

El andamiaje retórico de género: una deliberación sobre la cultura institucional de la Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, México (2008-2012)

The gendered rhetorical scaffold: a deliberation about the institutional culture at the Universidad Autonoma of Ciudad Juarez, Mexico (2008-2012)

Clara Eugenia Rojas Blanco

Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, México

crojas@uacj.mx

Resumen

En este artículo presento una versión sucinta de una investigación amplia de corte cualitativo-interpretativa centrada en el análisis de la estructura simbólica de género en la Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez (UACJ), México. En esta versión ofrezco una deliberación centrada en un análisis de la formación persuasiva/discursiva en donde examiné el proceso retórico que reproduce y recrea la relación entre el poder y el género. Los hallazgos más significativos muestran un proceso de normalización del género en las prácticas discursivas de los y las participantes. Argumento que la cultura generizada de la institución no permite la transversalización de la perspectiva género, porque las creencias y prácticas androcéntricas en la institución no se reconocen, por los y las agentes de la comunidad universitaria, como prácticas sexistas.

Palabras clave: cultura de género, educación superior, crítica feminista, Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez.

Abstract

In this article, I present a succinct version of a comprehensive qualitative research project centered on the analysis of the gendered symbolic structure in the Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez (UACJ), in Mexico. In this version, I offer a deliberation centered on the analysis of the persuasive/discursive formation, where I examined the rhetorical process that sustains the relationship between power and gender. I argue that the gendered institutional culture does not allow the transversalization of the gender perspective, because the androcentric beliefs and practices within the university are not recognized, by the university agents (men and women), as sexist practices.

Keywords: gendered culture, higher education, feminist critique, Universidad Autonoma of Ciudad Juarez.

Fecha Recepción: Enero 2015 **Fecha Aceptación:** Julio 2015

Introduction

In this article I present a discussion around gender ideology as a symbolic scaffolding and re-articulated institutional gender culture of the Autonomous University of Ciudad Juárez (UACJ). In this sense, underlies the desire to open a process of reflection on the implications that has had-and has-for women and men UACJ, a personal and political level to college thinking from a vision androcentric. Also, this text responds to my interest as a feminist academic, contributing knowledge from a set UACJ and Ciudad Juarez, conversation reflections promoted by feminists interested in exhibiting, documenting and analyzing the issue of gendered culture of Institutions Higher Education (IES) in Mexico (Palomar, 2004, 2011; Buquet, 2011;. Buquet and Monroe Cooper et al, 2006; Munévar D. and M. Villaseñor, 2005).

The text realizes primarily the affective side of the androcentric culture. Although not an analysis of emotions per se, the focus of rhetorical feminist critique realizes the "rhetoric of moral conflict" with which women confront power in a male-centered culture face, mainly feminists (Campbell, 2001, p. 198). At the center I present a qualitative-interpretative analysis where I examine a historical moment in which a joint or what I call "gender crisis" which allows me to see and hear the gendered culture in UACJ occurs.

That time was shaping up to late 2009, when the incumbent administration UACJ (2006-2012), declaring openly interested in pursuing certification of Gender Equality promoted and awarded by the National Institute for Women (INMUJERES) . Paradoxically, this decision coincides with the fact that in 2010, succeeded in financing granted by the National Council of Science and Technology (CONACYT) to study gender culture in the institution, which involved both teachers and students of the institution.

The cyclical meeting of these two projects, one official and one feminist produces a contradiction in where I was able to observe and document reproduction and recreation of gendered power, mainly symbolically. The exercise of this power is embodied in a group of agents who represented the institutional hierarchy, who "spoke" primarily through the rhetoric of silence. This rhetoric is formed by a set of metaphors voice and silence, where the latter worked as faces of the same coin, thus constituting a sustained minimization and exclusion in speech. In this process, investigating and, while the project symbolically were disqualified, blurred and disjointed official project.

