Gender equality and representation within and beyond the University of the Highlands and Islands

A book in celebration of International Women's Day 2021 (Edited by Alexandra Walker)

Distancing the (privileged) male from the machine: supporting gender balance and representation through acts of allyship in academic processes and practices

Keith Smyth | keith.smyth@uhi.ac.uk
Professor of Pedagogy and Head of the Learning and Teaching Academy
University of the Highlands and Islands (UHI)

Abstract

This chapter seeks to address how male colleagues who are in privileged positions of leadership, influence or seniority within universities can contribute to challenging gender bias, and champion greater gender representation in academic processes and practices, through acts of male allyship. The chapter begins with a consideration of the historical developments that have privileged the male voice

in academia and the generation and dissemination of knowledge, before exploring in the current context the dominance and favouring of male voices within the publication of academic and scientific research through issues that include homogeneity in journal boards and learned societies, and phenomena such as citation and co-authoring bias. The chapter then briefly considers contemporary movements and campaigns (including 'Why is my curriculum white?' and 'Decolonising the curriculum') which are seeking to challenge the dominance of white, male western scholars within the curriculum.

This then leads into an exploration of the specific acts of male allyship that can support gender balance, and amplify the voices of women colleagues, in curriculum design, authoring and presenting scholarship and research, and in leading learning and teaching related work and initiatives. An emphasis is placed on the importance of distributed leadership as a key act of allyship that can enable greater gender balance in educational leadership and decision making. The chapter concludes with the point that male

colleagues who are seeking to support gender balance and representation in academic and higher education institutions have to pro-actively commit to acts of allyship, recognise when they themselves and other colleagues are being complicit in sustaining or reinforcing gender imbalance, and be prepared to challenge both the status quo and indeed their own status, leadership and responsibilities.

Keywords: Allyship, gender balance, privilege, bias, academic practice, curriculum, research, distributed leadership.

A historical perspective on the privileging of the male voice

The privileging of the male voice in education, academia and the production and dissemination of knowledge can be traced to more points in human history than this short chapter can possibly consider. However there are pivotal defining developments and eras in the evolution of culture

and society to which we can look, and which are particularly relevant to current practices that prevail in privileging the male voice in academia, academic practices and research.

We may look directly to the roots of philosophy and education in ancient Greece, where through the work of Socrates, Plato and Isocrates there is an emphasis placed on education as being about the development of citizens, but within which the citizen was almost universally assumed to be male. Furthermore while there were many women philosophers active across the different periods of ancient Greek history, engagement in philosophical endeavour was largely seen as the reserve of men to the extent that, beyond Hypatia, there is little common knowledge in the wider populace of other women philosophers such as Aspasia, Diotima, Arete or Hipparchia. This was compounded by and is attributable to, as Wider (1986: 21) observes, ancient and modern sources that are so gender-biased and sexist in their nature that they lessen and “easily distort our view of these women and their accomplishments”.

Tuana and Peterson (1993: x-xi) scrutinise and challenge the five major beliefs about woman's nature that were generally accepted by Western philosophy, theology and science up to the nineteenth century, specifically that: woman is less perfect than man; woman possesses inferior rational capacities; woman has a defective moral sense; man is the primary creative force; and woman is in need of control. Tuana and Peterson contend and reveal how these beliefs about woman's nature permeated and reproduced themselves in the realms of philosophy, theology, science and politics, and permeated social and cultural institutions, to the exclusion and distrust of women's voices and in reducing the sphere of the woman to the private, domestic realm.

The disenfranchisement of women voices extended to the development and dissemination of knowledge and the written word. Prior to the development of mass publishing, to be literate was the privilege of royalty, nobility and ruling elites, including organised religion, and the hand produced written manuscript was an instrument of power for priests,

princes and the privileged, allowing them to enshrine laws and belief systems that were themselves overwhelmingly patriarchal. The invention of the Gutenberg printing press in the 1440's revolutionised publishing and the mass distribution of knowledge that we have to this day, and was pivotal to the development of literacy across society, but mass printing technology remained largely in the hands of privileged males and the first book to be mass produced using the Gutenberg press was the Gutenberg Bible (also known as the Mazarin Bible). Printed works by European women authors did noticeably begin to increase in the sixteenth century, but only marginally. In her exploration of women and the cultural politics of printing, Stevenson (2009) observes that between 1500 and 1600 there were a total of only twenty writings by English and Scottish women printed, twenty in Spain, twenty-three in Germany and the Netherlands, thirty-two in France, and a more substantial two-hundred and twenty-one printed publications by women writers in Italy.

