

Undergraduate Final Dissertation of Philosophy, Politics and Economics

2022/2023

**The Marginalisation of Gender in Higher Education Institutions as
Hermeneutical Injustice: Causes and Consequences**

A Qualitative Case Study of a Spanish University

The struggle over politics is ultimately
fought on the plane of truth

LINDA M. ALCOFF | An Epistemology for the Next Revolution

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my supervisor for her/his guidance and encouragement throughout my research journey. Her/his expertise and feedback have been instrumental in shaping this dissertation.

My sincere appreciation goes to the participants who generously shared their time, knowledge, and experiences for this study. Their insightful contributions form the foundation and heart of this research. I hope that my work can help amplify their voices and contribute to the ongoing effort to create more feminist and inclusive higher education institutions.

Finally, I would like to extend my gratitude to [my university] for providing me with the resources and opportunities that have facilitated my academic growth and development.

Thank you all.

Declaration of Authorship

I X hereby declare that I am the sole author of this final dissertation for my BA in X. The ideas, arguments, and conclusions presented in this work are my own, and any external sources used have been duly cited and referenced. Likewise, I confirm that this work has not been previously submitted for evaluation in any module, either partially or in its entirety.

Barcelona, 26 May 2023

X

Abstract

An extensive body of literature has documented the existence of a marginalisation of gender studies within higher education institutions (HEIs), but a more nuanced understanding of the nature of this phenomenon is needed. This study contributes towards this aim by analysing the marginalisation of gender in teaching and research practices of HEIs as a form of hermeneutical injustice. Applying a social epistemological framework, the research investigates the causes and consequences of such marginalisation. The methodology consists of a qualitative case study of a Spanish university, in which 12 interviews were conducted with academics across the hierarchy ladder, including feminist academics and managerial positions. The study first identifies the causes of the marginalisation of gender through discourses that regard gender issues as irrelevant to one's field of study and ideological. Institutional practices contribute to the marginalisation through, among others, a lack of supervision of the implementation of the gender perspective in the classroom and a deficit of training provided to academics. The results also suggest that academics' immersion in gender-sensitive contexts mitigates the potential emotional and professional consequences of the marginalisation. Findings have relevant implications for gender-equality policy-making in universities and demonstrates the suitability of empirical work for disclosing how hermeneutical injustice occurs in real-life settings. Although the study has limitations due to its methodological design of a case study and the small sample, it provides valuable exploratory insights into a topic that has not received proper attention. For a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon, future research should investigate it in different contexts and include more diverse samples.

Keywords: gender perspective, hermeneutical injustice, epistemic ignorance, epistemic practices, higher education institutions.

Index

1. Introduction	6
2. Analytical framework	10
3.1 Marginalisation of gender in HEIs as hermeneutical injustice	10
3.1.1 Hermeneutical injustice	10
3.1.2 Marginalisation of gender in HEIs epistemic practices	11
3.2 Epistemological framework	13
3.2.1 Causes of hermeneutical injustice	13
3.2.2 Consequences of hermeneutical injustice	17
3. Methodology	20
4. Findings	22
4.1 Causes	22
4.1.1 Discourses	23
4.1.2 Institutional factors	26
4.2 Consequences	30
4.2.1 Economic consequences	30
4.2.2 Well-being consequences	32
6. Conclusions	34
References	38
Annexe	42

1. Introduction

Higher education institutions (HEIs) are not isolated from society, but rather subject to **power relations** which pervade broader socioeconomic and political structures. These power relations shape the norms and values which govern higher education settings and dynamics, including its core function in society: knowledge production, transmission, and dissemination. Power permeates universities' organization and configuration to systematically ascribe authority and authoritativeness to certain individuals, social groups, methodologies, and lines of inquiry while neglecting and disregarding others. As a result, not everyone is equally legitimized to generate knowledge, and not all types of knowledge are equally valued.

One of the most recognized **epistemic exclusions**¹ within HEIs is the **absence of a gender perspective in research and curricula**. An emerging body of literature has documented that gender is largely neglected in higher education settings, particularly in the classroom. As it will be discussed in greater detail, course syllabi are characterised by a significant lack of a gender perspective, female authors and feminist thinking (Diamant et al., 2018; Skitka et al., 2021; Hinton-Smith et al., 2022; Morris et al., 2022). Although literature has provided extensive evidence of gender marginalisation² in HEIs, a deeper and more comprehensive understanding is needed to fully comprehend the nature and implications of such marginalisation.

This study works towards this direction by applying a **social epistemological framework** to empirically analyse the marginalisation of gender in HEIs. This framework departs from the identification of gender marginalisation in HEIs as an instance of **hermeneutical injustice**, a concept developed by Miranda Fricker (2007). In short, hermeneutical injustice is the idea that marginalised groups are at a position of disadvantage to understand their own experiences, needs and concerns. Most conceptual resources in society have been developed from the perspectives of privileged groups and, therefore, are not useful for understanding the lives of marginalised groups. Gender marginalisation in HEIs means that

¹ This study employs an epistemological analytical framework with its corresponding epistemological jargon. The qualification of 'epistemic' should be understood in a broad sense, as relating to knowledge or its study. In this case, 'epistemic exclusions' can be alternatively interpreted as 'exclusions regarding knowledge', e.g. when a certain type of knowledge (area of study, line of inquiry, etc.) does not receive appropriate uptake or, closely related, when formal and informal barriers impede its creation and dissemination.

² For simplicity purposes, the absence of a gender perspective in HEIs' syllabi and research is also referred throughout this study as the 'marginalisation of gender in HEIs'. According to Cambridge Dictionary, 'marginalisation' is defined as the 'act of treating someone or something as if they are not important'. The fact that the gender perspective is largely absent from higher education epistemic practices essentially means that gender is not deemed relevant and important enough, which is equivalently to state that gender is marginalised in HEIs.

gender-sensitive knowledge remains underdeveloped in society, which essentially corresponds to hermeneutical injustice, as it implies that the available conceptual toolkits and methodologies are biased toward the dominant groups' perspective.

Drawing on relevant social epistemological literature (Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2013; 2016), two main aspects should be analysed after labelling a situation as hermeneutical injustice: **causes** and **consequences**. Following this approach, the empirical part of this study delves into these aspects in the case of the marginalisation of gender in HEIs. Given the potential multitude of causes and consequences of hermeneutical injustice, it is not feasible to cover all of them in a study with limited space and sample size. Therefore, I draw from the aforementioned epistemological literature to delimit the nature of the causes and consequences of hermeneutical injustice which will be considered³.

Concerning the causes, Medina (2013; 2016) provides an insightful theoretical account for understanding hermeneutical injustice as a product of discourses and institutional arrangements. Likewise, Fricker's (2007) development of the term hermeneutical injustice includes a discussion of the consequences, which are divided into economic and emotional. Following these classifications, the **research questions (RQs)** for this study are the following:

- ❖ *RQ1*: Which discourses and institutional arrangements produce and maintain the marginalisation of gender in HEIs?
- ❖ *RQ2*: Which professional and well-being consequences, if any, do academics engaged in gender studies experience due to the marginalisation of gender in HEIs?

These RQ are explored through a qualitative methodology consisting of **12 in-depth semi-structured interviews** with different positions across the Faculty of Political and Social Science of a public Spanish university, including feminist academics and managerial positions. The results of the interviews are subject to **thematic analysis**; the creation of themes is based on the operationalisation of the causes and consequences of the RQs.

The topic at hand has not received detailed attention in **previous literature**. However, some studies on gender mainstreaming in HEIs are relevant to the research questions (RQs). Particularly, the first RQ aligns with previous literature examining resistances to the incorporation of a gender perspective in the classroom. Verge et al. (2018) and Tildesley et al. (2022) examined factors hindering the inclusion of gender in curricula, including both discourses and institutional practices. However, neither of these studies conducted

³ Note that this delimitation is well justified as Fricker and Medina are highly prominent scholars on the issue. Fricker (2007) herself developed the notion of hermeneutical injustice, and Medina is a widely acknowledged scholar on hermeneutical injustice.

interviews with feminist scholars. Therefore, this study can expand on these previous findings by offering a detailed and nuanced understanding of the matter.

The second RQ has received less attention in previous literature. For one, the consequences for female academics' well-being deriving from the marginalisation of gender have not been previously explored. Regarding professional consequences, some studies have considered the effects of the desprestige of gender in certain dimensions such as publishing or securing funding (Hart, 2016; Blackmore, 2022). Nonetheless, the matter has not been explored comprehensively. Given the overall lack of existing literature on the consequences, this study offers exploratory insights in this regard.

The study is structured into **four sections**. Firstly, the *analytical framework* provides the theoretical discussion that guides and underpins the empirical work. It examines the concept of hermeneutical injustice and its equivalence with the marginalisation of gender in HEIs, as well as the causes and consequences of hermeneutical injustice as discussed by Medina (2013; 2016) and Fricker (2007). Likewise, the discussion outlines how such theoretical insights inform the operationalisation of the empirical exploration. Additionally, this section includes a review of relevant literature on gender mainstreaming in HEIs, which complements the operationalisation process and provides relevant theoretical insights to analyse the findings. The *methodological section* details the methods of data gathering and analysis used whilst outlining their relation to the theoretical framework. The subsequent *findings section* presents and analyses the results, drawing connections with previous literature. Lastly, the *conclusions* highlights the key findings, the main contributions to the existing literature, and the study's limitations and future directions.

HEIs mirrors social reality, but they can also be a driving force of change. The generation of knowledge is indispensable for advancing **social transformation**, as it allows unprivileged groups to theorise about their own experiences of subordination as well as construct projects of emancipation. It is therefore indispensable to critically examine society's epistemic practices⁴, considering the ways in which power shapes *how* knowledge is produced and by *whom*. Such understanding of the inner workings of power is the foundational base for developing **normative accounts of knowledge production** to ensure inclusivity and diversity in the process. It is precisely in this sense that Linda Martín Alcoff, a widely acknowledged feminist epistemologist, asserts that 'the epistemological problem must be central to the next phase of revolutionary struggle' (p.68, 2011). Given that HEIs are the epistemic centres of society, it is paramount to uncover dynamics of subordination within

⁴ Following the definition of 'epistemic' as concerning knowledge and its study, 'epistemic practices' should be understood as those actions related to the knowledge realm, e.g. knowledge generation, divulgation and dissemination.

these settings with the horizon of building much more inclusive institutions of knowledge—and this study is essentially born out of such task.

