

***Excellence and Gender Equality:
Critical Perspectives on Gender and Knowledge in the Humanities and Social Sciences***

**ANU GENDER INSTITUTE SIGNATURE EVENT 2019
Australian National University | 26--28 June 2019**

**Theatrette (2:02) Ground Floor, Sir Roland Wilson Building, ANU
120 McCoy Circuit, Acton ACT 2601**

PROGRAMME

Wednesday 26th June

8:30 Registration

9:00 Opening and Welcome to Country

9:10 Welcome from ANU DVC (Research) Professor Keith Nugent

9:15 Welcome from ANU Gender Institute – Professor Margaret Jolly

9:20 Concept Note – Associate Professor Fiona Jenkins

9:30 KEYNOTE: Promoting Gender Diversity in Peer Review? Lessons from *How Professors Think*

Professor Michèle Lamont

11: Tea

11:30 Session 1: Approaching HASS Disciplines

- **The Australian Academy of Humanities – Future Humanities Workforce** – Project presented by Kylie Brass and Iva Glisic
- **Gendered Excellence in the Social Sciences: A Tale of 5 Disciplines** – Project presented by Fiona Jenkins, Helen Keane, Marian Sawyer

12.45 LUNCH

1:45 Session 2: Gender Mainstreaming in the University: Contemplating Athena-Swan

- **Black Swans: The Translocation of Athena-Swan to SAGE in Australia** - Margaret Jolly
- **A Lick and a Promise: How the Rituals of Gender Mainstreaming Reinforce Inequality in University Context** - Joyce Wu
- **Excellence through Collaborative Processes: The Strength of HASS Thinking in STEM Problems** - Ryl Harrison, Elise Howard, Bunmi Malau-Aduli, Kristin Perry, Theresa Petray & Ines Zuchowski
- **Exploring Perceptions of Gender Equity Among SAGE Athena SWAN Self-Assessment**

Team Members in a Regional Australian University - Meredith Nash, Ruby Grant, Li-Min Lee, Ariadna Martinez-Marrades, Tania Winzenberg

3.45 Tea

4:30 KEYNOTE and PUBLIC LECTURE: Do Faculty Diversity Initiatives Work? Evidence from 600 Schools

Professor Frank Dobbin

6.00 Reception

Thursday 27th June

9.30 KEYNOTE: The Philosophy Exception: The Costs of Exclusion / An Imperfect Storm

Professor Alison Wylie

11: Tea

11:30 Session 3: Epistemic Injustice and Gendered Norms

- **'Pussy Panic' and Glass Elevators: How Gender Is Shaping The Field Of Animal Studies** - Fiona Probyn-Rapsey, Siobhan O'Sullivan and Yvette Watt
- **Designing for Epistemic Justice in the Humanities and Social Sciences: Imaginaries, Affect, and Institutions** - Millicent Churcher
- **Breaking the Circle of Structural Epistemic Injustice: Academic Excellence and Underrepresentation in Philosophy** - Amandine Catala

1.00 LUNCH

2:00 Session 4: Gender Relations and Knowledge in HASS

- **The Social Life: Reproduction in the Social Sciences** - Catherine Waldby
- **Agricultural research: A Story of Missing Women and Skewed Science** – Patrick Kilby
- **Transforming from the Sidelines? How Senior Feminist Academics Practice Disciplinarity in HASS** - Rebecca Pearse and Helen Keane
- **Gender Inequality and Conceptions of Excellence in the Academy and the Judiciary** - Renee Newman Knake

4:00 Tea

4:30 KEYNOTE – Do We Need a Feminist Bibliometrics? Dr. Claire Donovan

6:00 Close

7:00 Conference dinner at Parlour, New Acton

Friday 28th June

9:15 Keynote: **Got Gender? Excellent! – Values, Metrics, and Power** Assoc. Professor Yannik Thiem

10:45: Tea

11:15 Session 5: Interrogating Excellence

- **Interpreting ‘Excellence’ and Gendered Contributions in the Discipline of Law** - Achalie Kumarage
- **Double Disadvantage in Publishing? Evidence from Political Science and Policy** - Fiona Yap
- **Gender and Literary Excellence in Australia** - Julieanne Lamond, Melinda Harvey, Larissa McLean Davies

12.45 LUNCH

1.45 CONCLUDING DISCUSSION/ POLICY IMPLICATIONS – Speakers include Em.Prof Richard Baker, Associate Prof Julie Smith, and others tbc.

3.00 Tea and Close

Abstracts and biography

KEYNOTES

Promoting Gender Diversity in Peer Review? Lessons from *How Professors Think*

Professor Michèle Lamont, Harvard University

Drawing on her influential book *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgement*, Michèle Lamont discusses how criteria of excellence and diversity are reconciled in the work of peer reviewers in the social sciences and the humanities. She discusses the place of gender diversity in relation to other types of diversity (geographic, institutional, disciplinary, ethnoracial) and how diversity criteria emerge in the process of deliberation. She also addresses similarities and differences between SSH and STEM disciplines. She concludes with a set of prescriptions concerning how the study of academic evaluation can contribute to promoting diversity in higher education.

Michèle Lamont is Professor of Sociology and of African and African American Studies and the Robert I. Goldman Professor of European Studies at Harvard University. She served as the 108th President of the American Sociological Association in 2016-2017 and she chaired the Council for European Studies from 2006-2009. She is also the recipient of the 2017 Erasmus prize for her contributions to the social sciences in Europe and the rest of the world. A cultural and comparative sociologist, Lamont is the author of a dozen books and edited volumes and over one hundred articles and chapters on a range of topics including culture and inequality, racism and stigma, academia and knowledge, social change and successful societies, and qualitative methods. Her most

recent publications include the coauthored book *Getting Respect: Responding to Stigma and Discrimination in the United States, Brazil, and Israel* (Princeton University Press, 2016); a special issue of the *British Journal of Sociology* on “The Trump/Brexit Moment: Causes and Consequences”; and her ASA Presidential Address “Addressing Recognition Gaps: Destigmatization and the Reduction of Inequality,” published in the *American Sociological Review*. She serves on the boards of the American Council of Learned Societies, The Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, the Princeton Institute for International and Regional Studies, and the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity. Lamont is Director of the Weatherhead Center for International Affairs, Harvard University; and Co-director of the Successful Societies Program, Canadian Institute for Advanced Research.

