

UNITED WISDOM

Feminist epistemology: experience and the requirements of justification

Traditions and Worldviews

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-32-N02 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Feminist epistemology: experience and the requirements of justification

Epigraph

> *“Values are therefore not ‘science-free.’”*

Elizabeth Anderson, “Uses of Value Judgments in Science” (2004), p. 11. The quotation follows the English original; RU uses our own translation. Anderson discusses testing evaluative judgments against experience, rather than subordinating inquiry to an unchangeable value. Author’s copy.

What this article is about

At a meeting, people compare the results of a new work arrangement. A table shows time saved. An employee asks whether it includes the hours now spent helping colleagues after the shift. She is told: “We need facts, rather than personal experience.” Yet her question concerns precisely which facts are included: which work was chosen to count?

Feminist epistemology examines how people’s position affects access to information, recognition of competence, and the structure of justification. It need not assert that a woman is always right or that experience cancels scrutiny. Its strong question is whether a checking procedure that excludes particular experience in advance is reliable enough. This article distinguishes accounts of experience, causal explanations, and general conclusions; shows why values may guide inquiry while retaining an open outcome; and considers dispute and disagreement as parts of knowledge. The result matters beyond gender: human testimony can be taken seriously without unconditional agreement with every conclusion of its speaker.

I. Position provides access, rather than ready-made truth

Someone knows a situation from a particular position. It includes work performed, bodily capacities, language, relationships, and access to documents. A manager sees the departmental budget; an employee daily procedural failures; a customer events after the internal report is finished. None of these pictures becomes complete through the observer’s sincerity alone.

Situated knowledge helps pose a question about this access. In Elizabeth Anderson’s academic overview, it is central to feminist epistemology. Different approaches explain the knowing subject’s position differently; standpoint theory, feminist empiricism, and postmodern

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

approaches do not form a single answer. Anderson, “Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science,” introduction and Section 1.

The practical distinction is visible without a large term. Someone using a badly designed door daily has access to a recurring difficulty absent from the drawing. That grounds investigation of the door. Yet the difficulty does not establish one explanation: handle height, opening effort, or the passage’s arrangement may be the problem. Experience indicates an event; inquiry specifies conditions.

Access to information must therefore not become infallibility. A participant knows some sides of their situation better and may be mistaken about others. An outsider can see a pattern while missing significant context. A reliable procedure connects these possibilities without requiring one side to abandon participation beforehand.

The employee at the beginning did not demand acceptance of a complete theory. She pointed to work missing from the table. An answer can take the form of checking who does it, how long it takes, and whether it was counted before. Her position became a resource for a new question. It did not replace evidence; it revealed where evidence was still insufficient.

II. Experience consists of several claims

An account of experience rarely contains one simple fact. Event, feeling, meaning, and explanation are combined. Accepting or rejecting everything at once loses the possibility of precise discussion. Respect begins with distinctions that retain what matters rather than devalue the person.

The hypothetical statement “they do not listen because I am a woman” contains several parts. Someone reports recurring inattention, describes its significance, and proposes a cause. The first can be clarified through specific episodes, the second through their own account, and the third through comparison and alternative explanations. A cause is not confirmed by the experience’s intensity alone, but intensity makes the question significant.

This work becomes unfair when demanded only of some people. One may say “there is a problem in the team,” while another must provide a detailed log of every case. Formal devotion to data then conceals an unequal trust threshold. Both the account and symmetry of requirements for speakers need examination.

The reverse mistake is declaring every clarification an attack. Without clarification, participants may use identical words for different events. A speaker means interruption; a listener hears disagreement; a third person hears refusal to implement a proposal. They dispute rightness before agreeing on the subject. “What precisely happened?” preserves experience and makes it jointly discussable.

A useful sequence is to let the person finish, distinguish observation from explanation, then propose examination. Beginning by refuting the cause may sound like denying the event. Ending with sympathy alone leaves the event unable to ground change. A good discussion keeps both tasks: people may report what they know, while participants may examine the conclusion proposed from that knowledge.