2. Analytical framework

3.1 Marginalisation of gender in HEIs as hermeneutical injustice

3.1.1 Hermeneutical injustice

For the past decades, social feminist epistemology has produced an extensive body of literature on the relationship between power and knowledge (Nelson, 1990; Code, 1991; Hartsock, 1983; Haraway, 1991). This literature emerges as a comprehensive critique against traditional epistemology, which departed from the idea of knowledge as being generated from a detached perspective, without attending to the social conditions under which knowledge is generated. The ground-breaking contribution of feminist epistemology was to challenge such an ideal, putting forward the tenet of **situated knowledge**. According to such idea, knowers are socially situated in a myriad of ways—including but not limited to class, gender, and race—which determine *how* and *what* they know (Haraway, 1988; Wylie, 2003). **Social identities** shape, among others, individuals' opportunities, material conditions and the treatment they receive, which altogether produces specific experiences, needs and concerns which give rise to different understandings of reality (Haraway, 1988; Nelson, 1990; Code, 1991). The fact that knowledge is situated implies that knowledge production is grounded in social circumstances and, by extension, power structures and relations (Haraway, 1988; Wylie, 2003).

Closely related to this last point, **historically privileged groups**—particularly white middle and upper-class males—have had substantial power to control our epistemic practices and processes (Haraway, 1988; Nelson, 1990; 1993; Grasswick, 2019). Given their overreaching **control of knowledge institutions**, the vast majority of knowledge has been generated from their situated perspective (Harding, 1986; Longino, 1999). For instance, the field of political science has historically placed a large focus on institutional politics in detriment of analysing the domestic sphere (Evans et al., 2016; Lisa & Hawkesworth, 2015). Feminist argue that this focus is the result of social circumstances, as men have dominated the public sphere and thus have concerned themselves with understanding the workings of democratic institutions (Evans et al., 2016; Lisa & Hawkesworth, 2015). This is an example of the broader phenomena that Grasswick (2021, p.300) draws attention to when stating that knowledge 'bear the markers of their makers', as it employs conceptual frameworks that have been found useful to grasp the world from the privileged group's perspective.

Marginalised individuals may struggle understanding and articulating their own experiences as the culturally available conceptual resources have not been generated departing from such

experiences. This situation has been named by Miranda Fricker (2007, p.1) as **hermeneutical injustice**, which, as she phrases it, occurs ‘when a gap in collective interpretive resources puts someone at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to making sense of their social experience’. In other words, given that institutions of knowledge have been dominated by privileged groups, marginalised groups do not dispose of the same breadth and depth of concepts and theories by which to understand their lives and concerns. For example, for a long time, women did not have enough concepts by which to identify different facets of patriarchal violence, such as ‘mansplaining’ or ‘gaslighting’. Altogether, the concept of hermeneutical injustice discloses the inner workings of power relations and structures in shaping epistemic practices, which ultimately results in hindering unprivileged group’s ability to make sense of their surroundings.

3.1.2 Marginalisation of gender in HEIs epistemic practices

Numerous studies, both qualitative and quantitative, have analysed **universities’ syllabi** and teaching methodologies to conclude that incorporating a **gender perspective** is far from being a priority in this regard (Wright, 2016; Skitka et al., 2022; Morris et al., 2022). Although there are individual scholars who are committed to including a gender perspective in the classroom, these are unique examples rather than a general tendency (Hinton-Smith, 2021; Harris et al., 2020). Across different disciplines, syllabi contain a vast majority of male authors and there is a widespread lack of a gender perspective (Diament et al., 2018; Harris et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2021). Even though gender may be included as an ‘add-on’, e.g. a special category, it is not given proper relevance neither seen as a challenge to canonical knowledge (Hinton-Smith et al., 2022).

Multiple **quantitative studies** have illustrated such shortcomings with significant figures. Harris et al. (2020) analysed 128 syllabi from multiple disciplines in a North American university and found that 58% of readings did not include any female authors. Likewise, a study by Diament et al. (2018) considered 63 syllabi of American Political Courses from US universities and observed that only 18% of the readings had at least one female author, whilst readings on gender and women’s issues accounted for a 1%. Supporting these results, a case study of a Spanish university (Verge et al., 2018) analysed all modules of the BA in Political Science and found that only 3% of the modules dealt with issues of gender, women and feminism. Overall, as the reviewed literature suggest, higher education classrooms are still pervaded by white male privileged voices and androcentric frameworks⁵.

⁵ Please, see Chart 1 in the annexe for an outline of relevant literature regarding the absence of the gender perspective in higher education curricula.

Even though these studies have only considered the absence of gender in teaching, and not in research, they can arguably be interpreted as a wider **neglect of gender issues in academia**. Skitka et al. (2021) found that the under-representation of gender issues and female authors in syllabi does not reflect a shortage of female-authored publications or a preference for classical works, but is rather the result of **gender bias**. It is then especially hard to imagine that scholars who barely include female authors or gender issues in their syllabi—and who fail to do so mainly as a result of gender discrimination—will incorporate gender in their research. It is precisely in this sense that MacKinnon (2017) talks about a ‘gender illiteracy’ among scholars, defined as a widespread ignorance around gender that affects both teaching and research.

Why should the marginalisation of gender in HEIs should be understood as an instance of **hermeneutical injustice**? The peripheral position of gender in research and syllabi intuitively implies that knowledge departing and encompassing women’s experiences and perspectives—thus, aiming to disclose the gendered nature of social phenomena and relations—is largely underdeveloped in society. Given that universities are the institutionalised epistemic centres of society, in which most knowledge is generated and disseminated, the marginalisation of gender within such institutions is especially concerning. It poses overreaching blockages to the generation and circulation of gender and feminist issues, which essentially corresponds to what hermeneutical injustice refers to, a deficit of knowledge departing from marginalised groups’ experiences.

3.2 Epistemological framework

3.2.1 Causes of hermeneutical injustice

As developed in the last section, hermeneutical injustice corresponds to a deficit of epistemic resources considering unprivileged groups' lives, needs and concerns. The causes of hermeneutical injustice then refer to those mechanisms by which epistemic deficits are produced, maintained and justified (Fricker, 2007; Medina, 2013). Departing from the idea of epistemic ignorance, Medina (2013; 2016) argues that hermeneutical ignorance is generated by discourses and institutional arrangements. Table 1 outlines the operationalisation of the causes, in which, following Medina, the **dimensions** are separated in 'discourses' and 'institutional'. In the following paragraphs, I develop Medina's work whilst pointing out how his theoretical insights inform the operationalisation of the empirical exploration.

Medina (2013; 2016) coined the term of **epistemic ignorance** which, in short, occurs when individuals resist readily available knowledge. In other words, individuals are labelled as *epistemically ignorant* when they fail to consider, or refuse to engage with, knowledge that is accessible to them. For instance, when individuals persistently believe that women are worse at STEM careers despite evidence proving otherwise. Systematic epistemic ignorance generates hermeneutical injustice, since the lack of uptake and engagement with knowledge inevitably leads to its underdevelopment and marginalisation.

Academics' failure to include gender in their work, ultimately causing hermeneutical injustice, can be intuitively understood as epistemic ignorance as theorised by Medina. Even though incorporating a gender perspective is a complex and time-consuming task, the resources to do so are not on the 'dark side of the moon'. Scholars can access female authors' work and feminist perspectives, and thus, the failure or refusal to do so is an active choice, which largely fits the notion of epistemic ignorance.

Epistemic ignorance is, firstly, supported by **discourses** which excuse and justify individuals' lack of engagement with knowledge (Medina, 2013; 2017). In the most explicit cases, ignorance is accompanied by discourses which challenge the validity of knowledge to justify its rejection (Medina, 2013; 2016). This type of discourse is included as one of the **indicators**, namely, 'discourses which are **demeaning towards gender and feminist issues or challenge its validity**' (see table 1). Considering previous feminist literature, there are multiple possible grounds to attack the validity of knowledge departing from gender.

Feminist epistemologist Taneseni (2019) argued that gender studies tend to be dismissed for not being scientific enough or being overly ideological⁶. Closely related, Tildesley et al. (2022) and Lombardo & Margeart (2013) find that feminists are frequently accused of ideological indoctrination when advancing gender equality goals in university. Another possible discourse in this regard would be a trivialisation of gender equality. Verge et al. (2018) and Tildesley et al. (2022) find that the opposition to gender equality policy in HEIs is often entrenched in a post-feminist narrative which regards gender oppression as ‘something of the past’. This idea, which portrays feminism as no longer a concern, could indeed constitute excellent grounds to justify a lack of engagement with gender.

Ignorance can also be identified with more subtle discourses which do not necessarily problematise knowledge *per se*, but rather point at **external factors** to justify a lack of engagement, such as difficulty, lack of resources and availability, etc. (Medina, 2013; 2016). This type of discourse is identified as the **second indicator**, which can be found in table 1. Back to the object of study, such discourses could revolve around the complexity of gender and feminist issues. Lombardo & Mergaert (2013, p.305) find that academics in higher education institutions typically reject gender equality policy evoking the narrative that ‘the issue is too complex’. Additionally, another possibility would be alleging that there are not enough female-authored publications, which is indeed a widespread justification for academics to justify their own gender gaps in syllabi (Skitka et al., 2021).

Medina (2013; 2016) advances that epistemic ignorance is not only enabled by discourses but also by **institutional norms and arrangements** which excuse ignorance or, alternatively, fail to challenge it. As Martín Alcoff (2020, p.304) phrases it, certain contexts ‘operate with inadequate epistemic norms to reflect upon and address (...) [epistemic] exclusions or the impact that these exclusions have on their projects of inquiry’. Medina’s discussion on this institutional dimensions is mostly theoretical and abstract and, therefore, does not provide specific examples of which specific institutional aspects he may be referring to. Nonetheless, previous literature on gender inequality in HEIs offers relevant insights in this regard, which underpin the indicators of the institutional dimension.

Verge et al. (2018) examines institutional policy in relation to the absence of gender in syllabi and obtained several relevant findings. For one, they conclude that the under-representation of a gender perspective is largely enabled by a lack of institutional supervision in the implementation phase. In other words, universities do not monitor whether, and how,

⁶It is noteworthy that this discourse aligns with the discursive strategies employed by 'anti-gender' or 'anti-feminist' political and social groups who often label feminism and gender studies as ideological to discredit and undermine their legitimacy. By branding a field as 'ideological,' it insinuates that its theories and methods are influenced by political or moral bias, rather than empirical evidence and logical reasoning, which, in turn, questions their credibility and worthiness of serious consideration.

academics incorporate gender in the classroom. Following this, the **first indicator** is 'lack of supervision in the implementation process '(see table 1).