While we may observe the above as historical trends and developments, there is a legacy or at the very least a direct comparison we can draw between the above and the modern practices that continue to privilege the male voice - and marginalise and underrepresent the work and voices of women - in academia, education and research.

Prevailing practices and privilege

If space permitted, an appropriate starting point in exploring the prevailing practices that privilege males and the male voice in academia would involve examining the myriad of ways in which women have been disadvantaged within higher education.

Rees (2011) provides a thorough analysis, in the context of the gendered construction of scientific knowledge. Beginning with the observation that historically women were excluded from ‘the academy’ (and giving the example of Cambridge University, who did not allow women students to graduate until 1949 even if they had passed all their exams), Rees goes on to explore the various kinds of

gender-based segregation in universities, and draws on a substantial body of data to underline the disproportionate numbers of male graduates who become professors in comparison to females, despite female undergraduates outnumbering males in the data drawn upon at the time. Rees also examines the scarcity of women in leadership posts in European universities (with only 13% of heads of higher education/research institutions in the EU being women in 2009). As discussed elsewhere in this book, these trends prevail, and there are multifarious factors at play in this context. As Rees observes, many of these factors relate to the dominance of males and male perspectives in positions of influence in relation to what academic work is valued, and whom is being valued for producing it. This extends to the mechanisms and conventions that govern the production, scrutiny and dissemination of academic knowledge, and as Jester (2018) observes also encompasses decisions and practices around the curriculum and what is legitimised as 'valid knowledge' through being included in the subject material of curricula.

Gender bias in journal boards and learned societies

The underrepresentation of women in leadership positions, and in spaces of influence within academia, is particularly notable in the gender distribution within and across the editorial and review boards of journals, and also of learned societies and professional associations within higher education and academic research.

In an extensive recent study (Liévano-Latorrea, Aparecida da Silvaa, Vieiraa, Resendea, Ribeiroa, Borgesa, Sales and Loyola, 2020), the gender composition of editorial boards for thirty-one leading journals in the field of biological conservation were assessed. Of the 1251 editors across the journal boards that were examined, only 28.7 percent were women. While Liévano-Latorrea and colleagues note some variance in gender representation on editorial boards in other discipline areas, the imbalance is consistently in one direction. They also observe the wider implications of women being underrepresented on editorial

boards, with membership of editorial boards being an important indicator of status and professional standing in their fields for academics, and an important proxy indicator of the presence and leadership of women in academic spaces. Liévano-Latorrea et al. (2020) also articulate the wider benefits of greater gender balance in editorial boards, including drawing upon a richer pool of expertise and experience, surfacing a broader range of research, and identifying more innovative solutions to issues. Ultimately they contend that the undervaluing of research by women and of their wider academic and professional standing, as reflected in the composition of editorial boards, largely needs to be addressed by male editors taking direct action to achieve gender balance through recognising the “need to assume their part in the movement and start, for example, to hire and promote women's work” (Liévano-Latorrea et al. 2020: 5).

The awareness of editors with respect to gender representation on editorial boards, and within the reviewing and publishing processes, is an important area to address

in order to progress greater gender balance and increase the participation and representation of women. In their qualitative study exploring journal editors perceptions of gender, Lundine, Bourgeault, Glonti, Hutchinson and Balabanova (2019) found that there was little consideration of gender beyond striving to be ‘gender blind’, which they contend is not cognisant of the wider systemic factors at play. Ludine and colleagues underline the need for journals and publishers to consider being more explicit about the values of their journal, defining what research equity means and implementing measures to both gauge and promote greater gender representation.