From the findings he coined the metaphor "rhetorical scaffolding gender" as a profoundly useful qualitative standard tool for observing the androcentric structure which can only be seen in junctures. So, in time, space or specific place is configured and behave in a way, and at another time vanishes and re-structured differently. In this sense, it refers to the difficulty of naming and land discursive processes that sustain the subtle, elusive or ambiguous gender as a relation of symbolic power presence. Permanent re-articulation makes it slippery and multifaceted power; is discursive (in the broad sense, not only linguistic), but to that extent is performative (Butler, 1998, 1992; Austin, 1962). Thus, the rhetoric of silence takes the performative function of silence, while structure and supports the re-creation of what I call gender rhetorical scaffolding.

I believe that in all dialectical process various rhetorical situations (Biesecker, 1989) or processes of public deliberation, which crystallized the ideological basis of the contradictions and tensions and actions that expose opposition, in this case, standardization processes occur the genre. Opportunities are also possible to produce counter-hegemonic discourses. Under the circumstances, in situations of conflict or crisis in public areas -always generizadas- itself, you can see, hear and feel how the gender structure is embodied in both men and women.

Following Gramsci (1985), a crisis or social contradiction (in this case, at the university as a public sphere) is not an extraordinary event, but part of a socio-historical complex process that manifests itself in various ways, places, times and spaces, where the effects and causes are intertwined and can not establish the point of origin or inception. The moment it becomes visible is only a strident manifestation erroneous and tendentious is identified as the source. In this case, the historical process was manifested in the UACJ. As in other historical moments of the Juarez women in his meeting with the patriarchal system (eg femicide), I believe that the crisis gender in UACJ embodied the normalization of sex-gender system as a constituent part of culture institutional and manifested through the androcentric discourse practices in ontological and epistemological terms.

I clarify that although this culture does not represent all men in college, all are more likely to be favored before women. The androcentric culture is always articulated to other systems of domination, such as, among others, classism and racism. In this sense, Connell (1995) argues that institutions are constituted by gender ideology. He says that even when gender is not a prominent feature in certain circumstances their presence is implicit in the androcentrism of many institutions where not only men but also women are complicit through their regular participation and differentiated in their communities private practice.

Theoretical considerations

Poststructuralist feminist theories have contributed significantly to the description / understanding of the complexity of the discursive mechanisms that help re-production of power relations and gender in specific social contexts systems way. These approaches recognize that while the fabric structure as a system of domination remains present explicitly (physical violence, exclusion of women in political spaces, sexual harassment and public denigration of women, etc.), in

contemporary societies are re- It produces and reinforces in more subtle ways, which appear as seemingly innocent forms of power that are imminently discursive or symbolic (Lazar, 2005).

The feminist critique of the rhetoric has as its starting point the appreciation and recognition of women as political agents able to speak and write in their own voice in public and political spheres. They also raise the need to restructure the rhetorical strategies and tactics that have historically served to support and justify the patriarchal culture (Foss, Foss & Griffin, 1999; Foss, 1996; Condit, 1997; Campbell, 2001). Within this framework, the rhetorical discourse or rhetoric as it is called commonly understood as a symbolic action and as an intrinsic part of human communication. It is a deliberate discourse whose primary characteristic using persuasive discourse-as usual context processes and public spaces. So it has been and is an unavoidable part of the construction and negotiation of power relations in all social interaction. Historically it has been recognized as demagoguery or empty talk, but and scholars of contemporary rhetoric understand it as symbolic arm hegemonic groups to rationalize or justify their right to appoint, assign, exclude, torture, invade and impoverish vast parts of the population in the world. In this regard, Gill and Wedbee (2001) state that these studies are characterized by:

...the explanation of the dynamic interaction between a rhetorical text and context, ie, the way in which a text reinforces, alter or respond to the views of a particular public or social fabric of the community ... rhetorical criticism responds to contemporary criterion that linguistic structures or systems of speech order and give meaning to human experience (p. 236).