Additionally, the same study finds that the widespread belief among academics that their modules are gender-neutral is aggravated by an institutional lack of guidance and training on gender and feminist issues. These results are shared by Morris et al. (2022) and Morley (2007), who observe that scholars frequently do have the willingness to incorporate gender perspectives, which is nonetheless truncated by an absence of expertise on the matter. In line with this finding, the **second indicator** is 'lack of education about the gender perspective' (refer to table 1).

Table 1. Operationalisation of the causes of hermeneutical injustice

Concept	Conceptual definition	Operational definition	Dimensions	Indicators
Causes of hermeneutical injustice towards gender	Mechanisms that produce epistemic deficits (concretely, a lack of a gender perspective) in HEIs' epistemic practices	Attitudes, behaviours and policy which result in a disregard or negligence of gender-related knowledge in HEIs teaching and research practices	Discourses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discourses which are demeaning towards gender and feminist issues, or challenge its validity • Discourses which do not problematise knowledge <i>per se</i>, but rather point at other factors to justify not using such knowledge such as difficulty, lack of time or availability, etc.
			Institutional arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of supervision of the implementation process • Lack of training on the gender perspective

3.2.2 Consequences of hermeneutical injustice

Fricker (2007) development of hermeneutical injustice ends with a brief discussion of its consequences. This discussion does not provide too much detail of the nature of the harms deriving from hermeneutical injustice, but there is a distinction between two main kinds of consequences: economic and well-being⁷. Table 2 shows that this classification is applied to the operationalisation by dividing the consequences into these two main **dimensions**.

Economic consequences refer to negative professional or monetary penalisations caused by hermeneutical injustice (Fricker, 2007). In the context of this study, these consequences could be understood as adverse professional impacts that academics encounter as a result of the marginalisation of gender. In order to develop indicators for this economic dimension, I draw from the literature discussed below.

In a mixed-method study, Blackmore (2022) investigated the effects of the universities' increasing preference for STEMM over HASS⁸, including the marginalisation of gender studies that such preference entails. The study finds that HASS researchers face a disadvantage in securing funding from both university and external sources, as research priorities largely focus on STEMM. Regarding hiring processes, the study notes that whilst available positions in HASS fields have not decreased, they are becoming more precarious. Additionally, the research highlights the under-representation of feminist research in prestigious journals, where decision-making positions are predominantly held by men. Illustrative of this is the study by Hart (2006) that examined higher education scholarship in three core journals and found that only 9.8% of the publications considered gender issues. All these possibilities regarding the labour effects of the marginalisation of gender (in the three aforementioned areas of funding, hiring and publishing) can be found in table 2 as **indicators of the economic dimension**.

Regarding **well-being**, Fricker (2007) advances that hermeneutical injustice may negatively impact individuals' perceptions of their **epistemic confidence**⁹. Hermeneutical injustice

⁷ Fricker also develops a primary type of consequences which logically derives from the definition of hermeneutical injustice. This consequences if referred to as 'situated hermeneutical injustice': the exclusion of marginalized groups from knowledge generation and divulgation. The empirical approximation of it is better understood as the absence of gender in teaching and scholarship that, as explained, has been widely documented in previous literature. Thus, this study does not specifically address it.

⁸ STEMM stands for science, technology, engineering, maths and medicine. HASS stands for Humanities and Social Sciences.

⁹ Epistemic confidence refers to confidence is one's epistemic capabilities, which can be understood as those cognitive and non-cognitive skills related to knowledge acquisition, exchange and divulgation (Steup & Neta, 2020). Among others, they include memory, reading comprehension, motivation, mental agility, etc.

occurs when knowledge departing from marginalised positionalities occupies a peripheral position in the conceptual toolkit by which society understands and makes sense of the world. For instance, whilst queer studies and activism are developing a large jargon to describe their experiences (e.g. homonormativity, butch, gender dysphoria, etc.), these concepts are often neglected. At stake is that such conflict between one's understanding of reality and hegemonic conceptual resources may trigger individuals' **loss of confidence** in their epistemic capabilities.

In plain words, individuals may doubt their ability to make sense of their surroundings given that the theorisations departing from their perspectives do not receive recognition and engagement. Back to the queer example, if medical personnel routinely dismiss the claims of trans teens experiencing gender dysphoria, those teens may begin to doubt themselves and their reasoning abilities. Similarly, scholars working on gender issues may experience self-doubt and a loss of confidence if they feel their work is not considered relevant or is easily dismissed and challenged.

Expanding on Fricker's ideas, it is reasonable to expect that, other than impacts on one's self-confidence, hermeneutical injustice may prompt **frustration and disappointment**. This may be especially salient applied to the context of the study. Gender studies, along with other disciplines, are distinguished for being directly associated with struggles for emancipation. As a result, the relationship between the researcher and the object of study is arguably of a particular nature given the sensitive content that the research entails as well as the prospects of social change it has the potential to offer. Perceiving that issues which are highly socially relevant—and on a more intimate level, to what one's stands for—do not receive proper attention or recognition by colleagues may easily prompt scholars to experience a myriad of negative feelings, from discontent to discouragement.

Please refer to table 2 to find the '**well-being dimension**' which encompasses adverse reactions caused by the marginalisation of gender. The **indicators** include the aforementioned loss of self-confidence that Fricker discusses as well as the feelings of disappointment and frustration.

Table 2. Operationalisation of the consequences of hermeneutical injustice

Concept	Conceptual definition	Operational definition	Dimensions	Indicators
Consequences of hermeneutical injustice towards gender	Harms derived from the marginalisation of gender in HEIs' epistemic practices	Negative professional penalisations, experiences and feelings that academics endure as a result of the marginalisation of gender in HEIs' teaching and research practices	Economic	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disadvantages for securing research funding on gender issues • Disadvantages for publishing gender-related research • Labour discrimination related to gender-research
			Well-being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of self-confidence • Frustration, disappointment.

3. Methodology

The empirical work consists of a **case study of the Department of Political and Social Science at a public Spanish university**. The study employs **12 in-depth interviews with participants occupying various positions across the department**. The interviewees include 6 female academics¹⁰ and a doctoral student engaged with gender studies, a male academic who supports feminism, a member of the Equality Unit¹¹, and 3 managerial positions within the department. The age of the academics range from 30 to 50 years old, whilst the doctoral student falls within the 25-35 age range. The majority of interviewees hold the rank of associate professors whilst a handful are assistant professors¹².

The choice of methodology is partly based on **feminist standpoint theory**, which posits that feminists' understanding of relations of power leads to an epistemologically privileged 'standpoint'¹³ (Hartsock, 1983; Rose, 1983). In simpler terms, feminists have gained a unique perspective from which to critically examine the social world, which is especially insightful in uncovering and understanding the gendered nature of social phenomena. Regarding the context of study, feminist academics are arguably well aware of the marginalisation of gender in their everyday environment. Due to their engagement with feminism, they have the potential to provide critical insights into the matter at hand, drawing not only from personal experiences but also from a political engagement with such experiences. Hence, the main focus of the interviews is placed on feminist academics, with the purpose of placing their experiences and concerns—informed by feminist frameworks—at the core of the analysis.

The sample includes a doctoral student, in addition to academics, in order to reflect different perspectives across the university hierarchy. Furthermore, the male interviewee has the potential to offer complementary insights, as he is likely exposed to his male colleagues' controversial perspectives, which may not be shared in the presence of female academics. Finally, the interviews with individuals in managerial positions provide context on the

¹⁰ One of the female academics is a professor in the Department of Humanities. This participant was chosen for their substantial involvement in researching and teaching gender as a subject of study and an analytical category. In order to maintain anonymity, the chart in Annex 2, which includes the socio-demographic information of the participants, does not indicate the specific participant from the Humanities Department.

¹¹ The Equality Unit is an institutionalised body in higher education institutions which aims to promote feminism in universities' policies and functioning. Among others, they handle sexist violence occurring in universities and act as a consultant for universities' governing bodies in gender matters.

¹² Please, refer to chart 2 in the annexe for an outline of the relevant socio-demographics of the participants.

¹³ An epistemologically privileged 'standpoint' refers to a perspective or point of view that is considered to be particularly valuable or insightful when it comes to understanding certain aspects of the world (Hartstock, 1983).

current state of the inclusion of gender in the department, as well as the existing policies regarding the gender perspective in the classroom.

The decision to opt for qualitative research is also informed by the **state-of-the-art** of similar literature. Given the gap of literature on the topic, a qualitative methodology is the most appropriate approach, as the aim is to offer some initial insight into the issue rather than to establish trends or patterns. Moreover, this study can contribute to existing literature on resistances to gender mainstreaming in HEIs by incorporating the perspectives of female academics, which have not been properly considered before.

The interview script was developed following the principles of a **semi-structured interview format**, as guided by the feminist research by Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2006). Specifically, I followed a framework that included three blocks of broad themes, which were then explored further with specific questions tailored to each participant. The blocks were designed based on the RQs and theoretical insights provided in the analytical framework, in line with the manuals' recommended approach. To ensure clarity, two exploratory interviews were conducted, which resulted in minor revisions. The interview questions¹⁴ were intended to stimulate dialogue between the interviewer and interviewee and enable a thorough exploration of the topics. During the interviews, I adopted an engaged approach, following Hesse-Biber and Leavy's (2006) advice to focus on carefully listening to the interviewees and asking myself 'what are they trying to tell me?'. This allowed for the **interviewees' perspectives and experiences** to be central in the analysis.

The duration of the interviews ranged approximately 45–60 minutes. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed for analysis. **Thematic analysis** was employed, following the process outlined by Braune and Clarke (2006). This involved familiarising myself with the data, generating initial codes, combining codes into potential themes, and reviewing the themes to ensure coherence and relevance to the research questions.

Ethical considerations were carefully taken into account throughout the research process. Informed consent¹⁵ was obtained from all participants prior to the interviews, and they were informed of their right to withdraw at any time without penalty. All data collected was kept confidential and anonymous, and stored in a secure location accessible only to myself. Likewise, findings do not contain any personal information that would allow the identification of participants.

¹⁴ The script of the interview can be found in the annexe, along with a brief discussion of the selected blocks and the functioning of the interview.

¹⁵ Please, find in the annexe the information sheet and consent form provided to participants.

4. Findings

4.1 Causes

The marginalisation of gender in academia is perpetuated by discourses and institutional factors, which are critically examined in the following section. The **indicators of discourses** sustaining the marginalisation of gender¹⁶ were two. Firstly, *discourses which draw on external factors to justify the lack of engagement with gender*, such as alleging complexity, lack of time or sources, etc. Secondly, *discourses which are demeaning towards gender and feminist issues or, closely related, challenge its validity*. The main identified discourses are two, each corresponding to one of the indicators. The first discourse regards **gender as irrelevant to one's field of study or modules**. The second discourse identifies **gender issues as ideological**, which is aggravated by a **desprestige of qualitative methodology**¹⁷.