Do Faculty Diversity Initiatives Work? Evidence from 600 Schools

Professor Frank Dobbin, Harvard University

U.S. colleges and universities have experimented with dozens of different programs to promote faculty diversity, including anti-bias training, taskforces, mentoring programs, work-life programs, and anti-harassment initiatives. But in the last two decades, faculty diversity has barely budged. We look at data from 600 schools over more than 25 years to determine which programs show the greatest promise and which are most likely to backfire. Work-life programs lead to significant increases in white, black, Hispanic, and Asian-American women on the faculty. Diversity programs oriented to recruiting and retaining women and minority faculty mostly help. Yet harassment and diversity programs designed to shame and blame bad actors tend to backfire. Findings point to how colleges and universities can move the needle.

Frank Dobbin is professor of sociology at Harvard. He holds a B.A. from Oberlin College and a Ph.D. from Stanford University. His *Inventing Equal Opportunity* (Princeton University Press, 2009), which won the Max Weber and Distinguished Scholarly Book Awards from the American Sociological Association, charts how corporate human resources professionals defined discrimination under the Civil Rights Act. With Alexandra Kalev, he is developing an evidence-based approach to diversity management, studying both the effects of corporate diversity programs on actual workforce diversity, and the effects of workforce diversity on corporate performance. In a new project, he is exploring how university hiring, promotion, diversity, work-life, and harassment programs have shaped faculty diversity over the last quarter century.

The Philosophy Exception: The Costs of Exclusion / An Imperfect Storm

Professor Alison Wylie, University of British Columbia

Philosophy is notoriously “demographically challenged,” as Alcoff put it in her 2013 APA Presidential address. In recent years an outpouring of conceptual, empirical, and “critico-sociological” studies have documented the contours of this appraisal, explored a range of hypotheses aimed at explaining how and why philosophy should find itself so challenged, and suggested strategies for mobilizing change. A broad consensus is crystallizing around the view that we are dealing with deeply entrenched patterns of discrimination sustained as an “interactional effect” of a great many mechanisms of deflection and marginalization of those who do not fit dominant social norms: a “perfect storm,” as Antony has characterized it (2012).

The content effects of systemic inequity are often noted, as embodied in a “culture of justification” (Dotson 2012) that narrows the range of topics that constitute “real philosophy”, entrenches a

polarizing methodology (Moulton 1983, Rooney 2012), devalues philosophical lines of inquiry that attend to the specifics of experiential and social standpoint (Smith 2017), and sequesters the insights arising from such non-ideal theory, even when adjacent subfields take up questions and engage methodologies long since developed by critical race and feminist philosophers (Mackenzie 2019). Just as often, however, the possibility that philosophical content and practice could be affected by our situated social selves, configured by structural inequities, is treated as an empirical question that awaits systematic investigation (Thompson et. al 2016), or is rendered unthinkable by a dominant, field-defining norm that philosophers do (or should) embody ideals of transcendent, fully deliberative rationality (Berenstein 2018, Peña-Guzmán and Spera 2017). I draw inspiration from a case study of how the research agenda in a subfield of archaeology was distorted by complexly layered mechanisms of gender inequity – manifest in intra-field segregation, in differential access to critical resources, and in publication and citation patterns – to propose a strategy for addressing the question of how philosophical content and practice is impoverished by the demographic inequities that afflict this most challenged of fields

Alison Wylie, is Professor and Canada Research Chair in Philosophy of the Social and Behavioural Sciences at the University of British Columbia. She works on epistemic and ethical/political issues raised by archaeological practice and by feminist research in the social sciences. Recent publications include *Material Evidence* (2015) and *Evidential Reasoning in Archaeology* (2016), co-edited and co-authored with archaeologist Bob Chapman; journal articles on “What Knowers Know Well” (*Scientiae Studia*, 2017) and “How Archaeological Evidence Bites Back (STHV 2017); and contributions to collections such as the *Springer Handbook of Model-based Science* (2017), *Objectivity in Science* (2015), *How Well do 'Facts' Travel?* (2010), *Agnotology* (2008), *The Ethics of Cultural Appropriation* (2009) and *Embedding Ethics* (2005).

Do we need a feminist bibliometrics?

Dr Claire Donovan, Brunel Business School, Brunel University London

Bibliometrics is the scientific investigation of the quality or scientific impact of academic publications, based on data about research productivity and citation numbers. Bibliometric data is increasingly being used by research managers, research funders, and academics themselves to assess research excellence, and is assumed to be an objective basis for decisions about hiring, promotion, tenure, awarding grants, and as a marker of the quality of an individual’s research. However, empirical studies have revealed that the concept of academic excellence is a social construct, is gendered and discriminates against women.

There is, however, conflicting evidence for and against bibliometrics being a technology that can harm or liberate women academics, and which can expand our understanding of the dynamics of gender studies and feminist scholarship within the wider research system. This paper will present a review of the literature on gender and bibliometrics, and gender and academic excellence. It will focus on gendered excellence in the social sciences and ask, ‘Do we need a feminist bibliometrics?’ Is there a need for a fresh approach to bibliometrics and research evaluation that exposes and removes gendered assumptions and biases about what constitutes excellence in the academy? And what would a feminist bibliometrics look like?

Claire Donovan is Reader in Science Policy and Research Governance at Brunel Business School, Brunel University London. She has published widely on research evaluation and policy, the governance of social science, gender and Higher Education, and the role of the university in society.

She has given advice on assessing the broader impacts of research to various governments, including policymakers in Australia, Canada, the USA and the UK. Claire previously held research and teaching positions at The Open University, Oxford University, and The Australian National University. She is an International PI on the ARC Discovery Project 'Gendered Excellence in the Social Sciences', with Fiona Jenkins, Helen Keane and Marian Sawer.

Got Gender? Excellent! – Values, Metrics, and Power

Associate Professor Yannik Thiem, Columbia University and Villanova University

As research excellence is more and more widely assumed to require some sort of gender equity, gender equity increasingly emerges as a category for assessment metrics. Excellence, equality, and equity are indisputably desirable as are ways of evaluating and being transparent about how well we are accomplishing these goals. However, as has been demonstrated, a version of Goodhart's law holds also in university environments and metrics not only distort what they seek to measure, but frequently undermine the underlying values that the measurement was supposed to further (e.g. Elton 2004, Power 2008). Against this background, "gender" and "gender equity" are productive sites for inquiry in order to examine and, hopefully, start addressing several larger structural problems with academic performance assessment structures.

