



SWEDISH
SECRETARIAT FOR
GENDER RESEARCH

Research Funding and Gender

A Research Review – Conclusions and Challenges

Parallel 6: Policy Actions for Systematic Change

Fredrik Bondestam

Swedish Government
Nordic Council of Ministers

University of
Gothenburg

Swedish
Secretariat
for Gender
Research

Nordic
Information on
Gender, NIKK

Includegender.org

Gender
Mainstreaming
in Government
Agencies

Gender
Mainstreaming
in Higher
Education

We strengthen the impact of
research and knowledge about
gender and gender equality in
academia and the rest of society

Bondestam, F & Grip, L. (2015).

*Fair Allocation? Research Funding
and Gender – A Research Review.*

In Swedish, with a summary in English.



Criteria

- ---2014
- Peer-reviewed and published
- Knowledge produced by researchers
- Focus on gender and/or gender equality
- Processes concerning research funding

Design

2 000 peer-reviewed international publications
on gender and research funding...

...118 of them analysed in depth



1. A funding paradox?

A majority of all studies show that the distribution of research funding lead to fewer and smaller grants for women.

But the notion of (male) professors equals out gender effects according to quantitative research on research funding.

➡ RFOs may be reinforcing unequal, gendered conditions for research due to a lack of knowledge on, and insufficient ambitions to improve, gender equality in academia.

2. Outbalancing inequality?

An equal/proportional distribution of female and male applicants and recipients of research funding, is not the same as gender equality in research funding.

RFOs are deliberately/unconsciously trying **not** to understand the effects of their own statistical version of proportionality.

➡ Shift to the concept of (**eliminating**) **gender inequalities** through using feminist perspectives on academia.

3. Peer-review as split vision?

A common understanding of scientific quality and gender equality as two incompatible ideals stands in the way of change.

Gender is always used as an “add-on-version” in decision-making.

➔ RFOs need to establish new criteria for scientific knowledge **starting out** from an understanding of the gendered effects (always already) structuring peer review.

A vision for RFOs...

1. From gender balance to gender inequalities
2. Use critical knowledge on academia through promoting feminist theories and perspectives
3. Set up criteria on scientific quality starting out from knowledge on gender (in)equalities
4. From a simplistic "men/women-dichotomy" to intersectional inequalities



SWEDISH
SECRETARIAT FOR
GENDER RESEARCH

Research Funding and Gender

A Research Review – Conclusions and Challenges

Parallel 6: Policy Actions for Systematic Change

Fredrik Bondestam

fredrik.bondestam@genus.gu.se