The analysis of **institutional factors** enables a comprehensive understanding of the factors behind the enduring existence and perpetuation of the marginalisation of gender. The **indicators** in this regard were the following: ***lack of supervision of the implementation process*** and ***lack of training on the gender perspective***. The empirical exploration has found both of these issues, which will be discussed in detail. Moreover, the results incorporate a third institutional aspect—not included in the indicators—identified as an **absence of settings in which to conduct epistemic exchanges** in which scholars could mutually help each other in pursuit of gendering their research.

¹⁶ Note that the focus is not to quantify the prevalence of these discourses (e.g. how widely shared are across the department), but rather to offer insights into the nature and characteristics of such discourses.

¹⁷ The first discourse aligns with the first indicator as the focus is not on questioning the internal validity or legitimacy of gender studies, but rather on the perception that gender studies lacks relevance to one's specific field of study. It's important to note that this discourse does not attack the validity of gender studies itself, but rather highlights the challenge of applying gender perspectives to other fields. The second discourse corresponds to the second indicator since the focus is directly on gender studies as a discipline, with explicit demeaning remarks towards the field. The issue raised is not about the lack of relevance to a specific field of study, but rather an argument against the scientific or rigorous nature of gender studies as a whole.

4.1.1 Discourses

Gender as irrelevant to one's field of study and modules

The Faculty ratified a regulation that introduced a set of obligatory norms concerning the integration of a gender perspective in syllabi¹⁸. Among these norms, a particularly significant one mandates that female authors should account for at least 40% of the assigned readings. Subsequent to the implementation of this regulation, the managerial positions explain that they received informal complaints via email from certain academics who expressed their reluctance to comply. Specifically, these academics argued that the gender perspective was not applicable to their discipline and modules. As recalled by one managerial authority, their claim was that the gender perspective 'had nothing to do with (...) [their field of study], it is something completely unrelated'¹⁹ (MP2, associate professor)²⁰.

The grievances expressed in these complaints align with a discourse that portrays the gender perspective as **irrelevant** to one's field of study and course modules. By asserting that gender is unrelated to their field or that it cannot offer valuable insights when applied to their modules, individuals are essentially providing justifications for neglecting its incorporation. This finding supports the results of Verge et al. (2018), whose research highlighted scholars' resistance to assuming the responsibility of integrating gender into curricula on the grounds that it is not pertinent to their respective fields.

Drawing on the notion of **epistemic ignorance** (Medina, 2013; 2017), this discourse should not be understood as resulting from a mere lack of expertise and, thus, morally innocuous. As explained, ignorance is always 'active' in the sense that it involves deploying resistance against knowledge. Even if implementing a gender perspective is a highly complex task, academics have access to a myriad of resources to guide them through the process. Deciding to ignore such resources is, in Medina's terms (2013; 2017), a result of laziness. What's more, claiming gender to be irrelevant to one's field of study is implicitly demeaning towards gender, as academics did not consider acquiring expertise about gender as worth their time and effort.

Closely related to this last point, Medina (2013; 2017) holds that addressing ignorance is challenging because ignorant individuals often have to change how they understand

¹⁸ For more information on the regulation of the gender perspective in the Faculty please refer to the first section of the annexe, 'Context of the state of gender in the Faculty'.

¹⁹ 10 interviews were conducted in the regional language, Catalan, whilst the remaining 2 were conducted in English. Therefore, quotes used in the results from the interviews conducted in Catalan were translated into English by myself.

²⁰ To view the codes of each interviewee as well as their sociodemographic information, please refer to the chart 2 'Interviewees' socio-demographics' in the annexe.

themselves and the world around them. This idea aligns with the insights of the male academic, who has been working in the university for more than 10 years, explaining that introducing a gender perspective 'can generate an epistemological problem, (...) there is an exercise, especially for men but also female professors (...) of admitting that you do not know [about gender issues]' (MA, assistant professor). Certainly, incorporating a gender perspective often entails challenging beliefs that many scholars have held for many years. In this sense, gendering the curriculum implies engaging in a **meaningful reflection** about teaching practices and, in a broader sense, one's understandings of their fields of study. Hence, the discourse conceptualising gender as 'irrelevant' should not be seen as resulting from a mere lack of expertise, but as a lack of willingness to critically examine one's values and practices.

Gender as ideological

Five out of the six interviewed female academics²¹, along with the male academic and the PhD student diagnose an animosity towards gender and feminism articulated by a characterisation of such issues as 'ideological'. Particularly illustrative of this is the following testimony of a female academic:

I have silenced myself a bit [regarding gender] because I have received critiques, especially from students but also from professors, that it is something too ideological. (...) There is always this view that if you do gender, that's ideological. Just because their thing [canonical works] is mainstream and hegemonic does not make it universal and neutral, just because ours is a critique does not mean it is partial and ideological' (FA2, tenure-track professor).

Similarly, another female academic (FA5), an associate professor, expressed concern that the syllabi of one of her modules would be seen as 'ideological' after introducing a large modification in pursuit of a comprehensive gender perspective. A third female academic (FA3), an associate professor with more than 10 years of experience in the Faculty, reported that she had once requested the university library to purchase a widely acknowledged journal on feminist economics, only to be told that there were no resources for 'esoteric' journals²².

²¹The only interviewee who did not express this (FA4) simply did not bring up the topic in conversation. Therefore, it cannot be inferred that she denies the existence of this ideological discourse either.

²² The interviewee explained this anecdote as part of a wider conversation about gender being regarded as ideological. One of the meanings of 'esoteric' is, according to Merriam-Webster dictionary, 'of special, rare, or unusual interest'. The comment of a widely acknowledged feminist journal being 'esoteric' could arguably fit into the narrative of gender as ideological as it regards gender studies as something peripheral and even mysterious (portraying the idea of gender studies as ideological demands of a few feminists) as opposed to a rigorous field of study.

The account of the male academic, an assistant professor, who is frequently exposed to his male colleagues' comments—arguably omitted in the presence of female academics—offers complementing insights in this regard. He expresses concern over the fact that many academics have accepted the introduction of a gender perspective but insofar as an **ideological trend** which will 'go away' and not as what it truly is, a broader critique to systematic bias pervading knowledge. In his own words, '[feminists] are pointing at a structural thing of how is knowledge structured, but this deep reflection is not understood as such, most people understand it as an ideology' (MA). He adds that this view is made especially evident by language claims he has heard from colleagues, concretely, that gender issues should be openly labelled as 'feminist' to make it clear from the beginning that they are indeed ideological demands.

All these accounts suggest that **androcentric frameworks** still pervade universities' dynamics and settings. Drawing from feminist epistemology, both feminist and canonical works are situated and partial in the sense of being generated from a particular perspective and, as an extension, attend to specific needs and concerns. Nonetheless, **canonical works** remain to be perceived as universal and neutral whilst **critical perspectives** are identified as partial and ideological. Simone De Beauvoir (1989, p.143) famous statement that 'the representation of the world, like the world itself, is the work of men; they describe it from their own point of view, which they confuse with the absolute truth' remains very well alive in universities. This finding supports the results of Tildesley et al. (2022) and Lombardo & Mergaert (2013), who observe that gender-equality actors are often dismissed as seeking ideological goals.

The desprestige of qualitative research

Related to the 'ideological' discourse, three female academics (FA1, FA2 and FA3) and the PhD student draw attention to a desprestige of qualitative methodologies, which ultimately contributes to a demeaning of gender studies. A female academic who holds the rank of associate professor and has been in the Faculty for over ten years (FA3) states that 'under the hegemonic mindset, a good scientist is who makes science. And the word **science**, especially in this department, is associated with quantitative research'. Especially illustrative of this is the testimony of the doctorate student who presented her qualitative research on gender issues, and the audience failed to comprehend her research as they were applying a quantitative mindset:

'there was this quantitative logic of 'what are your variables and hypothesis?', but qualitative research works differently (...) It's something not properly understood in

this predominantly quantitative department (...) If I had presented a quantitative article on political parties, all of them would have had feedback to give me' (DS).

At stake is that qualitative research is widely deployed in the field of gender, so the desprestige of such methodology often reinforces the view of gender research being ideological or not scientific. One female academic (FA2), a tenure-track professor, discusses this idea with a personal anecdote: 'I once made an article about 8 non-binary individuals (...) it was not only about them being queer but also having an eight-individual sample, if you add those things, everything seems less scientific and rigorous'. Altogether, the lack of understanding and undervaluation of qualitative research further aggravates the **discourse of gender as 'ideological'** as opposed to a relevant field of study.

4.1.2 Institutional factors

Lack of supervision of the implementation process

Almost all the female academics²³, along with the member of the Equality Unit and the doctoral student, expressed concerns about the lack of monitoring of the gender perspective in teaching. A pivotal regulation related to the gender perspective in the classroom is the requirement to include a minimum of 40% female authors in the syllabi²⁴. This criterion is relatively straightforward to verify, as managerial positions review the syllabi prior to uploading them to the course webpage, ensuring that at least 40% of the readings are authored by women. However, there are no **systematic mechanisms** to examine whether (i) academics consistently adhere to this balance and (ii) the gender perspective is incorporated beyond the mere inclusion of female authors.

When asked about the state of inclusion of gender, a managerial position responded 'it is a good question because I don't know what to tell you. It is satisfactory on a formal level [regarding the 40% of female authors and other rules] (...). But, on a content level, I do not know' (MP1, assistant professor). This lack of oversight in the implementation process aligns with the findings of Verge et al. (2018), who also identified such issue as allowing academics to neglect the mandate to include a gender perspective in syllabi.

Managerial positions were aware of this problem and identified two main causes. Firstly, as it is logical, there is a **lack of information** on what truly goes on in the classroom. The member of the Equality Unit as well as one academic (FA5, associate professor) discussed

²³ The female academic (FA4) who did not express concern about this simply did not mention this aspect during the conversation. Therefore, it cannot be inferred that she did not consider it a problem either.

²⁴ For more information on the regulation of the gender perspective in the Faculty, please refer to the first section of the annexe, 'context of the state of gender in the Faculty'.

one possible solution to address this situation. Particularly, they believed that student evaluations of teaching could include a question about the gender perspective. Doing so would allow the university to gather systematic data on the inclusion of gender, and academics could obtain feedback on their teaching practices in this regard as well.