This presentation will begin with the question what work "gender equity" as a metric is currently doing, how it is assumed to indicate research excellence and how it is rendered measurable. Drawing on insights from two Mellon Foundation funded initiatives -- [HuMetricsHSS: Rethinking humane indicators of excellence in the humanities and social sciences](#) and [Publication Ethics: An initiative encouraging conversations on publication ethics in the humanities](#) -- this presentation will explore how "gender equity" points to how the general goal of "excellence" leaves under-defined and often preempts discussions of the unacknowledged presupposed substantive values, power relationships, and legitimation mechanisms that determine a) which kinds of knowledges to whose benefit are validated, supported, disseminated, and amplified, and b) how our institutions and practices of knowledge production and curation function and what the terms and conditions for successful inclusion and participation are. In order to aid the goals of equity, gender in research assessment efforts therefore needs to be expanded beyond measuring "gender" as a question of "women" and/or the demographics of the researcher producing the knowledge and be adapted as one lens among others through which to evaluate a) the values and power relations at work in knowledge creation, validation, and implementation and b) the values and power relations structuring institutions and practices of knowledge production, circulation, and preservation.

Yannik Thiem is Associate Professor in the Department of Religion at Columbia University and also Associate Professor of Philosophy at Villanova University. Thiem specializes in feminist theory, queer theory, religion and politics, critical theory and political philosophy. Thiem also maintains an interest in the ethics and politics of research and publication in the humanities, and was co-PI on a yearlong grant initiative funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to investigate publication ethics in philosophy. Thiem is the author of *Unbecoming Subjects: Judith Butler, Moral Philosophy, and Critical Responsibility* (Fordham UP, 2008), with a second book *Ripples of Redemptive Time: The Ethics and Politics of Temporality in Hermann Cohen and Walter Benjamin* under contract with Fordham UP. Currently, Thiem is working on a new project entitled *Queer Nuisances: Race, Religion, Sex and Other Monsters* drawing on queer theory, transfeminism, religious studies, critical race theory, and whiteness studies. Most of Thiem's work to date was published under Thiem's previous name, Annika Thiem, which remains Yannik's official double as far as the government of Yannik's country of origin, Germany, is concerned.

CONFERENCE PAPER ABSTRACTS

SESSION 1: APPROACHING HASS DISCIPLINES

Future Humanities Workforce - The Australian Academy of the Humanities

ARC Learned Academies Special Projects

Chief Investigators: **Professor Joy Damousi** FASSA FAHA (University of Melbourne), **Professor Jane Lydon** FSA FAHA (University of Western Australia), **Professor Graham Oppy** FAHA (Monash University); and **Dr Kylie Brass** and **Dr Iva Glisic**, Australian Academy of the Humanities

The *Future Humanities Workforce* project aims to develop a new and comprehensive account of Australia's humanities research workforce, in order to understand the challenges that this workforce faces today, and devise strategies to secure its future vitality. It will pursue three inter-related lines of enquiry pertaining to the position of early career researchers in the humanities, the skills and knowledge that the humanities research workforce will require in the future, and workforce diversity and gender equity, acknowledging that each of these areas is critical to the future of humanities disciplines in Australia. With respect to gender equity, the project echoes recent efforts to move away from the focus on 'pipeline' issues and the belief that greater participation automatically affects change in employment patterns, seeking instead to develop a broader picture of mechanisms that continue to reproduce inequalities in humanities disciplines. Drawing upon publicly available data, evidence collected through a consultation paper, and findings from targeted workshops, the project will engage with the Conference theme 'Excellence and Gender Equality' in probing questions regarding current inequity within the humanities workforce, best practice models for tackling this inequity, and challenges and opportunities associated with extending STEMM gender initiatives into the humanities.

Gendered Excellence in Social Sciences: A Tale of 5 Disciplines

Fiona Jenkins, Helen Keane, Marian Sawer, Australian National University

There exists considerable variability between HASS disciplines in terms both of the rates of progression of women and the integration of feminist and gender research. What effects do conceptions of proper subject-matter, appropriate methodology and 'excellent' research have upon gender equity in these fields? If HASS disciplines pose problems that arise from the gendered content, ideologies and institutional histories of disciplines, how well is that captured in the generic frameworks for assessing gender inequality that prevail in universities? What happens to women, and to the institutional legacies of their research, when we focus on redressing gender balance, but ignore issues that are specific to the forms of knowledge produced by disciplinary fields?

In this session we present some of the data we have gathered on the gender breakdown of the workforce in political science, sociology, economics, history and philosophy; and discuss our approach to linking the diverse patterns we see to dominant norms and conceptions of excellence in these disciplines. We discuss the role of critical feminist scholarship in transforming disciplines and ask whether a focus on women's under-representation, numerically captured, can address the issues we really need to engage in these HASS fields.

SESSION 2: GENDER MAINSTREAMING THROUGH ATHENA SWAN

Black Swans: The Translocation of Athena-Swan to SAGE in Australia

Margaret Jolly, Australian National University

Black swans are not just elegant creatures who cruise on Australia's lakes and rivers and symbols of the state of Western Australia. They have also been icons of the impossible in European thought: for philosophers signs of the limits of inductive reason and more recently a compelling example in an argument for undirected scientific research given the unpredictability of our world. I invoke 'black swans' in a more mundane way to ponder the process whereby the gender equity program developed as Athena-Swan in the United Kingdom has been translated and translocated in Australia (though some of that alluring dark plumage may prove sticky). I consider how the nature of the program, originally focused on the refractory problem of women in the natural sciences and especially STEM, was extended to HASS disciplines and how concerns about intersectionality and indigeneity have been 'added on' in the antipodean version. Has the presumptive core of the original rendered these other concerns more marginal, even residual? What has been the relation between quantitative and qualitative data in SAGE exercises in Australian institutions? Is the process adequate for revealing masculinist power not just in the numbers but in the gendered nature of knowledge and in gendered notions of scholarly value and excellence - all concerns central to feminist challenges and, in some fields, radical transformations in humanities and social sciences for decades.