Rees (2011) offers similar observations relating to research councils, professional bodies and other ‘learned societies’ within academia, the memberships of which tend to be male dominated, and for which membership and leadership of are marks of esteem associated with standing and, as with editorial board membership and publishing, are often key factors in career progression and promotion.

Rees (2011: 138) challenges us to ask several questions regarding gender balance and the membership of such councils and societies:

“The critical issue is how do people get selected to become Council members of these and other international science bodies…? What are the recruitment mechanisms for membership of prize committees and learned societies? Who are the gatekeepers to accessing these powerful positions who determine what is deemed to be excellent? By what criteria are they operating? What roles do networks and ‘knowing’ potential candidates or those who recommend them play in the process? A lack of transparency and evidence-base in the vetting of candidates raises concerns that contacts, networking and cloning may have a disproportionate impact.” Rees (2011: 134) also asks the pertinent question that is central to judging the extent to which opportunities for academic influence, leadership and presence are actually gender neutral: “if systems of adjudication are largely acceptable and if we accept that academic ability is equally distributed

between the two sexes, then why are there so few women among the recipients of accolades in the academy, such as fellowships of learned societies, medals or Nobel Prizes? Why, indeed, are there still so few women professors?"

Citation and review bias

Citations of published work are, rightly or wrongly, taken as a key indicator of scholarly esteem within academia. The citation of one author's (or group of co-authors) work by another underlines the perceived value of that work to supporting or even advancing the work that the other author (or authors) is disseminating, and the number and spread of citations (within and beyond the immediate field that work is published within) is accepted as a key measure of impact of both the author(s) and their work.

Unfortunately the phenomena of citation bias, in the various forms it can take, also serves to privilege the male voice in academia. It is well accepted that male authors tend to cite other male authors more frequently than women authors (Ferber and Brun 2011; King, Bergstrom, Correll, Jacquet

and West 2017), which disproportionally validates research and knowledge generated by males. This results from and further compounds the challenges already in place due to the lack of equal opportunities for women to progress into significant research and scholarly roles (Rees 2011), and also disadvantages women academics who are already in small minorities within their fields and the collective work of whom is less visible overall (Ferber and Brun, 2011).

In their expansive study examining citations in 1.5 million research papers published between 1779 and 2011, King et al. (2017) also found that men self-cited their own papers 56 percent more than women did, rising to 70 percent more since around the year 2000. Women were also found to be over 10 percentage points more likely not to cite their own previous research, with there being clear implications to these overall patterns for both the scholarly visibility of women researchers and academics, and a cumulative advantage for men with respect to their academic standing and careers.

There is also an established gender bias when it comes to the peer review of work for potential publication, or the peer review of applications for research funding. With respect to the peer review of work for potential publication, Liévano-Latorrea et al. (2020) draw on a range of previous research in discussing the phenomena of ‘homophily’, which manifests itself through practices including: the majority of review invitations being made by men to other men; the higher acceptance of papers with male leaders or first authors; and when women-led papers are reviewed more harshly and receive lower acceptance rates than papers with male lead authors.

Similarly, with respect to the review of research funding proposals, there is a wealth of evidence which underlines the systemic bias within the peer review and awarding of research grant applications. In synthesising a range of this research, Morgan, Hawkins and Lundine (2018: E487) found that “female applicants with past grant success rates equivalent to male applicants were given lower application scores by reviewers, and male applicants with less

experience than female applicants were favoured and awarded grants at a higher rate". Morgan et al. attribute this to historical and systemic gender bias within academic institutions that have favoured the development and promotion of male academics in research and leadership positions, and contributed to the development of cultures within which gender stereotypes influence the work men and women academics are respectively expected to or as seen as best able to do, and within which women with domestic responsibilities are particularly disadvantaged in relation to engaging in various kinds of academic work.

Similarly, Guglielmi (2018) reported on research which demonstrated that women academics are far less successful than male applicants for funding when the review process is focused on assessing the researcher, but with this gender bias greatly reduced when the review is focused primarily on the research proposal itself.