Secondly, there is an **absence of expertise** among managerial positions in charge of evaluating the gender perspective that impedes a critical examination of syllabi. In this sense, one managerial position (MP1), an assistant professor in the field of political science, explains that he often lacks information to contrast whether syllabi are incorporating gender in a transversal way:

‘Monitoring is particularly difficult because much stuff is not easy to identify. For instance, if in a political science module, I only see ‘masculine suffrage’ I would definitely say that something is missing here. But in economics or law modules, it’s complicated because I am not familiarised [with the fields]’ (MP1).

This account corroborates the results of Lombardo & Margeart (2013) who find that one of the problems of implementing gender-equality policy in university is that it requires a high degree of expertise among managerial positions who are not experts. The managerial position explains that a solution to address this has been to find ‘allies’ who are knowledgeable about different fields to help him with the task. Even if this may be a temporary band-aid, it does not seem an adequate method in the long term as it is contingent on finding those allies. Moreover, even if those allies—who tend to be women—are happy to help, it can add up to the burden of women in academia, who tend to do unrecognised and unpaid work addressing gender issues (Henderson, 2019).

Lack of training on the gender perspective

Virtually all female academics²⁵, the male academic, the PhD student and the member of the Equality Unit share the concern that their colleagues, especially male, lack an understanding of what the gender perspective entails, especially from a transversal and intersectional perspective. Such concern is often discussed in relation to the **regulation on the gender perspective in the classroom**²⁶, as it is perceived as a mere formality which does not translate into a structural change in teaching practices. In this sense, a female academic (FA3, associate professor) explains that:

²⁵ There was only one female academic (FA6) who hesitated to claim that there was a lack of understanding of the gender perspective in the department. She had only been working in the department for a short time and felt that she didn't have enough information to accurately assess the situation.

²⁶ For more information on the academics' views and perceptions regarding the inclusion of gender in the Faculty please refer to the first section of the annexe, ‘context of the state of gender in the Faculty’.

‘[the 40% rule is] insufficient because it is necessary to see check how is this perspective incorporated in the discourses, which relevance they [professors] give to intersectionality and gender in their modules. Many still believe that incorporating gender is incorporating gender-disaggregated statistics’ (FA3).

In a similar tone, another academic (FA1, associate professor) voices her opinion about the 40% rule: ‘yes, it is a stir and mix, but the underlying question is, if you are blind [to gender and feminist issues] how do you actually do it?’. Under this scenario, female academics expressed the need for institutional training on gender and feminist issues. Since the introduction of the policy about syllabi, there were only two voluntary trainings, which participants consider insufficient. This **demand for institutional training** is highly well-founded, as numerous studies have linked the absence of institutional training on the gender perspective to the lack of the gender perspective in the classroom (Morley, 2007; Verge et al., 2018; Morris et al.; 2022)

Absence of settings in which to conduct epistemic exchanges

Some participants drew attention to the absence of institutionalised settings in which to share each other research, other than in research groups and occasional research presentations. As one female academic states ‘there are no spaces in which we can evaluate others’ research. I know what my office colleague does (...) but I do not know about the rest, there are no spaces (FA1, associate professor). This lack of awareness on what others are doing is also associated with the **frenetic rhythm of academic career**. In a second female academic’s words, ‘it’s in the nature of this work that we have so much to do (...) so we don’t know what the others are doing really’ (FA4, assistant professor).

At stake is that such settings could provide a useful space for scholars to help one another to conduct gender-sensitive research. Concretely, experienced scholars in the field of gender studies could make suggestions and **constructive criticism** to their fellow academics. In some interviews, academics showed a willingness to sensitize their colleagues and, more broadly, to contribute to gendering researching, so they would—at least to some extent—be happy to help in many cases. In this sense, a female academic (FA2, tenure-track professor) states that ‘we live in a patriarchal (...) society and things must be explained somehow. I have always tried to be kind to those that are happy to listen and learn (...) I think it’s part of our job too’.

The existence of spaces in which to provide feedback to other’s research is highly advisable from a **feminist epistemology approach**. Departing from the developed idea that knowledge is socially situated, a large body of feminist science has advanced that good

epistemic practices involve an active engagement between different perspectives in the pursuit of objectivity (Longino, 1990). Participants with contrasting backgrounds can disclose how others' assumptions may be biased—in this case, scholars working on genders issues can problematise other's preconceived notions and, in a more constructive tone, point out at directions to gender one's research. Altogether, it may be fruitful to establish institutionalised settings to occasionally conduct epistemic exchanges placing gender at its core.

4.2 Consequences

This section exposes and analyses the findings on the consequences of the gender marginalisation, whilst relating them to relevant previous research. The operational definition of consequences was based on two dimensions: economic and well-being, which divide the subsequent discussion.

4.2.1 Economic consequences

The **three indicators of the economic dimensions** referred to disadvantages deriving from conducting gender-related research in the following three aspects: *selection processes*, *funding* and *publishing*. As it will be developed, female academics extensively work on gender issues and, by and large, do not consider this area to be a source of professional penalisation for them in neither of the three aforementioned aspects.

Regarding **selection processes**, female academics do not have the perception that their specialisation in gender has hindered them. One interviewee, hired by the university a few years ago, states that ‘in my professor application, there was [the word] gender all over it’ (FA1, associate professor). Another female academic (FA6), recently hired by the university, holds the perception that her commitment to gender—and her will to incorporate it in the classroom—was highly regarded by the hiring department. In her own words, ‘I also noticed that, from the part of the department, there was this encouragement (...) of making the syllabus in a way that it incorporates excellent work by female scholars’ (FA6, tenure-track professor).

Concerning **funding**, several female academics (FA1, FA2 and FA4) believe that funding calls are increasingly prioritising gender in the selection criteria. One of them notes that ‘I have obtained three research grants with the word gender all over it’ (FA1, associate professor). Another states that ‘nowadays the people evaluating [research funding calls] consider these topics as relevant and wish to promote it’ (FA2, tenure-track professor). A third female academic (FA4, assistant professor) believes that this promotion of gender holds especially true at the European level. In this sense, she states that, in European research calls, gender is not only not being discriminated against but is currently prioritised over other areas.

As for **publishing**, female academics do not report encountering any problems or difficulties when trying to publish gender-related research, except for some anecdotal accounts²⁷. Nonetheless, it must be noted that most academics mainly submit their articles to

²⁷ For instance, one academic (FA3, associate professor) explained that she once sent an article about parenting licences to a journal not specialised in gender issues and the review she obtained was that

journals specialised in gender or women's issues. Their experiences of publishing gender-related literature may differ when engaging with broader-topic journals, which, as literature suggests (Hart, 2006; Blackmore; 2022), may not be as welcoming to gender issues.

Several academics (FA1, FA2, FA3 and FA5) associate the absence of professional penalisation with being immersed in **gender-sensitive contexts**²⁸. Most academics are affiliated in research groups in which gender holds a significant importance, and their close colleagues tend to be academically engaged with gender as well. However, other scholars outside these contexts may encounter different experiences regarding professional penalisation. Indeed, a female academic (FA2, tenure-track professor) warns against drawing broader conclusions from her personal experiences:

'I've always worked in powerful [gender] research groups, extensively funded and acknowledged (...) I have lived in a bubble (...) but I have colleagues that have had a totally different experience, who are like 'had I specialised in a different field [other than gender] I would not be in the precarious position I am in.' (FA2).

Hence, scholars who are embedded in contexts in which gender is not salient (e.g. research groups of a broad field such as political science and not attuned to gender issues) may be especially vulnerable to professional repercussions. This idea is, to a certain extent, illustrated by the experiences of the doctorate student (DS) who conducts gender-related research in a research group in which gender occupies a peripheral position. She explains that, in such a setting, working on gender issues automatically labels you as the '**gender person**', which results in adverse professional effects:

'When you work on gender issues you are then seen as the 'gender person' and nothing else. Hence, you are not taken into consideration for other projects in which you could perfectly participate. Because these projects are not gender-related, you are not being taken into account, but my colleagues are indeed considered for everything' (DS).

the topic of the article was a 'minor matter' and there was no need to research into it. However, the participant herself regarded this as an isolated case as she has not encountered further difficulties in this regard.

²⁸ The other two female academics (FA4 and FA6) are not specifically part of gender research groups. Instead, they belong to other research groups that have a broader focus but are still attentive to gender issues. However, despite their respective research groups being sensitive to gender issues, FA4 and FA6 do not consider themselves to be in a gender-related environment. As a result, they do not attribute the absence of professional consequences to their presence in such an environment.

The interviewee's account matches Henderson (2019) research on the experiences of being the gender person in academia²⁹. As Henderson discusses, the gender person is perceived as an embodiment—or, in other words, a representative—of the gender field as a whole. As a result, the individual perceived as the gender person is usually marked out of their context as a politicised body whose main task is to resolve matters related to gender. This essentialisation of the person as a gendered body arguably explains the participant's experience of being left out of non-gender affairs. As she points out, her external identification as a gender person affects her professionally since she is missing out on opportunities in comparison to her colleagues not working with gender, who tend to be male.

4.2.2 Well-being consequences

The **indicators for the well-being dimension** are a *loss of self-confidence*, especially in one's epistemic capabilities, and *feelings of disappointment and frustration*. In short, most academics are not particularly impacted by such adverse psychological aspects given their immersion in gender-sensitive contexts which are a source of stability and confidence. Nevertheless, as will be discussed, the doctorate student who's embedded in an environment in which gender is not salient has had a different experience.

Most female academics (FA1, FA2, FA3 and FA5) agree that the demeaning of gender has prompted, to a lesser or larger extent, **feelings of self-doubt** of themselves and their research³⁰. Nonetheless, such feelings have been largely **mitigated by being embedded within settings in which gender has a central or substantial importance**. One interviewee's account is particularly insightful in this regard:

'There is a lot of questioning oneself, if what you are doing is really worth it or not. But I have always been in gender research groups. (...) Then, I have never felt left out (...) I don't think that I am doing this alone, and it's a *kooky*³¹ thing of mine' (FA2, tenure-track professor).

²⁹ The notion of the 'gender person' was first developed within international organisation studies (Ferguson, 2015) and was subsequently applied to the academic setting by Henderson (2019). The 'gender person' in HEIs is defined by Henderson as those scholars who teach or research about gender but whose primary affiliation is not to a gender studies department or research setting.

³⁰ The fact that two academics (FA4 and FA6) did not emphasize feelings of self-doubt may be attributed to the fact that, although they actively engage with gender issues and incorporate them into their research and teaching, gender is not their sole research focus but rather one of several. As a result, it is likely that they did not experience potential emotional consequences to the same extent as the other interviewees, who primarily focus on gender research, because it does not represent a core part of their academic identities.

³¹ The exact word was 'pedrada' (in Spanish), which is slang for referring to something crazy, bizarre, kooky, etc.