A Lick and a Promise: How the Rituals of Gender Mainstreaming Reinforce inequality in University Context

Joyce Wu Australian National University

Gender mainstreaming was the exciting strategy that was meant to help achieve gender equality and ending discrimination against women. The 1995 Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action had set out how mainstreaming should be done at government and institutional levels. For a while, the terminology and practice gained momentum as policy documents, tool kits, and training manuals proliferated. 23 years later, human rights are increasingly undermined by populist and conservative states. Within the university Humanities and Social Science (HASS) context, gender research and curriculum are still seen as "boutique", and those who specialise on gender have a hard time exhorting their colleagues and institutes to do more to integrate equity and diversity in learning and research. In other words, tertiary institutions who claim to have policies and processes to address equity and diversity continue to pursue a business as usual model. What went wrong?

In this paper, I compare gender mainstreaming with regulations. Just like regulations, gender mainstreaming is about adopting new institutionalised practices to bring an organisation into "compliance", where new routines and processes are developed by gender experts and insiders to ensure the staff can mainstream gender in their everyday work. However, this has resulted in the ritualism of gender mainstreaming, where people tick boxes and write up narratives of how they have analysed gender without understanding why they did it.

Drawing from my current researches based on a Fulbright project, and the International Alliance of Research Universities (IARU) to respectively examine universities' experiences of gender mainstreaming, I share observations of gender rituals: what the daily rituals are in

universities; how feminist and gender theories are diluted and depoliticised; how the rituals mask complexities and inequalities; and finally, how ritualism can perpetuate inequality. In conclusion, I will discuss how the rich history, theories and practices of HASS can counter this challenge.

Excellence through Collaborative Processes: The Strength of HASS Thinking in STEMM Problems
Ryl Harrison, Elise Howard, Bunmi Malau-Aduli, Kristin Perry, Theresa Petray & Ines Zuchowski
James Cook University

The Science Australia Gender Equity (SAGE) Athena SWAN pilot has played an important role in encouraging research institutions to focus on gender inequity in STEMM disciplines. Implicit within this pilot is the expectation that STEMM researchers are well equipped to analyse gender data to inform evidence-based action plans. In this paper, we discuss the approach to develop James Cook University's (JCU) Athena SWAN application. Rather than privileging STEMM epistemologies, we argue that HASS thinking, especially a feminist focus, has much to offer STEMM gender equity programs.

To inform JCU's Athena Swan application, mixed methods research was undertaken collaboratively by STEMM and HASS researchers. The strength of HASS thinking enabled an in-depth analysis of qualitative research using feminist theory. We challenged the assumption that STEMM women are gender experts by virtue of their personal experience of being a woman. We also challenged the 'business case' focus on gender equity. The collaboration enabled a research process that engaged large numbers of women, and created spaces where they shared stories and 'took shelter' (following Ahmed). In the process, they came to recognize that the inequities they individually face are systemic in nature and require collective action to change.

Exploring perceptions of gender equity among SAGE Athena SWAN self-assessment team members in a regional Australian university
Meredith Nash, Ruby Grant, Li-Min Lee (School of Social Sciences, University of Tasmania)
Ariadna Martinez-Marrades (Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor – Research, University of Tasmania), Tania Winzenberg (Menzies Institute for Medical Research, University of Tasmania)

Gender inequality in Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics, and Medicine (STEMM) is well documented internationally. The Athena SWAN (AS) Charter was launched in the UK in 2005 to provide an impetus for positive cultural and structural changes to advance gender equality in UK universities. The Australian pilot of the AS Charter began in 2015 and is overseen by the Australian Academy of Sciences. Despite extensive engagement with AS over the last 15 years in the UK and more recently in Australia, feminist qualitative research on the awards application process and its impact on AS Self-Assessment Team (SAT) members is limited. To fill this knowledge gap, we undertook a feminist qualitative interview study examining how gender and gender equity are operationalised and understood by SAT members in the first year of an AS pilot at a regional Australian university. Findings indicate key gender differences in SAT members' motivations for AS participation which, we argue, potentially translates into unequal gendered workload distributions on the SAT. Although AS is positioned as a key mechanism for addressing inequality in STEMM broadly, our findings suggest that the initiative's impacts in Australia risk being undermined by its unintentional reproduction of gender inequality in the academic workforce.

SESSION 3: GENDERED NORMS AND EPISTEMIC INJUSTICE

'Pussy Panic' and Glass Elevators: How Gender is Shaping the Field of Animal Studies

Fiona Probyn-Rapsey (University of Wollongong), Siobhan O'Sullivan (University of New South Wales) and Yvette Watt (University of Tasmania)

The 'pussy panic' of our title is a phrase that belongs to Susan Fraiman. It is a diagnosis, a lament, and a warning about how the rise of Animal studies' academic respectability is premised upon a turning away from its feminist roots. Inspired by Fraiman's reading and her sense of a lingering pussy panic in academic scholarship (but particularly Animal studies), we were interested to inquire whether or not the academic legitimacy the field deserves has also brought with it a privileging of men's voices as it has developed over the last decade. In 2015 we conducted a large, broad-ranging international survey of AS scholars. We have also examined canon formation, conference cultures and academic podcasts to ascertain the extent to which men's voices are over-represented in positions of research leadership. Our data lends support to the idea that 'pussy panic' and glass elevators have indeed shaped the direction of the relatively new field so far.

Designing for Epistemic Justice in the Humanities and Social Sciences: Imaginaries, Affect, and Institutions

Millicent Churcher, University of Sydney

This paper brings work in institutional theory (Ahmed 2012; Krook & Mackay 2010), social imaginary studies (Taylor 2004; Gatens 1996), and research on affect and embodiment (Gregg & Seigworth 2010; Ahmed 2004) into conversation with social epistemology scholarship, with the aim of developing a deeper understanding of the resources for, and impediments to, reforming patterns of 'epistemic injustice' (Fricker 2007; Medina 2013) that impair the uptake of female contributions and concerns within HASS disciplines. As part of this discussion, I reflect on the role of the corporatized and managerial university in contributing to affective dynamics and problematic norms of emotional management that assist to keep noxious epistemic practices in place (Ahmed 2012; Bailey 2018). If equity and diversity initiatives are to foster rather than inhibit the conditions for epistemic justice, I argue that they must be able to provoke critical reflection upon, and constructively shift, the cluster of affective dispositions that motivate and sustain destructive patterns of epistemic agency. The final parts of the paper offer some reflections on the form that such initiatives might take.