Authoring and co-authoring bias

Authoring and co-authoring bias is also at play in privileging the work and voices of male academics over that of women. There is a general trend for male academics and researchers to publish with other men, and to support other men to engage in publishing (Liévano-Latorrea et al. 2020). This extends to co-authoring, with the study by Frances, Connor, Fitzpatrick, Koprivnikar and McCauley (2020) finding that male researchers in the last author position were more likely to co-author with other males, whereas women first and last authors were more likely to publish with men.

While in their own field of biology the authors found that there had been a modest increase in the proportion of women co-authors over a thirty year period, this was correlated with an increase in the average number of authors per paper. Additionally, they found that the proportion of women co-authors on papers remained well

below the proportion of PhDs awarded to women in biology over the same time period.

This provides further evidence of the disconnect in place between the successful engagement of women graduates, in this case research postgraduates, in their academic studies and the numbers subsequently successfully transitioning into further academic work and developing their profile as academics and researchers.

The COVID-19 global pandemic has only served to widen gender differences with respect to engagement in academic work, including research, through exacerbating gender imbalances in childcare, care of relatives and domestic responsibilities. Bell and Fong (2021) investigated gender differences in first authorship in public health research submissions during the pandemic. While there were higher submission rates overall, increases were higher for men (41.9% first author) compared to women (10.9% first author), with women authoring only 29.4% of COVID-19 related articles.

Gender bias in the curriculum

In recent years there has been a groundswell in contemporary movements and campaigns which are seeking to challenge the dominance of predominantly white, male western scholars within the curriculum, and within bodies of knowledge more generally. These have emerged as a collective student and staff process of questioning the colonial legacies reproduced in the design, delivery and assessment of the curriculum, and more widely in challenging the dominance of the privileged western male voice. Movements and campaigns active in this space from around 2015 onwards include ‘Why is my curriculum white?’, ‘Decolonising the curriculum’, ‘Dismantling the Master’s House’, ‘Rhodes must fall’ and ‘Women also know stuff?’.

Jester (2018: 606-607) considers many of these movements and campaigns in the context of the decisions academics make about the curriculum, observing that higher education “operates in a system that typically

privileges the white male experience" and that "the decentralised nature of higher education means that every programme or course leader asks themselves, consciously or otherwise, certain questions when designing the curriculum. Whose voices are imbued with the most authority? What must students know to be well-versed in a particular topic? What type of knowledge is valued in the context in which you are operating?". Jester also puts forth a range of evidence that illustrates the bias inherent in this decision making about the curriculum, and within which "the experiences and work of those who are women and/or people of colour are typically underrepresented".

The privileging of the male voice, both historically and to this day as perpetuated through the biases and biased mechanisms of academia explored thus far, has imbued and shaped curricula to the extent that many curricula present a narrow view of the world, constrained and kept restrained by the processes that continue to provide a platform to predominantly male perspectives, scholarship and research. However, due to the relative autonomy that

course and programme leaders have for the content of the curriculum within higher education institutions, there are pragmatic means of direct action that can be taken to address this, and to realise the curriculum not simply as a body of knowledge to be taught, but to enact the 'curriculum as praxis' (MacNeill, Johnston and Smyth 2020) directed at democratically and inclusively challenging and changing that within society that requires to be challenged and changed.

Male allyship

The cumulative effect of the phenomena and practices explored above, with respect to gender balance and representation in academic and related work in our universities, and in wider related fields of academic and scientific endeavour, is that women academics, researchers and educational professionals are disenfranchised, disadvantaged and disempowered in their engagements, visibility and opportunities in comparison to men within 'the academy'. As a consequence women are underrepresented in published bodies of knowledge, in

spaces and positions of influence, and in the curricula we support the education of our students through.

In asking what is to be done, the problems hitherto outlined reveal for themselves many of the potential answers. However, and as already briefly alluded to, there is a responsibility (and it is both a moral and ethical one) upon male colleagues within the higher education sector, and within our HE institutions, to support and champion gender equality and representation through their own actions and directed efforts.

Broido (2000: 3) defines allies as “members of dominant social groups (e.g., men, Whites, heterosexuals) who are working to end the system of oppression that gives them greater privilege and power based on their social-group membership”.