It is noteworthy that she employs the term 'kooky' to express what she may have felt if she were not situated within a feminist context, as it clearly resonates with the self-doubt that Fricker (2007) discusses. Feeling that one's work does not receive proper uptake and recognition by others may easily lead to challenging the validity and relevance of the work, as well as the reasoning skills that prompted oneself to be concerned with that matter in the first place. In the face of this possibility, the experience of being surrounded by feminist scholars provides researchers with a sense of purpose and a security that what they are doing is meaningful and relevant.

In this vein, the aforementioned academics (FA1, FA2, FA3 and FA5) expressed **gratitude and admiration for the academics of the previous generation** who introduced gender in their departments and research groups, thus paving the way for subsequent feminist academics. As one academic (FA3, associate professor) phrases it, 'I have always felt really good, basically because of my female colleagues in the gender field who are super enthusiastic (...), who have (...) cleared a path for me'. These pioneering scholars that interviewees talked about undertook the complex task of justifying gender as a rigorous field of study. As a result, they set up a level playing field for the younger generation of feminist academics, who now feel more confident with themselves and their field of study.

As the interviewees' accounts suggest, other academics conducting gender-related research in **hostile environments** may have lived different experiences. This was captured by the doctorate student who was previously mentioned as feeling the 'gender person'. She routinely endured **feelings of disappointment and isolation** as a result of feeling alone in a predominantly male research group in which gender issues are not adequately accounted for.

With certain affliction, she explained that this context had taken an emotional toll on her. In her own words, she experienced 'feelings of frustration, helplessness and sadness because of these masculinised dynamics, which do not contribute to the existence of a healthy space in which to develop yourself academically' (DS). By **masculinised dynamics** she referred to the fact that her colleagues established an informal network of which she was not part of, aggravated by their lack of knowledge on gender issues. As she phrases it, they simply did not 'speak the same language' (DS). Her testimony matches the aforementioned results of Henderson (2019, p.739-741), who find that individuals identified as the 'gender persons' typically experience isolation and loneliness as they feel 'misfits'. Altogether, the case of this interviewee suggests that environments in which gender is not salient may be especially hostile for academics engaged with gender studies.

6. Conclusions

In essence, this study addresses normative considerations of knowledge production in the pursuit of ensuring diversity and inclusivity in the process. This task is especially relevant in the current context of the **rise of anti-gender politics across democracies**. Whilst long-standing historical feminist victories appeared to be firmly established, recent years have brought about an alarming setback. Anti-gender policies that severely curtail the socioeconomic and reproductive rights of women and sexual minorities are being approved in numerous parliaments. These policies are justified through the articulation of discourses based on prejudiced and problematic assumptions about marginalised groups.

To counteract anti-gender discourses, it is of utmost importance to create counter-narratives that disclose their biased premises and challenge their logic of causation. In an influential paper, Linda Martín Alcoff (2011, p.69) argued that ‘the struggle over politics is ultimately fought on the plane of truth’. Anti-gender politics are made possible through the construction of worldviews and interpretations of events, and so their disarticulation must first and foremost be tackled through knowledge production. It is therefore indispensable for universities to provide a **safe and intellectually stimulating environment for scholars engaged with gender studies**. Understanding and addressing the marginalisation of gender in HEIs constitutes a fundamental step towards this horizon.

The following subsections of the conclusions highlight the main findings of both RQs and outline the most relevant contributions to the existing literature. The subsequent subsections address the most significant implications, considers the limitations and suggests directions for future research.

The marginalisation of gender in HEIs is generated and perpetuated by both discourses and institutional arrangements

The identified discourses in this regard were twofold. Firstly, a **discourse which regards the gender perspective as irrelevant** to one’s field of study or, alternatively, modules. This finding aligns with previous research that also identifies this discourse as a mode of resistance against gendering curricula (Verge et al., 2018; Tildesley et al., 2022). Secondly, a **discourse that dismisses gender and feminist issues on the grounds of being overly ideological** or, closely related, not scientific enough. Such discourse corroborates previous literature both in the field of feminist epistemology (Tanesini, 2019) and resistance to gender inclusion in HEIs (Verge et al., 2018; Tildesley et al., 2022).

Concerning institutional arrangements, the results identify three main aspects hindering the inclusion of gender. Firstly, a **lack of supervision of the implementation of the gender perspective** in the classroom, which aligns with the results of Verge et al. (2018) and Tildesley et al. (2022). Secondly, a **deficit of institutional training** to equip academics with the necessary knowledge and skills to implement a gender perspective in a transversal and intersectional manner, in line with previous findings (Morley, 2007; Verge et al., 2018; Morris et al., 2022). And thirdly, a **lack of institutionalised settings in which to conduct epistemic exchanges** in pursuit of gendering research. Note that this last finding was not originally part of the indicators, since it was not identified during the literature review as a factor contributing to the marginalization of gender. Instead, it emerged as a distinct theme based on the interpretation of the results.

Overall, the findings contribute to previous research by providing a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the identified discourses and institutional practices through the perspectives of female academics. One of the most important contributions is the identification of the **demeaning of qualitative methodologies** as an aggravating factor for the ideological discourse. Additionally, the **epistemological framework** through which the findings are interpreted offers a better grasp of the two identified discourses by embedding them in broader epistemological phenomena, specifically, androcentric frameworks and epistemic ignorance.

Academics engaged with gender studies do not experience, by and large, adverse professional or well-being consequences given their immersion in gender-sensitive environments

In terms of **professional consequences**, most academics do not believe that their involvement in gender studies has hindered them in the three areas considered, e.g. hiring processes, publishing, and securing research funding. This finding contradicts the results of Blackmore (2022), who observed that scholars of HASS fields and engaged with critical thinking encounter additional difficulties in these aspects. However, the experiences of the participants in the sample may be biased, as they are embedded in **gender-sensitive contexts** that mitigate such potential adverse consequences, as they themselves recognise.

Indeed, there is one interviewee who conducts gender research in a context where gender is not salient and does feel **professionally penalized**, contradicting the majority's experiences. Her account contributes to Henderson's (2019) study on being the 'gender person' in HEI by uncovering that such label may entail being dismissed for non-gender-related projects.

Regarding the **well-being** dimension, the majority of academics have not been affected by the marginalisation of gender, either in terms of self-confidence or emotionally. Academics link this to being embedded in feminist contexts, which provide them with a sense of belonging and purpose. Again, an exception to this is the aforementioned interviewee identified as the '**gender person**', who feels isolated in an environment that does not properly acknowledge gender issues.

Altogether, given that the emotional effects for female academics of the marginalisation of gender have not been previously explored, this study offers exploratory insights in this regard. Furthermore, the findings underscore the notable disparities in experiences and outcomes among academics involved in gender studies across various academic contexts.

Implications

The study has **two main practical implications for gender-equality policy-making in HEIs**. Firstly, merely introducing regulation on the gender perspective in syllabi is insufficient to promote the inclusion of gender in the classroom. The prevalence of discourses dismissive towards gender studies, along with a lack of understanding of how to effectively deal with these issues, largely impedes the integration of gender in the classroom. In response to this, institutions should conduct **frequent training sessions** to provide academics with a detailed understanding of what the gender perspective entails as well as its relevance. Doing so would arguably counteract the identified hostility as well as address the deficit of expertise. Secondly, the results point to the **importance of establishing feminist networks** to provide feminist academics with an intellectually stimulating and safe workplace. In this sense, it is highly advisable to promote the creation and strengthening of such networks through institutional funding and recognition.

Apart from the implications discussed for policy-making, there is an additional implication related to empirical work in the field of social epistemology. Theories of hermeneutical injustice have made a groundbreaking contribution by revealing that not all knowledge is considered equally valuable. However, there has been a lack of attention to how hermeneutical injustice occurs in specific contexts. This study suggests that **empirical research has the potential to provide a much-needed understanding of how hermeneutical injustice manifests in the real world**. Since universities are the epistemic centres of society, it is key to comprehend the nature of hermeneutical injustice within these institutions. However, it is also crucial to uncover epistemic exclusions in many other settings, and this study demonstrates that empirical work is well-suited for this task.

Limitations and future directions

Higher education institutions are influenced by a range of cultural and socioeconomic factors that may impact the way in which gender marginalisation occurs. As a result of this, the study has certain limitations that should be considered when assessing the **generalizability and representativity** of the results. First, it is important not to assume that the results are representative of the marginalisation of gender in HEIs across different institutions and geographical regions. It should be noted that the studied faculty is from the social sciences, which may be more attuned to gender issues than faculties in other fields, such as STEM disciplines, which are more male-dominated and masculinised.

The **reduced and homogeneous sample size** exacerbates the issue of generalizability, as it constraints the ability to draw broader conclusions from the insights provided by the interviewees. It is worth noting that all participants are white and cisgender. This is significant because individuals with marginalised identities may face additional challenges when engaging in critical academic work.

Future research should continue to investigate the marginalisation of gender in academia in **different socioeconomic and cultural contexts** to obtain a broader understanding of the phenomenon. To this end, it is advisable to include more **diverse samples**, such as individuals with intersecting identities, as well as scholars conducting gender research in contexts where gender is not salient.

Another important area of future research is the examination of **strategies** used by feminist academics **to resist the marginalisation of gender**. Tildesley et al. (2022) studied the counter-resistance deployed by gender equality actors in HEIs in order to advance feminist policies, and identified a wide range of strategies, including establishing alliances with external associations and students. However, further research is needed to understand how feminist agents counteract the marginalisation of gender in the knowledge realm. One specific area of inquiry involves exploring the discourses that potentially emerge in response to the identified derogatory discourses surrounding gender issues.

References

- Alcoff, Linda M. (2011). An epistemology for the next revolution. *Transmodernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(2). <https://doi.org/10.5070/T412011808>
- Colgan, Jeff. (2017). Gender Bias in International Relations Graduate Education? New Evidence from Syllabi. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 50(2), pp. 456-460. DOI: 10.1017/S1049096516002997
- Code, Lorraine. (1991). *What Can She Know? Feminist Theory and Construction of Knowledge*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctv5qdg81>
- Criado, Caroline P. (2019). *Invisible women: Data bias in a world designed for men*. Abrams.
- Diamant, Sean. M., Howat, Aam. J., & Lacombe, Matthew. J. (2018). Gender representation in the American politics canon: An analysis of core graduate syllabi. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 51(3), pp. 635-640. DOI: 10.1017/S1049096518000392
- Disch, Lisa, and Mary Hawkesworth (Eds.). (2015). *The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory*, Oxford Handbooks, Oxford Academic. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199328581.001.0001>
- Dotson, Kristie. (2012). A cautionary tale: On limiting epistemic oppression. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 33(1), pp. 24-47. <https://doi.org/10.5250/fronjwomestud.33.1.0024>
- Ferguson, Lucy. (2015). "This Is Our Gender Person" The Messy Business of Working as a Gender Expert in International Development. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 17(3), pp. 380-397. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2014.918787>
- Fricker, Miranda. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198237907.001.0001>
- Grasswick, Heidi. (2019). Feminist Epistemology. In: Fricker, M., Graham P., Henderson, D., Pederen, N. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Social Epistemology*. Routledge, pp. 295-303.