Breaking the Circle of Structural Epistemic Injustice: Academic Excellence and Underrepresentation in Philosophy

Amandine Catala, University of Quebec at Montreal

Women and other non-dominant groups are significantly underrepresented in philosophy. Epistemic injustice is a type of injustice that affects individuals specifically as epistemic agents, i.e. as knowledge users or contributors. I argue that standard conceptions of academic excellence in philosophy constitute a form of epistemic injustice, which results in the underrepresentation of non-dominant groups in philosophy, which in turn perpetuates epistemic injustice by leaving intact standard conceptions of academic excellence -thereby creating a vicious circle.

While many accounts of epistemic injustice are agential/interactional, I argue that standard conceptions of academic excellence produce and maintain epistemic injustice in a distinctively structural/institutional form. I argue that standard conceptions of academic excellence, much like

standard conceptions of objectivity, conceal dominant (e.g. male, white, non-disabled) assumptions and interests, which result in the exclusion or marginalization, and hence in the underrepresentation, of members of non-dominant groups (e.g. women, racialized groups, people with disabilities) as epistemic agents in philosophy - resulting in an exclusionary process of philosophical knowledge production. Following the strategy adopted by feminist theorists for the concept of objectivity - namely, re-conceptualizing rather than abandoning it- I propose to re-conceptualize the concept of academic excellence from feminist insights and commitments for greater structural epistemic justice.

SESSION 4: GENDER RELATIONS AND KNOWLEDGE IN HASS

The Social Life: Reproduction in the Social Sciences ***Catherine Waldby, Australian National University***

Human reproduction, the biological conception, gestation, birth and nurture of children, is the foundational act of social life, the primary condition in which any social world can exist. If reproduction were curtailed, human extinction would follow, and even a short period of suspension, a year or two's interruption to generational renewal, would have profound consequences for social structure and viability, the welfare state, tax base, education systems, the composition of the labour force and to the population capacity to reproduce in the future. Within the social science disciplines this most essential form of social action is differentially acknowledged. Mainstream economics is systemically blind to household reproduction dynamics. Breast feeding for example is excluded from GDP and national accounts as are all forms of household based reproduction that does not involve transaction. At the same time a global market in breast milk substitutes and in reproductive goods and services like IVF, surrogacy and gamete markets generate enormous revenue for their businesses and attract private equity and other forms of investment. To put it another way, the biology of human reproduction is only recognised by the economic gaze when it involves market transaction, while the *a priori* dimensions of reproductive action, the bearing and nurture of successive generations, remains occluded.

We can discern a similar withholding of recognition in Political Science, which generally speaking locates human reproduction in the private domain, and hence outside its concerns with public life and its analysis of political power. Other disciplines – Sociology and Demography in particular – have historically engaged with some dimensions of reproduction. Sociology has since its inception been concerned with the organisation of the family and in its 19th Century formation was entwined with eugenic philosophy, which placed reproduction at the centre of racial hygiene and hence social improvement. In its 21st Century form it deals extensively with dimensions of reproductive experience deemed 'private' (sexuality, maternal practise). Clearly, for demography, reproduction is core business, and in many senses it is the necessary supplement to economics in discerning the ways generational processes contribute to national life. Each of these four disciplines in turn have internal debates generated by feminist scholarship that seeks to engage the various blind spots and systems of value that tend to exclude feminised action from consideration.

This paper will present some preliminary ideas towards an analysis of the status of reproduction in the social sciences, and sketch out some possible ways to articulate its centrality.

Agricultural research: a story of missing women and skewed science
Patrick Kilby, School of Anthropology, Australian National University

How does gender inequality affect the construction of knowledge claims? This paper considers an example drawn from an area of research with major impacts on the lives of women, but also an accurate understanding of agriculture.

Agriculture research over the past century 150 years has led to major increases in food production both in developed and developing countries exemplified by the Green Revolution from 1940 to 1980. A common theme across up until now has been the complete absence of women farmers either being recognised in research or having research directed at their needs. The term 'farmer' in general refers to a man, with women in a supporting or subsidiary role as 'women on farms' and very occasionally 'women farmers'. The language of 'men farmers' is not used - presumably it is seen as tautological.

The effect of this implicit bias to gendering the presumed 'farmers' in research skews knowledge claims to privilege those crops grown by men (often cereal grains such as rice and wheat) at the expense of crops grown by women such as vegetables, beans, pulses etc. This affects intra-household power dynamics to disadvantage women and make them worse off. This paper will explore the impact of these knowledge claims in agriculture research and argue that not only is the women's equality project adversely affected, but agriculture research more broadly loses out.

Transforming From the Sidelines? How Senior Feminist Academics Practice Disciplinarity in the Social Sciences and Humanities

Rebecca Pearse (University of Sydney) Helen Keane (Australian National University)

This paper examines the research practices and strategies of a group of senior Australian feminist academics. How do they practice feminist scholarship in relation to the gendered authority of the mainstream disciplines? We analyse the career trajectories and research agendas of 44 feminist researchers in Australia, in 5 different disciplinary 'homes': sociology, history, political science, economics, and history. The careers and institutional setting of our interviewees signal change and contestation in all disciplines. No discipline is transformed, but sociology and history stand out as much more reformed than political science, economics and philosophy. A pattern of dis-engagement from the disciplinary mainstream is evident across the groups of researchers in our study. However, we found disengagement comes in degrees and in different forms, with uneven effects.

Disengagement can mean marginalisation. It can also be a signal of collective strength where new vibrant fields have been forged, creating new centres of intellectual authority.

Gender Inequality and Conceptions of Excellence in the Academy and the Judiciary

Renee Newman Knake (Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University & University of Houston Law Center)

This paper examines the intersection of gender (in)equality and assessment of excellence in the academy through the lens of the judiciary which, like higher education, is a space of historic, persistent discrimination against women. Empirical studies document that female judges reach decisions differently than their male counterparts when evaluating certain types of cases. Other research shows that the perspective and presence of women in the judiciary enhances the credibility and legitimacy of the rule of law. The experience of female judges, both in legitimizing what constitutes expert knowledge and in engaging in the administration of justice, offers insights

relevant for addressing gender disparity within the Humanities and Social Science (HASS) disciplines. A judiciary that reflects the diversity of the public it serves increases institutional credibility and public confidence in the rule of law. Likewise, the cohort of scholars in the HASS fields should reflect this diversity for similar reasons. Literature on women in the judiciary, as this paper reveals, explains how gender inequality impacts the construction of knowledge claims and authority, an analysis equally applicable to the academy. This paper concludes by considering alternatives to the 'business case' for gender equality in higher education by applying justifications used in the judicial realm.