In this framework, and scholars of contemporary processes rhetorical postulate that is necessary to study the rhetoric and symbolic action process in order to explain how the symbols, words, images, signs, music and bodies operate to form our perception of reality, and invite us to act in disagreement. In studies of contemporary rhetoric it is meant to / os subjects and multiple, conflicting mediators, consisting of multiple discursive formations and subject positions. In this vein, the rhetoric is constituted by a complex interaction between the sender, the message / audience / situation / change, at a certain point in space (McGee, 2009).

So when we refer to the rhetoric of women, what language are we talking? What social, political and economic consequences brought us to understand our experiences, our collective identity and our actions from the rhetoric of language or other? How has influenced gender ideology in the way we use or not-women rhetoric? From there, the scholars of rhetorical practices protests for the rights of women exposed (inside and outside academia) who could speak or write publicly or politically, who is not, and how each affects the ethos who to be or not heard / as (Condit, Campbell, 2001; Ede and Lunsford, 1995, 1984; Foss, Foss and Griffin, 1996; Biesecker, 1989).

In contemporary societies and recreates it occurs in more subtle ways, which appear as seemingly innocent forms of power, discursive or symbolic imminently. Lazar (2005) states that these forms of power are embedded and dispersed networks of relationships, processes of self-regulation that act both in the processes of subjectivity, as subjugation. In this regard, he said that even if we accept the idea of Foucault that "power is everywhere", we must point out that gendered selves and are affected / os very differently, depending on their position in these relationships gender, race, class, nation, ethnicity, among other socially constructed position (pp. 3-8).

Specifically, the metaphors of silence and silencing have meant the exclusion of women from cultural production and the absence of prospects based on the experiences of women from cultural traditions and traditional discipline. However, if we understand the silence exclusively in terms of their opposites-speech, voice and noise-, we limit our discussion for speech or voice and factors unique to the inclusion or exclusion. For example, if the only problem was the fact that women "have no voice" or our history "it has been deleted" apparent solution would be located only in an increase in our participation through stronger and affirmative voices, as well as the ability to access the producing structures know to enroll in history legitimized by the groups in power (De Vault, 1999). Therefore, the study of sociopolitical silence must consider how social relationships (re) produce the voice and silence and how (re) intentionally or not articulated hegemonic discourses.

In this situation, it is necessary not only expose, but to dismantle the mechanisms of silencing, censorship and teorizándolos devaluation visibilizándolos, re-naming and rethinking new ways of doing politics to expose, but also disrupt the political interests that support them . In this sense, Clair (2002) states that although politically speaking, "a voice" carries the potential of change, not

always having voice is related to the possibility of resistance or emancipation. It argues that, "... sometimes the metaphor appears disembodied voice and ineffective ... requires us to question how we talk about other conditions / os and for what purpose we do. It reminds us that the discursive practices are always immersed in specific conditions and material practices ... you can silence the voice and silence can speak (p. 177). Then, the possible significance depends not only on its cyclical re / joint in certain socio-political circumstances, but other factors such as recognition, prestige and the ability of the / os agents involved / os. These factors, in turn dependent on socially constructed and attributed to the people involved according to different positions of the subject identity.

Methodological considerations

The methodology is informed by the principles of feminist epistemology, reflexivity that demand before and during the methodological process, not only on technical aspects, but in terms of the ethical implications between the researcher and or / os participants. While the emphasis on situational characteristic of much of what is considered knowledge, epistemological relativism is not accepted. Accepting knowledge as situated, is not the same as saying that all perspectives are valid or "true". What matters at a point or situational awareness is that enables specific questions on specific contexts, and are difficult to frame in epistemologies that consider gender, emotions, subjectivity and situation or he knows is irrelevant to knowledge (Harding, 2002; Alcoff, 1992; Alcoff & Potter, 1993; Haraway, 1988).