- Jiménez, Jaime S. G., & Varel, Maria del Rocío F. (2017). Gaslighting. La invisible violencia psicológica. *Uaricha, Revista de Psicología*, 14(32), pp. 53-60. <http://www.revistauaricha.umich.mx/index.php/urp/article/view/151>
- Haraway, Donna (1988). Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective, *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), pp. 575–599. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3178066>
- Haraway, Donna (1991). *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, New York: Routledge.
- Harding, Sandra (1986). *The Science Question in Feminism*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press
- Harding, Sandra (1991). *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7591/j.ctt1hhfnmg>.
- Harris, Jenine K., Croston, Merriah A., Hutti, Ellen T., & Eyler, Amy A. (2020). Diversify the syllabi: Underrepresentation of female authors in college course readings. *PLoS One*, 15(10). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0239012>
- Hartsock, Nancy (1983). The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism. In Harding, S., Hintikka, M (Eds.), *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and the Philosophy of Science*, 161, Springer, Dordrecht.
- Henderson, Emily F. (2019). On being the ‘gender person’ in an academic department: Constructions, configurations and implications. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 28(6), pp. 730-742. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2019.1620709>
- Hinton-Smith, Tamsin, Marvell, Rosa, Morris, Charlotte, & Brayson, Kimberley. (2022). It's not something that we think about with regard to curriculum. Exploring gender and equality awareness in higher education curriculum and pedagogy. *Gender and Education*, 34(5), pp. 495-511. DOI: 10.1080/09540253.2021.1947472
- Hesse-Biber, S. & Leavy, P. L. (2006). *Feminist research practice: A primer*. SAGE Publications Incorporated (US).
- Lombardo, Emanuela, & Mergaert, Lut. (2013). Gender mainstreaming and resistance to gender training: A framework for studying implementation. *NORA-Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research*, 21(4), 296-311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2013.851115>

- Longino, Helen E., (1999). Feminist Epistemology. In: Greco, J., Sosa, E., (Eds.), *Blackwell Guide to Epistemology*, Malden: Blackwell, pp. 327-353.
- MacKinnon, Catharine A. (2017). Butterfly politics. In *Butterfly Politics*. Harvard University Press.
- Medina, José. (2013). Active Ignorance, Epistemic Others and Epistemic Friction. *The Epistemology of Resistance: Gender and Racial Oppression, Epistemic Injustice* (pp. 27-55). <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199929023.003.0001>
- Medina, José. (2016). On refusing to believe: Insensitivity and self-ignorance. *Rationality Reconsidered: Ortega y Gasset and Wittgenstein on Knowledge, Belief, and Practice*, pp. 187-200. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110454413-013>
- Medina, José. (2017). Varieties of hermeneutical injustice. In: Kidd, J., Medina, J., Pohlhaus, J. (Eds). *The Routledge handbook of epistemic injustice*, pp. 41-52. Routledge.
- Morley, Louise. (2007). Sister-matic: gender mainstreaming in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(5-6), pp. 607-620. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510701595267>
- Morris, Charlotte A., Hinton-Smith, Tamsin., Marvell, Rosa., & Brayson, Kimberley. (2022). Gender back on the agenda in higher education: Perspectives of academic staff in a contemporary UK case study. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 31(1), pp. 101-113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2021.1952064>
- Nelson, Lynn. (1990) *Who Knows: From Quine to a Feminist Empiricism*, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Nelson, Lynn. (1993) Epistemological Communities, In: Alcoff, L., and Potter, E. (Eds.), *Feminist Epistemologies*, New York: Routledge, pp. 121-159.
- Solnit, Rebecca. (2014). *Men explain things to me*. Haymarket Books
- Skitka, Linda J., Melton, Zachary J., Mueller, Allison B., & Wei, Kevin Y. (2021). The gender gap: Who is (and is not) included on graduate-level syllabi in social/personality psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 47(6), pp. 863-872. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220947326>
- Smith, Amt., Hardt, Heidi., Meister, Philippe., & Kim, Hannah. (2020). Gender, Race, Age, and National Origin Predict Whether Faculty Assign Female-Authored Readings in

- Graduate Syllabi. PS: *Political Science & Politics*, 53(1), pp. 100-106. DOI: 10.1017/S1049096519001239
- Steup, M., & Neta, R. (2020). Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Epistemology. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Online)*, Stanford, CA, USA.
- Sweet, Paige L. (2019). The sociology of gaslighting. *American Sociological Review*, 84(5), pp. 851-875. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122419874843>
- Tanesini, Alessandra. (2019). Standpoint then and now. In: Fricker, M., Graham P., Henderson, D., Pederen, N. (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Social Epistemology* (pp. 335-343). Routledge.
- Tildesley, Rebecca., Lombardo, Emanuella., & Verge, Tania. (2022). Power struggles in the implementation of gender equality policies: the politics of resistance and counter-resistance in universities. *Politics & Gender*, 18(4), pp. 879-910. DOI: 10.1017/S1743923X21000167
- Verge, Tania., Ferrer-Fons, Mariona., & González, Maria José. (2018). Resistance to mainstreaming gender into the higher education curriculum. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 25(1), pp. 86-101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1350506816688237>
- Wright, Toni. (2016). Whatever happened to the F word in higher education? *Journal of Gender Studies*, 25(2), pp. 215-227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2014.931801>
- Wylie, Alison. (2003). Why standpoint matters. In: Figueroa, R., Harding, S. (Eds.), *Science and other cultures: Issues in philosophies of science and technology*, Routledge. pp. 26-48.

Annexe

Context of the state of gender in the Faculty	2
Chart 1. Outline of the literature review on the absence of a gender perspective in syllabi	4
Chart 2. Interviewees' socio-demographics	6
Interview Script	7
Information sheet	9
Consent form	11

Context of the state of gender in the Faculty

Although the focus of the study is to delve into the cause and consequences in relation to the marginalisation of gender, rather than quantify such marginalisation, the following section briefly discusses the state of gender inclusion within the department. This **contextualises the findings** and offers an understanding of how discourses and institutional policies are embedded into the wider dynamics and practices of the department regarding gender.

According to the three managerial positions, **the inclusion of gender in teaching** has been largely shaped by the approval of a **policy** that established a set of **compulsory norms** regarding the gender perspective in syllabi. The most relevant of these norms is that female authors must write at least 40% of the readings. Additionally, citations must include both the name and last name of the authors to make clear, at first sight, the gender composition of the readings. The managerial positions explain that since the introduction of this policy, the vast majority of syllabi comply with such rules, with only a few exceptions. In the words of one managerial position (MP1, assistant professor), ‘I think the modules that do not formally include it [the rules] are only a few’. Controlling compliance with the rules is indeed relatively easy, as the syllabi are first checked by two of the interviewed managerial positions before publication.

However, as the managerial positions recognise, adherence to the aforementioned rules is not automatically translated into an **adequate implementation** of the gender perspective in the classroom. At stake is that there is **no mechanism** for monitoring whether and how the gender perspective is incorporated. Despite the absence of such data, the managerial positions share the belief that the gender perspective is **satisfactorily implemented** at the departmental level. As one phrases it, ‘my honest and completely sincere perception is that (...) [the gender perspective is] extensively present, much more than I expected to achieve by now (...) it has arrived to many more aspects that I was expecting’ (MP2, associate professor). He adds that the absence of gender is rather punctual but not systematic. Another managerial position considers the inclusion of gender to be between ‘moderately satisfactory and satisfactory, at least from the modules that I know of’ (MP1, assistant professor). One managerial position bases this positive diagnosis on the overall lack of resistance to the institutional policy, as only a handful of academics have formally complained about it (MP2, associate professor).

Regarding **research**, the managerial positions offer a rather **positive view** as well, considering the faculty has adequately incorporated gender into their research lines. A managerial position was particularly enthusiastic, stating that the inclusion of gender was

‘fantastic, fantastic. In our department, it's fantastic. Not only because of the people we have, but also because issues related to gender inequality have been incorporated by professors in their research, even as a main topic’ (MP2, associate professor). Another managerial position holds that ‘we have a lot of people who do gender research in this faculty (...) it is quite transversal, it has been incorporated in a powerful way’ (MP1, assistant professor). In a similar tone, the three managerial positions named numerous colleagues from the faculty and their research group who conducted gender-related research as justification for their positive diagnosis.

The overall evaluation of the managerial positions highly contrasts with the much more **pessimistic views** offered by female academics, especially regarding teaching. According to the member of the Equality Unit, who holds the rank of associate professor, the gender perspective is **poorly implemented** in the department. She states that even if syllabi formally comply with the aforementioned policy, gender is frequently either lacking or not applied in a **transversal and intersectional** way:

‘It is not sufficient to simply include a few women in the curricula. The gender perspective extends far beyond acknowledging the existence of differences between men and women. It requires a more comprehensive and intersectional approach, integrating gender as both content and methodology, which is lacking in many modules’ (MEU).

The insights of a female academic (FA1, associate professor) largely fit this view: ‘by what students tell me, the majority of modules do not have a gender perspective. They are totally androcentric and masculinized, and the gender perspective is covered by a seminar’. Similarly, the doctoral student states that gender is practically absent: ‘when you speak with students, you are told they do not study any female authors, or that there is no gender perspective. Women appear as a section or subsection one day’. Virtually all interviewees hold similar views based on their own perceptions or their students', and express genuine concern for the situation.

Regarding **research**, numerous academics are in gender-related research groups and have not been extensively exposed to the research of other colleagues in the department, so they are reluctant to offer an evaluation. An exception to this is the doctoral student, who is not in a gender research group and considers gender to be largely **inexistent** in such group, in the best of cases, being superficially reduced to the introduction of the variable ‘gender’.

