseeable future political situation maybe I will also feel urged to focus on thematic issues like racism, xenophobia, antifeminism and antisemitism.

As a guest lecturer at the *Sigmund Freud University Vienna* I would be delighted to engage in teaching in the study program *MA Psychology, Focus: Social Psychology and Psychosocial Practices*. I would like to offer a lecture: 'Psychoanalysis in Discussion with Sociology and Historical Sciences'.

As mode of my lectures I prefer seminars where students give a report about a text, focused on central theses, open questions and an own critical appreciation. The base text should have been read by all participants for preparation. After the presentation there should be much time left for discussion. The other kind of lectures I like to give are workshop-like colloquia, in which students have the possibility to develop, present and discuss their own little research projects.

CHOICE OF INSTITUTION

I have chosen the *Interdisciplinary Center of Women's and Gender Studies* (IFF) at the *University Bielefeld* as the umbrella organization for my research project. Embodied with an outstanding inter- and transdisciplinary scientific tradition the IFF offers me a stimulating, controversial and fruitful atmosphere, within which I have been allowed to follow my own way of thinking as well as have been forced to position and re-position my ideas in the confrontation with different perspectives.

I was significantly involved in writing the proposal for the re-registration of the IFF in 2015. The designated focus of the IFF will be "Gendered Modes of Existence", regarding the questions "which emotional, affective and corporeal precipitations of gendering processes are to be seen in individuals [...] and which effects are resulting for the social practices as well as for the cultural perception of gender" (Proposal for the Re-Registration of the IFF, May 2015). This fits very well with my project.

In addition, the *Sigmund Freud University* in Vienna will offer me an intensive interchange with the recent psychoanalytic discussions, which I am missing in Bielefeld. The combination of these two distinctive institutions will be a wonderful intellectual environment for my research project.

COOPERATION PARTNERS

Beside my colleagues at the IFF, especially **Prof. Dr. Tomke König** (Gender Studies and Sociology) and **Dr. Julia Roth** (Intersectionality Studies), I was able to win the following scientists as cooperation partners for my research project:

Dr. Nicole Burgermeister (Psychoanalytic Seminar Zurich – Gender and Queer Studies, Psychology and Psychoanalysis)

Prof. Dr. Karin Flaake (Ossietzky University Oldenburg – Gender and Adolescence Studies, Sociology)

Prof. Dr. Christine Kirchhoff (International Psychoanalytic University Berlin – Psychoanalysis)

Prof. em. Dr. Gudrun-Axeli Knapp (Leibniz University Hanover – Gender Studies and Sociology)

Prof. Dr. Hans-Dieter König (Goethe-University Frankfurt – Depth Hermeneutics, Sociology and Psychoanalysis)

Dr. Julia König (Goethe-University Frankfurt a.M. – Sexuality Studies and Educational Sciences)

Prof. Dr. Andrea Maihofer (University Basel – Gender Studies, Philosophy and Sociology)

Prof. Dr. Rolf Pohl (Leibniz University Hanover – psychoanalytic Social Psychology and Men's Studies)

Prof. Dr. Barbara Rendtorff (University Paderborn – Sociology and Educational Sciences)

Dr. Nora Ruck (Sigmund Freud University Vienna and York University Toronto – Psychology)

Prof. Dr. Ilka Quindeau (Frankfurt University of Applied Sciences – Gender and Sexuality Studies, Psychoanalysis)

INFORMATION CONCERNING OTHER FUNDING ORGANIZATIONS

It is not envisaged to submit this application to other funding organizations.