III. A neutral question already has boundaries

Inquiry chooses what counts as a problem. Data do not make this choice because they have yet to be collected. Service speed or convenience for people with restricted mobility can be studied; managerial satisfaction or work quality after handover to a customer can be studied. Each question opens some information and leaves other information outside.

In a hypothetical assessment of a schedule, a researcher asks how many tasks finish per shift. Someone responsible for a child after work asks about predictable finishing time. Both questions can receive verifiable answers. The second remains an investigative question despite its relation to a particular life. The first is not value-free either: productivity was chosen as an interest.

The distinction avoids a false choice between cold facts and subjective wishes. Facts are needed, but their composition depends on the question. Values can explain why the question deserves asking. They should not predetermine its answer. Schedule predictability can be valued while a proposed reform is found not to improve it.

In her 2004 article, Anderson distinguishes values that assist inquiry from values driving it toward a predetermined conclusion. This allows discussion of a feminist interest without automatically alleging bias or providing exemption from scrutiny. Anderson, p. 11.

The consequence is strict. Researchers must show the question, its significance, and what would count as an inconvenient result. If every outcome confirms the initial idea, no test exists. If a significant interest leads to new observations and permits revision, it can improve knowledge. The connection with an open procedure, rather than the question’s impartial appearance, determines whether it performs investigative work.

IV. “Women” does not describe one life

A gender category reveals some relationships but cannot replace descriptions of people. Work, income, age, language, and family situation change access to events. Removing differences makes a theory speak for people whose experience has not actually been investigated.

Imagine three hypothetical participants discussing work hours. One may work remotely, another must attend onsite, and a third is paid only for completed orders. An identical flexibility rule has different consequences. Asking whether women favor flexible schedules is insufficient. We need to know which possibility “flexibility” names and who bears uncertainty’s risk.

Experience therefore needs a plural. One account may reveal an important problem without representing the entire class. Even a persuasive general difference cannot confidently predict an individual life. A particular situation again needs information, rather than application of a category through an outward sign.

Political association should be distinguished from research homogeneity. People may jointly seek educational access without identical convictions and needs. A shared aim does not require a shared inner constitution. A procedure must leave room for intragroup disagreement or reproduce exclusion under a new name.

The opposite extreme obstructs inquiry too: large differences do not prove shared restrictions never exist. The level of conclusion needs establishing. A rule restricting a category can be discussed on justified grounds without assigning every member one reaction. A good concept opens examination; a bad one closes it. “Women’s experience” helps when it leads to precise questions about distributed opportunities; it becomes empty when a prewritten portrait replaces reading actual accounts.

V. Particular access does not confer authority on everything

Someone encountering a restriction may see its mechanism earlier. This creates no advantage on every neighboring question. Recognizing an obstacle and knowing the best change are different capacities, each requiring its own grounds.

In hypothetical transport design, a user accurately describes inability to change to the needed line independently. An engineer knows design restrictions, an organizer the timetable, and another passenger evening-access difficulties. If one voice becomes final on every question, information is lost. If user experience is excluded, engineering accuracy becomes an accurate answer to a badly posed task.

Reliable authority follows its subject. In describing their difficulty, someone has access unavailable to an outside observer. Causal explanation needs comparison. Choosing a solution needs consequences for different participants. Final assessment returns to actual use. These stages do not devalue experience; they help it change action.

Mary Wollstonecraft connected independence with developing judgment, rather than exchanging one authority for another. Her educational argument provides a historical basis for

the right to participate in reasoning. It creates no contemporary theory of investigative privilege. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, Chapter IV.

Respect for experience should therefore be precise: “you have information about this aspect that we lack,” rather than “you know everything better.” This preserves authority and names a boundary. People need not become infallible for their knowledge to count. The possibility of error without losing interlocutor status is a condition of real participation. Otherwise recognition is a fragile gift withdrawn at the first inconvenient clarification.