Chart 1. Outline of the literature review on the absence of a gender perspective in syllabi

Author(s) and Year	Methodology	Sample	Findings
Charlotte A. Morris, Tamsin Hinton-Smith, Rosa Marvell and Kimberley Brayson (2022)	UK case study, qualitative	29 in-depth interviews with professors, undergraduate students and managerial positions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inclusion of gender in syllabi is poor • When included, gender is an ‘add-on’ • The inclusion depends on individual scholars
Tamsin Hinton-Smith, Rosa Marvell, Charlotte A. Morris and Kimberley Brayson (2021)	UK case study, qualitative	19 in-depth interviews with faculty members and 11 undergraduate students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Despite the fact that most participants agree that gender is relevant for curricula and pedagogy, there is a lack of responsibility to do so • Many faculty members consider gender to be totally integrated and no longer a concern • Gender’s inclusion is conditioned on staff specialism and student’s concerns, instead of being systematically included.
Tania Verge, Mariona Ferrer-Fons and Maria José González and (2018)	Spanish case study, mixed methods (content analysis of syllabi, participant observation and surveys with professors, and focus groups with students)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 60 syllabi of 60 modules of the BA in Political Science • 3 focus groups with undergraduate students • Survey to 80 professors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender is strikingly lacking from the syllabi. • Only 3% of the topics in syllabi concern gender, feminism and women's issues • Only 19% of authors in syllabi are female authors, whilst 35% of syllabi include none female authors. • 36% of faculty members consider gender to be ‘barely relevant’ or ‘not relevant at all’ for their modules
Toni Wright (2016)	UK case study, qualitative	In-depth analysis of the syllabi of the 6 modules that the author teaches of health and social care studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender issues, feminist perspectives and women are largely absent from the modules • Even when readings refer to women’s experiences, they do not include women’s own perspectives around such experiences

Jenine K. Harris, Merriah A. Croston, Ellen T. Hutti and Amy A. Eyler (2020)	US case study, quantitative analysis	129 syllabi (including 2345 readings) from multiple disciplines: STEM, social science and humanities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a substantial syllabi gender gap with female authors being underrepresented • 58% of readings did not include any female authors, which is aggravated in STEM modules, with a 76%. • The mean percentage of female authors in syllabi was 34,1%.
Linda J. Skitka, Zachary J. Melton, Allison B. Mueller and Kevin Y. Wei (2021)	Quantitative analysis of syllabi	72 syllabi (including 3415 readings) of modules in social/ personality psychology in the US	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compelling evidence of a gender gap in syllabi • Less than 30% of the readings are written by female scholars • The documented gender gap cannot be explained by a lack of availability of female work in literature nor by a preference for classical works
Sean M. Diamant, Adam J. Howat, Matthew J. Lacombe (2018)	Quantitative analysis of syllabi	63 syllabi of American Politics Courses from the top 75 US Political Science departments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a large under-representation of women and gender issues • Only 18% of readings have at least one female author and 11% a female first author. • Readings on gender and women's issues only accounted for a 1% of the assigned work.
Amy Erica Smith, Heidi Hardt, Philippe Meister and Hannah June Kim (2020)	Quantitative analysis of syllabi	840 syllabi (75.601 readings) of the American Graduate Assignments DataSet (assigned graduate readings)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant under-representation of work written by female authors relative to female publication rates in top journals. • Readings with female-first or only authors is 18,5%, lower than female-author works in top journal publications

Chart 2. Interviewees' socio-demographics

Interviewee		Code	Position	Age range	Seniority
Female academics	1	FA1	Associate Professor	35-45	>5 years ¹
	2	FA2	Tenure-track Professor	35-45	<5 years
	3	FA3	Associate Professor	>45	>5 years
	4	FA4	Assistant Professor	30-40	>5 years
	5	FA5	Associate Professor	35-45	>5 years
	6	FA6	Tenure-track Professor	30-40	<5 years
PhD Student		DS	-	25-35	<5 years
Male academic		MA	Assistant Professor	35-45	>5 years
Member Equality Unit		MEU	Associate Professor	35-45	>5 years
Managerial positions	1	MP1	Assistant Professor	35-45	>5 years
	2	MP2	Associate Professor	45-55	>5 years
	3	MP3	Full Professor	45-55	>5 years

¹ The year intervals are vague, indicating only whether seniority is above or below 5 years, for anonymity purposes.

Interview Script

Following the feminist research manual of Hesse-Biber and Leavy (2007), I used **semi-structured interviews** with blocks to collect data for my research. During the interviews, I followed a predetermined framework that included **three blocks of broad themes**, which were then explored further with **specific questions** tailored to each participant. Based on the participant's insights, preoccupations, and perspectives, I made specific follow-up questions or asked them to elaborate on certain issues. The blocks allowed me to explore the three areas in-depth whilst still allowing for flexibility to ask specific questions based on the participant's responses. The three blocks and some initial questions I formulated for participants (for each corresponding block) are the following:

1. ***Inclusion of gender in the department:*** What is your general perception of the extent to which gender is included in the department's teaching and research? In what contexts is gender present or absent?
2. ***Causes of the marginalisation of gender:*** Can you identify any mechanisms that marginalise gender as a field of study? Are there any discourses demeaning or dismissing gender-related knowledge or gender studies? Are there institutional practices or arrangements that create or perpetuate such marginalisation, such as a lack of resources, expertise, or supervision during the implementation process?
3. ***Consequences of marginalisation:*** Have you experienced any emotional or professional consequences due to the marginalisation of gender? For example, have you encountered any disadvantages in publishing or selection processes or experienced feelings of frustration? Have you or others around you experienced such consequences? If you have not experienced adverse consequences, is there an explanation for their absence?

The first block of the semi-structured interview was intended to provide an introduction to the issue and prompt participants to reflect on their perceptions regarding the marginalisation of gender in their everyday lives. Additionally, this block also served to gather insights into the state of gender in the Faculty from the perspectives of academics. The second and third blocks corresponded, respectively, to the first and second research questions (RQs). As can be seen from the script above, I used findings from the literature review (exposed in the analytical framework) as examples for the second and third blocks, in cases where the interviewee was unsure how to navigate their response. Overall, the use of these three blocks within the semi-structured interview framework helped to provide a

systematic and comprehensive approach to understanding the complex issues related to gender inclusion and marginalisation in academia.

During the interviews, I adopted a **participant-centred perspective**, guided by feminist research principles (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2007), which emphasized focusing on ‘what is the participant trying to tell me?’ during interviews. This approach allowed the participants' voices to take centre stage in the analysis process, ensuring that their perspectives shaped the creation of themes and categories. By actively listening to participants without imposing personal expectations or preconceptions, I aimed to understand their unique experiences and meanings. This participant-centred approach strengthens the validity of the research findings and promotes inclusivity in the research process.

Interviewees with managerial positions and the male academic consisted of the first and second blocks (without the third). This decision was made following feminist research principles, specifically, standpoint theory as discussed in the methodological section. These individuals (managerial positions and the male academic) are not directly engaged with gender studies as a field of study, and therefore, they have likely not experienced first-hand the consequences of the marginalisation of gender. Whilst they could indeed speculate about such consequences or draw from the insights of their fellow feminist academics, the methodology prioritises the voices and experiences of those who are directly affected by the marginalisation of gender, i.e. female academics and the doctorate student.

Full d'informació

Títol del projecte: The Marginalisation of Gender in Higher Education Institutions as Hermeneutical Injustice: Causes and Consequences.

Investigadora: X

Supervisora: X

Institució: X

Finançament: No

Objectius i durada del projecte: El meu treball gira entorn en l'aplicació d'un marc teòric epistemològic a la marginalització de gènere als espais universitaris (des dels plans docents fins a la recerca). Més concretament, l'objectiu de la recerca és doble. Per una banda, el primer objectiu és indagar en les causes d'aquesta marginalització, especialment en termes de discursos i política institucional. El segon objectiu és explorar les conseqüències que la marginalització del gènere pot tenir per investigadores que treballen en qüestions de gènere, sigui impactes emocionals o professionals.

Metodologia i participació: La part empírica consisteix en la realització d'entrevistes a professores, investigadores, persones en càrrecs de decisió i una membre de la Unitat d'Igualtat. L'objectiu de les entrevistes és recopilar informació sobre les causes de la marginalització del gènere així com les conseqüències de tal marginalització. Per altra banda, també s'indagarà sobre l'estat de la inclusió del gènere a la facultat.

Durada: de 45 minuts a una hora aproximadament, m'adaptaré a la disponibilitat horària de cada participant.

Criteris d'inclusió per a la participació:

- Ser major de 18 anys
- Ser membre de la Facultat de Ciències Polítiques i Socials o d'Humanitats.
- Capacitat per donar consentiment.

Privacitat: Tota la informació recopilada a través de les entrevistes serà mantinguda confidencial i anònima, assignant a cada participant un pseudònim per protegir la seva identitat. Les gravacions de les entrevistes seran esborrades en finalitzar la recerca i les transcripcions seran emmagatzemades en un lloc segur accessible només per a mi. De la mateixa manera, les dades seran utilitzades únicament per a fins de recerca i les conclusions no contindran cap informació personal que permeti identificar als participants.

Compensació: La teva participació no tindrà compensació econòmica.

Riscos i beneficis: Discutir sobre la marginalització del gènere pot portar sensacions de malestar o frustració en recordar possibles experiències personals desagradables. Tanmateix, també pot ser gratificant i terapèutic poder expressar opinions i visions sobre l'estat del gènere a la universitat per tal de verbalitzar les preocupacions d'un mateix i compartir-les.

Participació voluntària: La participació és voluntària.

Informació de contacte: X

Full de consentiment

Títol del projecte: The Marginalisation of Gender in Higher Education Institutions as Hermeneutical Injustice: Causes and Consequences.

Investigadora: X

Supervisora: X

Institució: X

CONFIRMO que:

- he llegit el full d'informació del projecte de recerca
- he pogut fer preguntes sobre el projecte
- he rebut suficient informació sobre el projecte
- compleixo els criteris d'inclusió i tinc més de 18 anys.

ENTENC que la meva participació és voluntària i que puc abandonar l'entrevista en qualsevol moment i sense haver de justificar-ho.

☐ DONO EL MEU CONSENTIMENT per participar en aquest estudi.

Nom i cognoms:

Signatura:

Lloc i data:

D'acord amb el que disposa el Reglament General de Protecció de Dades, Reglament (UE) 2016/679, resumim la informació de protecció de dades:

Finalitat: Realització del projecte de recerca descrit. Les dades personals es conservaran durant el període de realització del projecte i dos anys més per a la seva validació científica.

Legitimació: El vostre consentiment es pot retirar en qualsevol moment.

Destinataris: Les vostres dades només seran utilitzades per X i no se cediran a tercers, excepte per al compliment d'obligacions legalment establertes. Les dades anonimitzades es podran publicar en repositoris de ciència oberta.

Drets: Podeu accedir a les vostres dades; sol·licitar-ne la rectificació o la supressió i, en determinats casos, la portabilitat; oposar-vos al tractament i sol·licitar-ne la limitació