Here I present knowledge located in time, place and space, as is the UACJ, which may or may not be related to other experiences in other contexts of higher education. The first part of the analysis includes a corpus of conversations obtained through personal communication between the research-six partners (three men and three women) who occupy or occupied positions in the hierarchy or near the nest. These communications the documented both through participant observation and field notes or log. The key question was focused on documenting why, according to the interlocutors and the team kept quiet and the research project? Why order from whom?

In the second part, for reasons of space I present a summary of the transcripts of a corpus of 40 open or non-structured interviews, based on questions generators (talk) analysis. In this case, the goal was to document what they knew or how to explain the gender and partners and their relationship to sexism. It starts from the premise that gender is not taught by prescription, but necessarily from a critical self-reflection has. If not, the knowledge on gender are not deep enough to challenge sex-gender system. In all cases fictitious name used.

Women themselves, feminists

In the analysis of the comments by participant observation, the trope of the "feminist issues" and "man-hating" is part of the symbolic structure. Rarely explicitly stated but tacitly informs the processes of exclusion and ostracism towards women who question the hierarchies or power groups. This process is done by most men and not a few women. Concerning the situation in this text, the authorities in turn promoted symbolic actions that favor women who are "loyal" group or unconditional hegemonic power in the institution and not the rarely face each other. For example, as a first action to certification by INMUJERES gender, administration in turn appoints a group close to the group in power, as committee responsible for institutional gender women. In the first meeting of institutional gender committee, and to the questioning of some colleagues for the absence of most of the scholars of the genre UACJ, the coordinator of institutional gender committee publicly and emphatically stated: "No Feminists want to work with because they are very problematic ... can not work with them ..." (Dolores, personal communication, May 6, 2011).

The strategy of using a group of women and power devices silence to symbolically "feminist" has been very effective for the groups in power in all areas. In this sense, any controversy or claim on ethics, academic legitimacy or career, became metonymically de jure and de facto, a "problem among women", which refers to the historical myth that women can not work together. This strategy legitimizes the voices and feminist perspectives in many other contexts.

Then I show the transcript of interviews with exfuncionarias / os where the central question aims to confirm, via voices close to the current administration, the process of silencing by the institutional hierarchy during the period when the research was conducted (2008-2012). In 2012 change management and was the time it was possible to interview former officials / as. The names are fictional.

Veronica

I: (Researcher): Why do you think the administration blocked our research on gender culture in college?

V: I do not know exactly ... but I think a more serious problem was in fact offer such as product research, a master's program in gender studies ... for good, it was urgent or necessary to the program, not academic programs They can be organic in any IES, at least in Mexico ... its possible establishment is accepted or assigned from above, and only those groups that are loyal to the incumbent administration ... and less a master formed by feminists ... was very naive Meanwhile think you were gonna get away with it ... the political price will be higher "(Personal communication, November 2012).

I: What is not supposed to read the projects before taking the institutional signature?

V: Well, yes ... it is assumed ... but I think not read ... What you offered as a product?

I: Yes. As a master project. So at the project level, not as a program.

Veronica: So I do not know ... I heard it was so ... You go figure!

John

I: Why do you think the administration blocked our research on gender culture in college?

John: The order not support you and ignore your work coming from above.

I: Where?

J: Well ... the chief stewardship and his boys. What I've heard is that they do not want to advance the power of feminists in the UACJ ... because [laughs] Some feminists do not obey, do what they want, they are very authoritarian and aggressive but also, according to some, not You can trust you they do not respect the loyalty of group (personal communication, May 2012).

I: What do you think?

J: Well, it is true [laughs] ... not obey, do what they want, they are very authoritarian and aggressive. But there that are not legit, "post" is very different ... are not reliable because they are respononas and leave no handle ... but I know many here at the university ... Nomás to you [laughs].

Ramiro

I: Why do you think that the administration blocked our research on gender culture in college?

A: Well look, I do not think you can say that so strongly, because surely no misunderstanding.

I: Like what?

A: Well, as the decision of the administration was not in order to block the project, but to make one gender project with INMUJERES to not confuse the university community ... I really do not see why you and your team have to take so personally.