For men in positions of influence, leadership or seniority in academia and universities, there are specific acts of ‘male allyship’ that can support gender balance, and amplify the voices of women colleagues, in the areas of curriculum

design, authoring and presenting scholarship and research, and in leading learning and teaching work.

Distancing the privileged male through acts of allyship

Bilen-Green, Green, McGeorge, Anicha, Burnett, Prime and Moss-Racusin (2013: 4) discuss the nature of male allyship in relation to faculty development and institutional change, and to the development of male ally identities. In relation to the latter, they note a consensus in the literature around the importance of: potential allies first understanding unearned advantage and how it works in their own favour as well as how it impacts those who are systemically disadvantaged persons; the need for successful ally development approaches that educate and support members of the dominant group; and the need for male allies to practice ally behaviours and to hold themselves accountable through feedback from non-dominant group members.

Bilen-Green et al. (2013: 3) also explore the factors that can inhibit male allyship, including “fundamental fears [that] concern a loss of status, apprehension about mistakenly acting offensively, and inhibitions due to anxiety regarding other men’s disapproval”. A commitment to change, and commitment to critical reflection and action in relation to their own privileged position, is therefore key to male allyship. In this respect it may be observed and contended that in relation to supporting and championing gender representation and equality in academic institutions and practices, the overall challenge is to distance the (privileged) male from the machine.

In what follows, and drawing on personal experience, the practical ways in which ‘male allyship’ might be practiced in academia and academic work are considered.

Curriculum design and development

One of the most significant problems in relation to gender representation within the context of the curriculum, but perhaps one of the easiest to address, are gender biased

reading lists. In their analysis of over forty International Relations syllabi in one institution, Phull, Ciflikli and Meibauer (2019) found that over 79% of texts on reading lists were authored my men, which was in no way reflective of the representation of women in the professional discipline nor in the published body of work in the discipline.

Phull et al. also established that gender and seniority of the course convener were contributing factors, with readings authored by women assigned less frequently by male and/or more senior course conveners, and furthermore found evidence that gender bias was strongest in the early stages of curricula when students are being orientated to their field. This study is illustrative, and the phenomena of reading lists and the content of the curricula being heavily biased towards predominantly male scholars is a widely observed one, and a key focus of action for the aforementioned campaigns including ‘Why is my curriculum white?’.

The implication for male allies involved in the design, development and approval of curricula are clear, which is to challenge their own potential bias, and identify and challenge that of colleagues, in ensuring that reading lists are inclusive and representative with respect to gender but also culture and ethnicity. This requires a criticality and awareness of source, and also extends to diversity in concepts, theories and ideas within the content of the curriculum, and a commitment to valuing and representing a range voices in subject matter and material. There is a particular responsibility here for male programme leaders, who oversee and manage curricula, for male convenors of curriculum approval boards, and for male external examiners who scrutinise curricula and learning and teaching at other institutions.

There are pragmatic interventions to be considered too, including the extent to which curriculum approval and re-approval processes formally scrutinise gender and other forms representation within reading lists and the wider

curriculum, and make appropriate representation a condition of programme approval or re-approval.

Scholarship and research

In the area of scholarship and research, then of the aforementioned answers that have already revealed themselves, there is clearly an undeniable need for senior male academics who have editorial leadership, or responsibility for journal editorial and review boards, to pro-actively ensure gender representation within membership. They also need to go beyond this in scrutinising and clarifying the ethos of their journals, and in implementing measures designed to address gender representation and bias.

For male allies engaged in research and publishing, there is a need to reflect critically on whom they are citing, and why, and to commit to citing the work of women. Similarly, for those male colleagues involved in supporting others to engage in scholarship and research, then encouraging women colleagues to self-cite their own work as well as

exploring and citing the work of other women in their field would seem obvious.

Male academics also need to reflect on who they are supporting to engage in scholarship and research, and how they are supporting them. Engaging in co-authorship with women colleagues, and supporting or mentoring early career women colleagues to engage in scholarly and research activity, are positive acts of male allyship which, if more male colleagues mindfully chose to engage in them, would certainly have both a cumulative and a cascading effect over time.