VI. Disagreement can also be data

Different accounts need not refute each other. They may describe different process stages or conditions of participation. Seeking one average story too quickly loses precisely the material that widening the sources was meant to provide.

A new reporting system seems useful to most of a hypothetical team. Two people find it inconvenient. Their dissatisfaction proves no overall failure, but the majority cannot make it insignificant. They may perform a particular work type the form omits. Examination begins with different tasks, rather than accusations that a minority resists change.

This approach has a boundary. Disagreement may arise from mistaken expectation, misunderstanding, or conflicting interests. Minority status alone does not make it evidence. It remains grounds to establish a cause. Even a mistaken account sometimes shows that an instruction fails to explain a significant condition.

A dispute about fact must be distinguished from one about a criterion. Participants may agree on the completed-task count while disagreeing on whether it adequately describes success. The first dispute needs information; the second explanations of chosen aims and consequences. Mixing them makes one side answer a fairness question with a table, and the other answer a counting question with a value objection.

Inquiry benefits by recording these levels. An established fact, open causal question, and disagreement about a criterion may be retained together. Every conflict need not end immediately in a shared formula. Sometimes the precise result is understanding where the sides differ. That is stronger knowledge than artificial consensus where difference vanished only because some participants stopped speaking.

VII. Good intentions do not verify a conclusion

Research protecting people against injustice can be mistaken. Its aim explains the work’s significance but confirms no particular causal hypothesis. This must be acknowledged for reliability and respect for those the work serves.

Imagine a hypothetical project intended to reduce unequal burden. Some tasks become differently distributed after a change, but overall burden increases. Reporting only the first result produces an incomplete favorable story. Calling every negative effect proof of a deeper problem prevents the hypothesis from encountering objection.

Different possible outcomes should be recorded in advance: improvement on one feature, no change, deterioration on another, and different effects for subgroups. This does not make research unfeeling. It reduces the chance of a desired result making an actual consequence forgotten.

The possibility of revising a means while retaining the aim matters especially. If concern for accessibility produces an inconvenient procedure, the procedure’s failure can be acknowledged without abandoning accessibility. When aim and means merge, their critic appears an enemy of the aim. Public interest then protects an error it should have revealed.

The discipline applies to listeners too. Someone can support equality while rejecting a particular explanation of an episode. Their disagreement needs grounds, rather than automatic justification through good intentions. Speakers may ask for the grounds of doubt. Everyone retains one duty: making the transition from experience to conclusion visible. A strong moral position does not cancel that transition; it makes avoiding harm through wrongly chosen action especially important.

VIII. Examination should have an intelligible cost

Collecting information does not expand knowledge for free. Someone recalls unpleasant events, spends time, fills a form, and answers questions. Ignoring this work can mean using their experience without giving them actual participation in the result.

In a hypothetical organization, employees are asked again to describe everyday difficulties. Accounts were collected twice already, but nobody reported a change. A third request is refused. Concluding that people have no substantive information would be wrong. Refusal may concern procedure: time is spent while the link from testimony to action remains invisible.

A good request explains purpose, boundaries, and the next step. Why is this information needed? How will it be examined? What will be published, who has access, and may participation be declined? Every conversation need not become a complicated contract. Greater sensitivity and cost require clearer conditions.

Reliability benefits too. Someone fearing punishment may choose safe wording. Someone misunderstanding a question’s purpose answers another question. Unsuitable choices make information convenient for a table and inaccurate for the situation. Later counting cannot fully repair these errors.

Participation also means returning the result. Every sentence need not be agreed with everyone, but showing the established difference, the unknown, and what changes helps. People see their accounts did not disappear into another archive. Feminist epistemology becomes a question about arranging knowledge: making experience a verifiable basis while preserving the dignity, freedom, and intelligible role of its provider.