SESSION 5: INTERROGATING 'EXCELLENCE'

Interpreting 'Excellence' and Gendered Contributions in the Discipline of Law

Achalie Kumaraage, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka

This proposal examines gendered formations underlying institutional structures which inevitably and/or inadvertently, subordinate the contribution of women. A case study is drawn from law. Law is so markedly different from other disciplines in Humanities and Social Sciences (HASS) owing to the structure within which the entire institution of the legal profession is developed. The structure of the profession is moulded on the adversarial structure on which how courts operate in the common law system. As such, the profession is primarily bifurcated as practicing lawyers who engage in adversarial legal practice, commonly projected as vociferously arguing in courts, and non-practicing lawyers who largely engage in research, teaching and advisory roles. Legal practice is considered the core role and others supplementary or ancillary.

Within this institutional structure, the law academics, despite a continuing debate in this regard, are considered as secondary and their contribution to the development of the discipline subordinate to that of a 'practicing lawyer.' This is significant, as in many jurisdictions including the United States and Australia, the law schools and law academia are increasingly feminized, while a majority of men continuously dominate the practice. Nevertheless, 'excellence' in the legal profession, in general, is evaluated on success in the legal practice than on other contributions to the development of the discipline. From a critical feminist perspective and intersectionality, and such risks recognition of women's contribution to the discipline. This warrants for a close examination of the gendered formations of value setting in the legal discipline and how such conventions prevent reinterpreting 'excellence' in the context of equitable recognition of female contribution to the discipline.

Double Disadvantage in Publishing? Evidence from Political Science and Policy

Fiona Yap, The Australian National University

Studies show that there is a significant gender gap in publishing at the top-ranked, general journals in political science and policy studies, due in no small part to differences in submission between women and men. As Teele and Thelen (2017) underline, this difference demands further investigation: why are women submitting at different rates? This proposal addresses that question, by examining publication success by subfields and gender at the top ten political science and policy journals; further, we contrast that against gender representation and specialization at the top twenty universities internationally. In doing so, the study uncovers possible double disadvantages due to subfield expertise that may likely deepen the gender gap in journal publication success, and which would clarify some critical steps needed to improve the gender imbalance.

Gender and Literary Excellence in Australia

Julianne Lamond (Australian National University) Melinda Harvey (Monash) Larissa McLean Davies (University of Melbourne)

Public discussions of literature in Australia, as elsewhere, have focused on questions of gender equality in recent years. In 2010 U.S. literary organisation VIDA published the results of a count of reviews in prominent literary publications that showed that literary works by women were much less likely to be reviewed than those by men. Other counts - including an Australian one, called the Stella Count - have followed, and they have to some extent led to demonstrable change. These counts have followed on from projects in the field of literary prizes: women's-only prizes such as the Orange and Stella Prizes aim to enable women writers to access the most public-facing means of assessing and celebrating literary excellence.

However, these counts and prizes do not shift the underlying assumptions about the gendering of literary value that made them so pervasively masculine for so long. This paper outlines a research project that seeks to understand in a much broader and more evidenced sense the ways in which the reception of literature in Australia is gendered and what kind of interventions it might make in the interests of cultural change. Specifically, we seek to understand: how do notions of gendered excellence influence the reception of literary studies at important early stages in the value chain, especially the teaching of literature at universities and in schools? In relation to our own work as scholars in the field of academic literary studies, we set out to ask: how far is success in the field of academic literary studies influenced by gender? And how far is the notion of literary excellence (or literary value) that underpins decisions to teach and research certain texts also gendered.

Biographies

Dr Kylie Brass is the Policy and Research Director at the Australian Academy of the Humanities, where she leads a research and policy agenda focused on the future humanities workforce and national research infrastructure. She is co-author (with Professor Graeme Turner FAHA) of *Mapping the Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences in Australia*.

Amandine Catala is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at the University of Quebec at Montreal (UQAM). She received her PhD from the University of Colorado at Boulder. Prior to joining UQAM, she was a postdoctoral and visiting fellow at the London School of Economics, the Australian National University, and the University of Louvain. Her research has focused on territorial rights (in particular secession and annexation) as well as on epistemic injustice and on ignorance (including in the context of public deliberation).

Millicent Churcher is a postdoctoral research associate in philosophy at the University of Sydney (USYD). During her PhD candidature at USYD, she co-founded the USYD Women in Philosophy group and continues to contribute to the university's Minorities and Philosophy chapter. Her research interests include early modern sentimentalist philosophy and contemporary social and political philosophy, especially issues of epistemic injustice, failures of sympathy, and cultural misrecognition. She has published on these topics in *Social Epistemology*, *Dialogue*, and the *Australian Journal of Social Issues*. Her latest research project ('Institutional Transformations') examines the relationship between institutions, imaginaries, affect, and social justice, particularly in relation to sexual, racial, and settler colonial structures. Millicent's book, *Reimagining Sympathy, Recognizing Difference: Insights from Adam Smith*, will be released with Rowman and Littlefield International in 2019.

Larissa McLean Davies is Associate Professor (Language and Literacy) and Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) in the Melbourne Graduate School of Education at the University of Melbourne. Larissa is a leading Australian academic in literary education, with her research and publications spanning the fields of literary studies and English education.

Dr Iva Glisic is a Research Officer at the Australian Academy of the Humanities. She is currently engaged on a project funded by the Australian Research Council examining the future of Australia's humanities workforce. In addition to her work on the Australian higher education sector, Dr Glisic has an established track record of research into the political, intellectual and cultural history of Eastern Europe.

Ruby Grant is an Associate Lecturer and early career researcher in Sociology at the University of Tasmania. Drawing on intersectional feminist philosophies and queer theory, Ruby's research focuses on identity politics, sexual citizenship, and gender equity and diversity. Her PhD research examined bisexual and queer young women's sexual health in Tasmania, while her more recent research explores LGBTIQ-inclusive teaching practice and organisational responses to gender inequality in higher education. In both her research and teaching Ruby is passionate about exploring feminist pedagogy and its potential for challenging neoliberal discourses that foster inequality.