In this context, recognising the importance of ‘paying forward’ privilege to women who are new or ‘early career’ authors is essential, and to this end male allies would do well to consider when ‘first author’ attribution for collaboratively authored work can and should be attributed to women co-authors. Male academics who have already had the privilege of being published, but who are authoring with a women colleague who is publishing for the first time,

may want to reflect on both professional courtesy and their commitment to supporting their woman co-authors, and ask themselves who would most benefit from being named as lead author? A similar point can of course be made in relation to supporting any colleagues who are early career scholars or researchers, but in the context of addressing gender balance and amplifying women voices in 'the academy', acts of allyship with respect to author attribution are important.

'Paying forward' privilege in supporting gender balance can also be manifested in other important ways, for example through male allies seeking to ensure gender representation in the conferences and events that they are organising or co-organising, including ensuring women voices are heard in invited and keynote speaker slots, and avoiding the phenomena of all male panels. Co-presenting or co-facilitating with women colleagues who are new to presenting, but aspiring to do so, may be a positive intervention for experienced male allies, and even more so would be 'silently supporting' women colleagues to present

by offering guidance and advice in the background. Male allies who have already had the privilege of being invited to speak at conferences and events may also want to seriously consider when to suggest a more experienced or more talented women colleague who they know would be a better or more appropriate presenter for that next speaking invitation that they receive.

The work that male allies can do to support women colleagues in their scholarship and research should not just be limited to those women colleagues in academic roles, and should include women colleagues in professional services and leadership roles who may be seeking to engage in scholarly writing and presenting in the context of sharing their own knowledge, views, experiences and professional practices.

Shared or distributed leadership

Experienced male allies who are in leadership roles in universities may also want to reflect critically on the underrepresentation of women colleagues who hold

leadership roles and responsibilities, and determine what they can personally do both to address this and to create leadership opportunities for women colleagues.

For male allies in leadership roles, this may mean confronting the concern which Bilen-Green et al. (2013) highlight in relation to their own perceived role or status, and asking themselves some challenging but necessary questions. Based on the experiences of the author of this chapter, these questions must include:

- Do I need to lead the next iteration of that project I successfully led last time?
- Am I the best person in my team/area/department to lead that new initiative?
- Is there any part of my role I know a specific woman colleague could do better?
- Am I contributing to or supporting a working culture within which women colleagues get supported to initiate and lead on their own ideas?

In the context of these questions, and supporting gender balance and representation, the practice of shared or ‘distributed leadership’ becomes important. In broad terms, distributed leadership is the dispersion of leadership activities and responsibilities more democratically across teams, contexts and organisations, rather than within formal leadership positions (Jones and Harvey 2017; Jones, Lefoe, Harvey and Ryland 2012). Distributed leadership practices need to be approached critically, lest they create an unfair distribution of work or result in colleagues assuming more responsibility without recognition or opportunities for progression (Lumby, 2013). However Jones et al. (Jones and Harvey 2017; Jones, Lefoe, Harvey and Ryland 2012) observe how distributed leadership approaches in universities can provide more equitable opportunities and working arrangements that allow colleagues to apply and further development their own knowledge and experience, bring a diversity of views to the fore, and support innovation and enhancement within the work that universities do.

In their research exploring strategies that male allies can use to advance women in the workplace, Madsen, Townsend and Scribner (2020) identified 'leadership development' opportunities, including male colleagues creating, providing or sharing leadership projects and initiatives with women colleagues, as particularly impactful and beneficial to supporting the development and progression of women colleagues in leadership and leadership roles. This was allied to mentoring, and chimes with work in the area of mentoring within HE contexts which evidences that informal mentoring can help structure career progression, allow early career and established education professionals to develop confidence and work to their full talents, and that this has an additive impact on the work of teams (Lunsford, Crisp, Dolan and Wuetherick 2017).