I: And why are we not included as gender studies specialists in the actions taken by the UACJ with INMUJERES?

A. I do not know ... that decision should have taken the coordinator of the committee.

I: What do you think about our project has a CONACYT funding, and therefore products and precise delivery times, we still ministering deposited almost 8 months later?

A: Yeah ... Sure, but hey that problem was due to confusion in the ministry of projects ... I doubt it was intentional administration.

I: What about the blocked project a feminist project?

R: I do not know what to say, because UACJ ... I know ... there has never been feminists (personal communication, November 2012).

It was evident that the problem was not "women" per se but "feminist" or women with critical voice not necessarily feminists. The main fear is that "feminists have the power"; "Women can control them, not feminist." Apparently, a study from a feminist perspective was very risky for the power groups in the institution, especially because feminists understand gender as a system of oppression not only to women but also to men. A concern that our diagnosis would evidence that gender was certified, but a simulation, an action that did not mean substantial changes to the institution also manifests. Paradoxically, INMUJERES contributed, intentionally or not, in the process of silencing of feminist thought in UACJ.

Visions of gender and academic

At this stage he was invited verbally and in writing to a group of academic / os of the four institutes that make up the central campus UACJ (Institute of Social Sciences and Administration

(ICSA), Institute of Biomedical Sciences (ICB) Institute of Architecture and Art and Design (IADA) and the Institute of Engineering and Technology (IIT). The invitations in order to research and privacy policies explained in the use of pseudonyms. The guests and the academic / as were selected by networks of academic bodies. All / os voluntarily agreed to participate (10 from each school).

Transcripts of a corpus of 40 non-structured interviews over a period of two years (2010-2012) were analyzed. By this time is in the process of gender certification by the National Institute for Women in UACJ and that "gender" is present in the imagination of the university community. As the unit of analysis I took tropes related to gender / sexism. I emphasized differentiation by sex, but all the names are fictitious. In this case, only privilege generating conversation questions about the relationship between gender and sexism, such as: How do you explain that more senior positions and higher wages are occupied by men? Does that mean that there is (or there) sexism in college?

Then, in summary form a corpus analysis of interviews where the rhetorical process of construction of meaning is illustrated, where those interviewed / as unknown sexist practices, although they show a limited knowledge, and sometimes zero, it becomes what which means gender. In general, gender is understood as a problem of women and as a problem for men and women, but not as a structure that favors domination practices, visions and androcentric work. As for sexist practices, women included, or as they say / interviewees / as, "invited or involved in positions of power" must have shown to be intelligent and hardworking ... but also carry an uncritical loyalty to the group of men who were invited to participate. For example, "Maricruz" (interview, April 2012) states:

I do not know exactly what the genre ... I think we are all equal here at the university. I at least I have never felt discriminated against for being a woman, I have always respected ... This ... You're talking about the glass ceiling? No ... I do not think that's ... Yeah, look I think the fact that women are not invited or involved for these positions has to do with labor relations that have fostered with men seeking such positions. If you are an intelligent and

hardworking woman, you are always going to invite. It has to do with your abilities to do work, but most of all to be political, to be diplomatic, would be the word. There you do not see, do not hear and do not say ... whatever happens.

For its part, "Elizabeth" (interview, November 2012) explains:

Gender means that we are all equal ... men and women. Sexism in college does exist ... but ... is not as obvious as before ... yes sexism practiced, very dimly, and yes there is a preference for choosing men for key positions of responsibility and higher wages.

Although she emphasizes that gender means "are equal", not related to sexist practices. According to Elizabeth, that's the history of the university; They have always been men who make the decisions and are men who occupy positions with higher salary. This does not mean that women invite, but always positioned in subordination. They are not included in decision-making, even if they have a job at the same level of hierarchy. She adds:

Here no longer gives But if sexism data openly, but there is not as they say [men] "not want them to be or not want to work with women" ... so obvious and blunt. For example, I was invited several times to different positions and thought "these if they are inclusive" ... but in meetings and meetings in which it is assumed decisions are made ... I realized they already had gathered outside [of the university] to take agreements and meetings always me "mayoriteaban" ... we were always two women ... just in case your opinions are not taken into account ... they already have a fixed idea of what they want for college.