Dr Ryl Harrison is Strategic Policy Adviser in the VC's office at James Cook University. Ryl's doctoral research, in the disciplines of politics and women's studies, looked broadly at how women and girls negotiate the idea that 'Girls can do anything!' - and found, in a nutshell, that celebratory notions of girl-power becomes a problem when it means that efforts to succeed are individualised, and real structural barriers facing women and girls are swept away - considered residual, or even resolved. Ryl has served in governance roles on the management committees of community organisations that seek to meet the needs of women, including the Townsville Women's Centre between 2009 - 2015.

Melinda Harvey is Lecturer in Literary Studies at Monash University. She has worked as a literary critic in Australia for over a decade, reviewing books for publications such as *The Australian*, *Australian Book Review* and the *Sydney Review of Books*. She is editor of *Katherine Mansfield and Literary Influence* (2015) and series editor of *Contemporary Australian Writers* for Monash University Press. She is a judge of the Miles Franklin Award.

Elise Howard is a Senior Research Officer on Gender and Social Inclusion at the Department of Pacific Affairs in the College of Asia and the Pacific at ANU. Elise worked with James Cook University from 2015-2018 and during that time undertook the qualitative data collection and analysis for the JCU SAGE Athena SWAN application. Elise's research interests include gender equity, women's leadership and participatory processes.

Fiona Jenkins is an Associate Professor in the School of Philosophy, Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University. She served as Convenor of the Gender Institute at the Australian National University (2013-2015) a role she resumes in July 2019. She is the Lead Investigator of the ARC Discovery Project 'Gendered Excellence in the Social Sciences' which builds on earlier research on the under-representation of women in philosophy (*Women in Philosophy: What Needs to Change?* Oxford UP 2013). The project examines several academic disciplines comparatively in view of the relationship of gender and knowledge production. With a background in Nietzsche and post-structuralist philosophy, she also researches on topics at the intersection of law, political and social philosophy, and in aesthetics and literary theory. A full list of publications is at <https://researchers.anu.edu.au/researchers/jenkins-fk>

Margaret Jolly, FASSA is a Professor in the School of Culture, History and Language in the College of Asia and the Pacific and Convenor of the Gender Institute at the Australian National University (2016-2019). She was an Australian Research Council Laureate Fellow (2010–2016) and has written extensively on gender in the Pacific, exploratory voyages, missions and contemporary Christianity, maternity, sexuality, cinema and art. She is currently focused on an ARC Discovery Project *Engendering Climate Change, Reframing Futures in Oceania*. She has taught undergraduates at the ANU, Macquarie University, the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, and the University of California at Santa Cruz and supervised 58 PhD students and many Postdoctoral Fellows. Her most recent book is *Gender Violence and Human Rights: Seeking Justice in Fiji, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu* (edited with Aletta Biersack and Martha Macintyre, 2016). Her full list of publications is available at <https://researchers.anu.edu.au/researchers/jolly-ma>

Helen Keane is Associate Professor and Head of School at the School of Sociology at the Australian National University. She is a member of the Gendered Excellence in the Social Sciences team, with a particular interest in disciplinary norms and their impact on academic feminists. Her other main research area is health and forms of risky consumption, especially drug use. Her most recent book (with Suzanne Fraser and David Moore) is *Habits: Remaking Addiction* (Palgrave, 2014).

Patrick Kilby is a Senior Lecturer and convener of the Master of Applied Anthropology and Participatory Development Program, at the Australian National University. His research interests include NGOs and NGO accountability; gender and development; international development program management; and most recently the story of foreign aid. He has published two solo books on NGOs in India: *The challenges of women's empowerment and accountability* (2011), and *NGOs and Political Change: A History of the Australian Council for International Development* (2015). He has recently completed a Fulbright Senior Scholars Fellowship at Kansas State University looking at the history of the Green Revolution, and also to advise on how to improve women's engagement in their agriculture research.

Renee Newman Knake is a Professor of Law and the Doherty Chair in Legal Ethics at the University of Houston Law Center. For the first six months of 2019, she holds the Fulbright Distinguished Chair in Entrepreneurship and Innovation at Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology. Professor Knake also has been a visiting scholar at Stanford Law School's Center on the Legal Profession and the American Bar Foundation. Her award-winning publications (three books and over 20 articles) have been cited in prestigious law reviews like the Yale Law Journal and a range of media including Bloomberg Law, CNN, the Houston Chronicle, National Public Radio, and the Wall Street Journal. Her latest project, *Shortlisted: Women, Diversity, the Supreme Court and Beyond* will be published by New York University Press in 2020. Professor Knake has testified before the US Federal Judiciary on sexual harassment policies, and before the Supreme Court of Texas on judicial ethics. She is an elected member of the American Law Institute and was appointed as Reporter for the American Bar Association Commission on the Future of Legal Services. She also served as a delegate to the World Economic Forum Global Agenda Councils on Justice and Rule of Law. She earned her J.D. from the University of Chicago Law School.

Achalie M. Kumarage is an Attorney-at-Law and a Lecturer at the Faculty of Law, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka, and a Fulbright scholar. She obtained her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law University of Colombo, completing her LL.M. with a Distinction from that University and from American University Washington College of Law, USA, where she was the recipient of Solf Award for the highest scholastic average in the Program, Ed Bou Award for the foreign-born LL.M. graduate and the Outstanding Research and Writing Award. Her research and teaching interests are in comparative law, legal systems, family law, feminist legal theory, gender indicators and privacy.

Julianne Lamond is a Lecturer in English at the Australian National University. She has published essays on Australian writers including Rosa Praed, Barbara Baynton, Steele Rudd, Miles Franklin and M. Barnard Eldershaw, as well as on gender and literary value, and the history of reading in Australia. She is editor of *Australian Literary Studies*.

Associate Professor Bunmi Malau-Aduli is the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching and Academic Lead for Assessment and Evaluation at the College of Medicine and Dentistry, where she leads the strategic development of assessment and program impact evaluation across Medicine, Dentistry and Pharmacy disciplines. Bunmi's educational training and qualifications span across biological sciences, agricultural science, business administration, management and medical education. Her current research interests are development of innovative approaches to curriculum delivery, quality assurance of assessment processes, resource and staff development, internationalisation and cultural competence.