Distributed leadership and mentoring, as a means to ensure greater gender balance in leadership roles in universities, arguably requires a commitment to 'succession planning' if it is to be effective and sustainable, and in reflecting on the questions above requires identifying and supporting those

women (particularly early career women colleagues) who are the ideal colleagues to lead and provide leadership.

The overall implication of this, for male colleagues working in positions of influence and responsibility in educational institutions, is that a key act of allyship is to commit to sharing their own influence and responsibility with women colleagues to democratise and distribute educational leadership and decision-making.

Arguably this applies particularly to advancing and amplifying the work and voices of women in professional roles within universities, who are often the majority of staff in professional development and enhancement departments, and who support and drive learning and teaching enhancement activities in effectively ‘leading without authority’. Greater support for, recognition of, and career progression opportunities for women in these kinds of professional development areas and roles is critically important, and male leaders supporting and campaigning with women colleagues for this is essential.

Conclusion

The privileging of the male voice in academia and academic work is historically and systemically embedded in universities and wider spheres of academic practice and research. From the peer review, funding and publishing of scholarship and research, through biased citation and authoring practices and into the design of curricula, the work and voices of women in 'the academy' are underrepresented, and through a combination of the aforementioned and other factors, women in academic, research and also professional roles are disadvantaged and disenfranchised.

Male allyship does not provide a solution to the systemic biases that disadvantage women in universities and higher education. However it can provide an important contribution and there are specific acts of male allyship that can help address gender inequalities and support greater gender balance and representation in academic work and practices. Male colleagues who are seeking to support gender balance and representation in academia and higher

education institutions have to pro-actively commit to acts of male allyship, of the kind explored in this chapter. In doing so they must recognise when they themselves and other male colleagues are being complicit in sustaining or reinforcing gender imbalance, and be prepared to challenge both the status quo and indeed their own status, leadership and responsibilities.

Acknowledgements

To the extent that it was possible to determine, all of the publications cited in this chapter were either authored or first authored by women.

Author bio

Keith Smyth is Professor of Pedagogy and Head of the Learning and Teaching Academy (LTA) at the University of the Highlands and Islands. Through his work alongside colleagues in the LTA, Keith leads on, supports or contributes to a range of learning and teaching enhancement initiatives and professional development

opportunities offered across the university. In this context Keith has overall responsibility for the university's Learning and Teaching Enhancement Strategy, and for the development of educational research.

Keith's research interests relate to co-creative pedagogies and curriculum models, digital and open education, educational strategy, and academic development. There is strong focus on inclusion and widening participation embedded in much of this work. Keith has also been involved in a number of equality and diversity initiatives and organisations, including a period as Vice-Chair of the charity LEAD (Linking Education and Disability) Scotland. Keith blogs at https://3eeducation.org/ and is on Twitter @smythkrs.

References

Bell, M.L. and Fong, K.C. (2021) 'Gender differences in first and corresponding authorship in public health research submissions during the COVID-19 pandemic'.

American Journal of Public Health, 111 (1), 159-163. DOI https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2020.305975

Bilen-Green, C., Green, R.A., McGeorge, C., Anicha, C.L. and Burnett, A. (2013) *Engaging male faculty in institutional transformation* [online]. In 2013 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition, 23-49. Available from: https://peer.asee.org/engaging-male-faculty-in-institutional-transformation [09 July 2021].

Broido E.M. (2000) 'The development of social justice allies during college: A phenomenological investigation'. *Journal of College Student Development*. 41, 3-18.

Ferber, M.A. and Brün, M., 2011. The gender gap in citations: does it persist?. *Feminist Economics*, 17(1), pp.151-158. DOI https://doi.org/10.1080/13545701.2010.541857

Frances, D.N., Fitzpatrick, C.R., Koprivnikar, J. and McCauley, S.J. (2020) 'Effects of inferred gender on patterns of co-authorship in ecology and evolutionary biology publications' [online]. *The Bulletin of the Ecological Society of America*, 101 (3), p.e01705. Available from: DOI https://doi.org/10.1002/bes2.1705 [09 July 2021].

Guglielmi, G. (2018). 'Gender bias tilts success of grant applications'. *Nature*, 554 (7690), 14-15.