Similarly, "Delia" (interview, February 2012) states:

Not sure if this has to do with gender, but when you have so much time in this environment you realize it is very difficult that women can compete for positions, because first such posts are given on friendship, not on academic merit or by credentials. If as a woman you have a friend or invite friends as you lean ... that you come to power, but did not give the power of

decision-making ... Ah! and if you're wrong is not for the circumstances, it's because you're a woman ... they are always biased their views in this way.

For its part, "Lety" (interview, June 2011) argues:

Gender discrimination means men to women ... Look at me ... a colleague tells me is that women complain a lot when given the commissions ... but you imagine! always expect you to do the toilet or comidón to invite so and perengano ... Ah! and among them all ... apparently forgiven because after that use it to be attacked politically ... No, really end up thinking and doing ... like them. Look, otherwise, if there is a discussion they shout and to insult in general ... and then as usual. But if you do or you say something to you and you answer them or shout them, then you're crazy ... or you are a hysterical or a feminist.

In the same vein, "Grisi" (interview, June 2012) explains

My understanding gender means that all are equal, but never happens ... happens something very strange, very funny, no, not really funny, something like ... how very typical call? ... Rather offensive. I've noticed that if a man loses his temper and treats you badly, you gritonea or offends, it's because you can, because it has power. If a woman gets out of their boxes and treats you badly, it is crazy or you're accused of being hysterical feminist. Or they say "you're in your days", if that happened to me, even perhaps unconsciously, I have also assimilated and have tried this way: "slut is crazy and so and so is power."

For "Pedro" (interview, October 2012):

Gender equality does exist in the university, and you can see that has increased enrollment and recruitment of women to work and study at the university.

The argument of increased enrollment and recruitment of women, shows that there are gender equity in the HEI, but is achieved gender equality in academia. Part of a superficial and statistical

analysis that can not withstand a deeper as those in the National Autonomous University of Mexico and at the University of Guadalajara analysis. The only remaining numbers by sex, but do not explain and least disrupt gender culture.

When asked how he explains sexism at the university, "Pedro" emphasizes the fact that women in positions with decision-making and higher wages, has nothing to do with sexism but with the power groups (led by men) who do not trust women (emphasis added). It states:

All these administrative positions not just happen ... I mean arising from a relationship of friendship and very strong political work, which requires a lot of confidence ... it is alliances and between-group ... yes mostly men ... of course involving women, but and core positions have never been held by women ... is there no longer trust women ... I do not know why, but that between the center group there are other commitments ... they even have to do with relationships outside college, such as partisan filias.

For its part, "Paul" (interview, June 2011) recognizes that gender has to do with discrimination against women. He says:

Yes, they have women-- -the reason, there should be differences because we are equal.

Like all / as (as) respondents (as) he insists that there is or there should be no discrimination because we are all equal. This trope of supposed equality erases socio-cultural differences between men and women; differences in the gender power relations are based. Also, "Paul" agrees state that is not sexism that women have no access to positions of power, but because of lack of confidence. According to him:

No, I do not think that -only men in the hierarchy is sexism, because trust is a nodal point in this exclusion ... Oops! for many are positions of trust, are positions of trust right? and this, because the person pyramid goes from the rector, directors, and then ... how do you say? ... the positions of department, coordinators right? ... then it is a ... a trusted network is not ? ...

the director will give the opportunity to be the head of department to have confidence in him personally and this, the administrative work right? Then it depends on there [above]. No reason to trust ... I think.