Meredith Nash is Deputy Director of the Institute for the Study of Social Change and Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Tasmania. Her research broadly explores gendered inequalities in everyday life. She is the author of *Making Postmodern Mothers* (2012, Palgrave), the editor of *Reframing Reproduction* (2014, Palgrave) and the co-editor (w/Imelda Whelehan) of *Reading Lena Dunham's Girls* (2017, Palgrave).

Beck Pearce is a Lecturer in the Department of Political Economy at the University of Sydney, Australia. Her teaching and research address inequalities and socio-ecological change. Beck was Postdoctoral Fellow working on the *Gendered Excellence in the Social Sciences* ARC project in 2016-17, and before that she was Research Associate at University of Sydney researching global inequalities in knowledge product in gender, climate and HIV research. Her latest book, *Pricing Carbon in Australia* (2018, Earthscan/Routledge), details the contradictions of marketised climate policy. Her current projects investigate inequality in the City of Sydney, and land and labour in rural

energy commodity frontiers. Beck is a Chief Investigator on the ARC Discovery Project Decarbonising Electricity (2018-21) and a Key Researcher at Sydney Environment Institute.

Kristin Perry is a Talent Manager within Human Resources at James Cook University, where she leads the talent acquisition and academic promotions functions. With a particular interest in equal opportunity and talent development, she joined the SAT to provide insight into policy and practice which encourages best practice in diversity and inclusion.

Theresa Petray is a Senior Lecturer in Sociology and Anthropology. Her research focuses on Aboriginal activism and self-determination. Her current research, with Gugu Badhun nation, looks at economic development and nation-building through the lens of self-determination. Theresa teaches in the areas of sociology, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander issues, gender & sexuality, activism and social movements. Outside of JCU she serves as Secretary of The Women's Centre in Townsville. She joined the SAT in order to contribute to positive change for women from all backgrounds in higher education.

Fiona Probyn-Rapsey is Professor in the School of Humanities and Social Inquiry at the University of Wollongong, Australia. Her first book *Made to Matter: White Fathers, Stolen Generations* (2013), examines how the white fathers of Indigenous children (many now part of the Stolen Generations) reacted to and were positioned by Australian assimilation policies. This book highlights a research interest in the reproductive and biopolitical nature of settler colonial societies, a common thread that extends into more recent research in animal studies, including 3 co-edited books, *Animal Death* (SUP 2013) and also *Animals in the Anthropocene: Critical Perspectives on Non-human futures* (SUP 2015) and *Animaladies: Gender, Species, Madness* (Bloomsbury 2018) with Lori Gruen. Fiona is also Series Editor (with Melissa Boyde) of the Animal Publics book series through Sydney University Press, http://sydney.edu.au/sup/about/animal_publics.html

Marian Sawer is former head of the Political Science Program at the ANU and is now Public Policy Fellow and Emeritus Professor. Marian was made an Officer of the Order of Australia (AO) in 1994 for her services to women and to political sciences, was elected to the Academy of the Social Sciences in Australia, as President of the Australian Political Studies Association and as Vice-President of the International Political Science Association. She has published both scholarly and applied work in the areas of gender politics and policy machinery and has headed a number of large research projects funded by the Australian Research Council She is the author or editor of 19 books, 13 reports and the author or coauthor of around 140 research articles and book chapters.

Professor Catherine Waldby is Director of the Research School of Social Sciences at the Australian National University, and Visiting Professor at the Department of Social Science and Medicine at King's College, London. Prior to this, she was Professorial Future Fellow in the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Sydney. Her researches focuses on social studies of biomedicine and the life sciences. She is the author of fifty-five research articles and seven monographs in this area. Her recent books include *The Global Politics of Human Embryonic Stem Cell Science: Regenerative Medicine in Transition*, (with Herbert Gottweis and Brian Salter, Palgrave 2009) *Clinical Labor: Tissue donors and Research Subjects in the Global Bioeconomy* (with Melinda Cooper, Duke University Press 2014) and *The Oocyte Economy: The Changing Meanings of Human Eggs in Fertility, Assisted Reproduction and Stem Cell Research* Duke University Press (in press, 2019). With Nikolas Rose and Ilna Singh, she is the editor of *BioSocieties: an interdisciplinary journal for the social studies of life sciences*. She is a Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and a member of the History and Philosophy committee of the Academy of Science. She is also the Deans and Directors' representative on the ANU Council. She has received numerous national and international research grants for her work on stem cells, embryology, blood donation and biobanking, from the Australia

Research Council, the National Health and Research Council, the UK Economic and Social Research Council and the European Union FP7 program. Her work has been translated into Italian, Chinese and German.

Joyce Wu has over 15 years of work experience in gender mainstreaming from both research and practitioner perspective. Her work focuses on male behavioural change, gender and development, integrating gender in STEM research, and gender-based violence. In particular, she is interested in how feminist and gender studies contribute to diversity in higher education as well as more broadly (e.g. private sector; international development) through theories and practices of gender mainstreaming. Joyce is a 2019 Fulbright Scholar and her research will examine how equity and diversity initiatives in the USA higher education can be transferred in other countries' contexts.

O. Fiona Yap is an Associate Professor at the Crawford School of Public Policy, College of Asia and the Pacific, Australian National University/ Her main research interests are in policy and political economy of East and Southeast Asia, focusing on behaviors or outcomes motivated by strategic game-theory framework and tested systematically in cross-national studies of East and Southeast Asia. Her research work is available through journals such as the *British Journal of Political Science*, *Comparative Political Studies*, *Journal of East Asian Studies*, *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, *Social Science Quarterly*, *Korea Observer*, *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, *Asian Survey*, *Government and Opposition*, and *Policy Sciences* as well as chapter contributions in edited volumes. She is co-editor of the *European Journal of Development Research*, and *Asia & the Pacific Policy Studies*, board member of the Korea Institute, and editorial board member for *Asian Survey*, *Korea Observer*, and *21st Century Political Science Review*.

Ines Zuchowski is a Senior Lecturer in Social Work and Human Services at James Cook University. Her particular research interests are violence prevention, social work education, field education and internationalisation of social work education. Ines is an active collaborator in various research projects, and has published widely. Prior to her career in academia Ines has worked as a social worker in North Queensland with a particular focus on violence prevention, gendered violence, community education and training, project and service management.