Jester, N. (2018) 'Representation within higher education curricula: contextualising and advocating for feminist

digital activism'. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 23 (5), 606-618. DOI https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2018.1465036

Jones, S. and Harvey, M. (2017) 'A distributed leadership change process model for higher education'. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 39 (2), 126-139. DOI https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2017.1276661

Jones, S., Lefoe, G., Harvey, M. and Ryland, K. (2012) 'Distributed leadership: A collaborative framework for academics, executives and professionals in higher education'. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 34 (1), 67-78. DOI https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080X.2012.642334

King, M.M., Bergstrom, C.T., Correll, S.J., Jacquet, J. and West, J.D. (2017) 'Men set their own cites high: Gender and self-citation across fields and over time' [online]. *Socius*, 3, p.2378023117738903. Available from: DOI https://doi.org/10.1177/2378023117738903 [09 July 2021].

Liévano-Latorre, L.F., da Silva, R.A., Vieira, R.R., Resende, F.M., Ribeiro, B.R., Borges, F.J., Sales, L. and Loyola, R. (2020) 'Pervasive gender bias in editorial boards of biodiversity conservation journals'. *Biological Conservation*, 251, p.108767. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108767

Lumby, J. (2013) 'Distributed leadership: The uses and abuses of power'. *Educational Management*

Administration & Leadership, 41 (5), 581-597. DOI https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143213489288

Lundine, J., Bourgeault, I.L., Glonti, K., Hutchinson, E. and Balabanova, D. (2019) '"I don't see gender": Conceptualizing a gendered system of academic publishing' [online]. *Social Science & Medicine*, 235, 12388. Available from: DOI https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112388 [09 July 2021].

Lunsford, L.G., Crisp, G., Dolan, E. L., and Wuetherick, B. (2017) Mentoring in higher education. In: D. Clutterbuck, F. Kochan, L. G. Lunsford and N. Dominguez (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Mentoring*. New York: Sage. pp. 316-334.

MacNeill, S., Johnston, B. and Smyth, K. (2020) Critical engagement for active participation and reflection in the digital university in an age of populism. In: E. Michelson and A. Mandell (eds.) *Adult learning in the age of Trump and Brexit. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, No 165, Spring 2020, 115-127. DOI https://doi.org/10.1002/ace.20372

Madsen, S.R., Townsend, A. and Scribner, R.T. (2020). 'Strategies that male allies use to advance women in the workplace'. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, 28 (3), 239-259. https://doi.org/10.1177/1060826519883239

Morgan, R., Hawkins, K. and Lundine, J. (2018) 'The foundation and consequences of gender bias in grant peer review processes' [online]. *CMAJ*, 190 (16), E487-E488. Available from: DOI https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.180188 [09 July 2021].

Phull, K., Ciflikli, G. and Meibauer, G. (2019) 'Gender and bias in the International Relations curriculum: Insights from reading lists'. *European Journal of International Relations*, 25 (2), 383-407. DOI https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066118791690

Rees, T. (2011) 'The gendered construction of scientific excellence'. *Interdisciplinary Science Reviews*, 36 (2), 133-145. DOI https://doi.org/10.1179/030801811X13013181961437

Stevenson, J. (2009) 'Women and the cultural politics of printing'. *The Seventeenth Century*, 24 (2), 205-237.

Sugimoto, C.R. (2013) 'Global gender disparities in science' [online]. *Nature*, 504, 211-13. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/504211a [09 July 2021].

Tuana, N. and Peterson, M.J. (1993) *The Less Noble Sex: Scientific, Religious, and Philosophical Conceptions of Woman's Nature*. Indiana University Press.

West, J.D., Jacquet, J., King, M.M., Correll, S.J. and Bergstrom, C.T. (2013) 'The role of gender in scholarly authorship' [online]. *PloS one*, 8 (7), p.e66212. Available

from: DOI https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0066212 [09 July 2021].

Wider, K. (1986) ‘Women philosophers in the ancient Greek world: Donning the mantle’. *Hypatia*, 1 (1), 21-62.