"Gerardo" (interview, May 2011), argues that sexism at the university there, that women are included in all but must be supported by a group. He states:

Look ... I do not think it's by sexism that women occupy positions at that level ... that was over long ago ... here at the University not to discriminate against women ... I think we have very good relations. Well yes, yes no sexism, but it gives more personally ... there are men who are sexist, but not all are ... things in the sense that women occupy positions move differently. Historically, here at the University arrival in leadership positions and the rector, has been through the groups ... support groups that support an x person to come to power ... and yes also with the aim of reaching them to the rector. Well, yes, as you say power groups ... if you do not have a group to support it [as a woman] to be president (sic) because neither thought...

Overall, this was a pattern in all the interviews analyzed. Most teachers and "not recognize" androcentric beliefs and practices as sexist practices, and therefore not intentionally or not related to the power structure informed by gender. According to my analysis, this apparent ignorance has to do with "gender rhetorical scaffolding" that informs and sustains tacitly-through naturalization of the genre not only what is recognized or unknown, intentionally or not, but what it may or may not say in an informed and supported by a male-centered culture space.

The women interviewed recognize sexism, but still do not question because they know that the possibility of professionally (economically) scale depends on its "ability" to move or belong to powerful groups at the University. These power groups are led by men (sometimes not visible). Although women are always invited to participate, provided an androcentric, unconditional and uncritical from women making up those groups are expected practice.

In short, women who participate in these groups are not innocent in its seemingly uncritical participation in the structures of power. They know how to move within the institution, but there seem to oppose it actively participate in the groups. Are critical voices, embodied in the bodies of women academics, which you do not have them "trust" to be part of the power groups that move the processes to form the structures of power in the UACJ.

Final Thoughts

Throughout this paper, I show that the gendered culture in UACJ re / produced and reinforced by men and women through the discursive interactions, informed and justified by a rhetorical scaffolding gender. Although most have a limited knowledge of what "gender" knowledge itself is very clear that the university "sexism" is practical, but suggests that the problem of sexism has to do with a problem of women.

By this I mean that the problem continues to believe that gender, on the one hand has to do only with discrimination against women, and on the other a problem between men and women that require changes to individual or couple. Thus, the participants do not recognize that re / production sexist discourses and practices are an active part in shaping the gendered culture in the institution. This culture has historically favored symbolic actions that reproduce the androcentric as universal, and during that process, vision, history, science, experience and work of "hegemonic masculinity" in general, and specifically of men or they have occupied positions of power. This is achieved by the rhetoric of silence, represented by the absence of recognition of other worldviews.

Therefore, the presence of more women in management positions does not mean that the gendered or androcentric culture has changed. What it means is that the majority of women, including academic, do not question the androcentric culture. On the one hand, it is part of the normalization of gender and on the other, know that oppose or question the sexist policy will be placed in positions of greater disadvantage, and often are subject to ostracism. No groups of women organized to demand their rights or changes.

From my experience as a feminist scholar, informed by informal conversations and interviews with other / os teachers / it can say that it is clear, as in any culture, gender called institutional culture UACJ. This is re / produced and reinforced through constant negotiation or opposition in the fight, in this case not only for the sense of what the genre, but also by economic and symbolic resources (surveys) granted by the incumbent administration. In this sense, the advance of the actual changes in qualitative terms in the institution are only possible if it suits the interests of the incumbent administration, which in turn serves the interests of groups of historical power UACJ. These groups have influenced and influence both tacitly and explicitly in the production and distribution of symbolic and material goods of the institution.

Therefore, the recognition of women as active agents depends in the first instance, the ability and skill on the part of the agents involved, articulate, disarticulate and re-articulate the symbolic power of the voice and silence used as strategies persuasive for us invisible. If we organize women into groups of power within the institution, it is interpreted as a disregard for the rules preset by an entire gender system and shored discursively with the tropes of "feminists hate men." This system provides for the inclusion of women subordinate, even in management positions.

When a group of women who are not willing to be included in subordination promotes changes, these are always interpreted as feminist contempt, they are recognized as such or not. Then, still nodal for women-excluidos- other groups historically document, analyze and expose the abuse of language, by us and others, in order to change or transgress the limits and material -simbólicos historically They have blurred the recognition of women as historical subjects.

As an epilogue, it is necessary to mention that the crisis experienced in gender UACJ articulated with a change of administration. Although many of the former administration remain, the new rector of the UACJ (2012-2018) supported the opening of the Master of Interdisciplinary Gender Studies (2014), the first graduate of gender studies in the north of the country. Moreover, it is the first graduate UACJ you get recognition PNP CONACYT for two generations. The graduate is organic, born from the internal struggle of a group of women specialists in feminist and gender studies. Therefore, a feminist intervention.

Bibliography

- Alcoff, L. (1992). The problem of speaking for others. *Cultural Critique*, 20 (4), 5-32.
- Alcoff, L. and E. Potter (Eds.). (1993). *Feminist epistemologies*, New York: Routledge.
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biesecker, B. (1989). "Rethinking the rhetorical situation from within the thematic of difference". In J. Lucaites, C. Condit & S. Caudill (Eds.). *Contemporary rhetorical theory* (pp. 232-246). New York: Guilford Press.
- Butler, J. (1998). "Actos performativos y constitución del género: un ensayo sobre fenomenología y teoría feminista". *Debate Feminista*, 9 (18) 296-314.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech*. Routledge: New York.
- Campbell, K. (2001). "The rhetoric of women's liberation: An oxymoron". In C. Morris III & Stephen Browne (Eds.), *Readings on the Rhetoric of Social Protest* (pp.198-211). Pennsylvania: Strata Publishing.
- Condit, C. (1997). "In Praise of Eloquent Diversity: Gender and Rhetoric as Public Persuasion", *Women's Studies in Communication*, 20, 92-115.
- Clair, R. (1998). *Organizing silence*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- De Vault, M. (1999). *Liberating method: feminism and social change*. Philadelphia: Temple UP.
- Foss, S. (1996). *Rhetorical criticism: exploration and practice*. Prospect Hills: Waveland Press.
- Foss, K. , S. Foss & C. Griffin (1999). *Feminist rhetorical theories*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Glenn C. (1997). *Rhetoric retold*. Carbondale & Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Glenn, C. (2002). Silence: A rhetorical art for resisting discipline(s). *JAC*, 22, 262- 289.

Gramsci, A. (1995). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. New York: International Publishers.

Haraway, D. (1988). *Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective*. *Feminist Studies*, (14) 575-599.

Harding, S. (1993). *Rethinking standpoint epistemology. ¿What is strong objectivity?* In L. Alcoff and E. Potter (Eds.) *Feminist Epistemologies* (pp. 10-35). New York: Routledge.

Hendricks, C. & K. Oliver (Eds.) (1999). *Language and liberation: Feminism, philosophy and language*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Lazar, M. (Ed.) (2005). *Feminist critical discourse analysis. Gender, power and ideology in discourse*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Munévar D. y M. Villaseñor (2005). *Transversalidad de género. Una estrategia para el uso político-educativo de sus saberes*. En *Revista de Estudios de Género La Ventana*, (21), pp. 44-68.

Palomar C. (2005). *La política de género en la educación superior*, *Revista de Estudios de Género La Ventana*, (21), pp. 7-43.

Buquet, A. et al. (2013). *Intrusas en La Universidad*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Programa Universitario de Estudios de Género. Consultado el 8/05/2013. Disponible en: http://www.academia.edu/8811934/Intrusas_en_la_universidad

Palomar C. (2011). *La Cultura Institucional de Género en la Universidad de Guadalajara, México D.F.: ANUIES*. Disponible: http://biblioteca.universia.net/html_bura/ficha/params/title/cultura-institucional-genero-universidad-guadalajara-c-g-palomar-verea/id/54599660.html Consultado el 20 de septiembre 2013.