For sensitive conditions, distinguish public grounds from public identity. A verifiable conclusion needs enough procedural information, but not always disclosure of the speaker's name to everyone. In a small group, removing a name may not prevent recognition if details identify one person. Confidentiality promises must match reality. Sometimes a limited process description is safer, with separate agreement on access to episodes. This permits no publication of unverified accusations. It allows seeking necessary information without making participant risk the price of being heard. If sufficient examination is impossible under available conditions, retain a bounded conclusion. Further research can be needed and a reversible rule temporarily changed without declaring a still-unestablished cause. This is more honest and confident than demanding full disclosure at any cost or rejecting experience because it cannot immediately be presented publicly.

IX. Justification can be shared

Scrutiny becomes stronger when its rules are available to participants. People need to understand which information is relevant, who can object, and what happens afterward. A formal invitation means little if the answer is predetermined.

In contextual empiricism, Helen Longino connects a community's quality with the possibility and actual uptake of criticism. This is a philosophical normative model, rather than proof that every diverse group is automatically right. Longino, "Cognitive and Non-Cognitive Values in Science," pp. 39–40.

Three things can be made visible: the current conclusion's grounds, the objection's substance, and the decision on it. An objection changes a conclusion, is rejected on grounds, or remains open. Recording these outcomes does not require accepting every opinion. It prevents consideration from silently becoming polite listening.

In a hypothetical team, an employee identifies omitted time. The manager asks for comparison across several shifts. Examination shows the problem occurs only with a particular order type. The conclusion narrows without disappearing. It is more precise than the initial general complaint and more useful than the initial general table. Each side contributed what it could access.

Shared justification does not always create emotional comfort. Data may refute a desired explanation; a new question may challenge a familiar arrangement. An intelligible procedure

nevertheless reduces disputes about personal dignity. Someone can be told their hypothesis is unconfirmed while retaining recognition of experience and the right to ask another question. This stability distinguishes knowledge from encouraging agreement: participation continues when an answer inconveniences a participant.

X. Inner work begins with one’s own trust threshold

Every listener evaluates people in advance. Speech style, education, familiarity, and confidence help orientation but may quietly replace consideration of the message. Self-observation helps when it identifies a particular difference in one’s requirements.

In a hypothetical conversation, one person speaks calmly and gains trust. Another is anxious and must prove every detail. The doubt may be justified; anxiety may reflect importance of the subject. To understand, distinguish the account’s form from available grounds. A calm tone does not make a message true, nor tension false.

Ask yourself: what made me lower trust? Does it concern content? Would I demand the same of another participant? What would change my assessment? The last matters especially. If no evidence can change an opinion, the problem concerns listening’s structure itself.

Self-accusation helps little. A habit can be acknowledged, a question clarified, and a conclusion revised without constructing a new portrait of one’s corruption. Distinction concerns action: let someone finish, request an example, compare requirements, and return an overlooked message to discussion.

Feminist epistemology does not require identifying a speaker’s hidden identity each time. It invites inquiry into access and recognition. Inner work involves noticing when you call one life “personal experience” and another’s similar account “practical knowledge.” This proves no injustice in every case. It marks a place to begin substantive examination, rather than confidently treating one’s habit as neutral judgment.

XI. Experience should change the question, rather than decorate the answer

Sometimes research retains others’ stories only as emotional examples of a preaccepted theory. The account decorates the result. Someone was allowed to speak, but their information could not change the work’s direction.

This can be checked through a trace in the conclusion. Which new question arose? Which category required clarification? What stopped being treated as identical? Without answers, examine whether experience participated in justification. Every account need not change a theory, but the procedure must allow it.

Return to the initial table. The employee identified evening help to colleagues. A researcher can add her remark to the introduction and preserve the efficiency indicator. Or revise the unit of accounting and distinguish task completion from total time cost. The second is harder because it changes the answer’s structure. Precisely for that reason, it can produce new knowledge.

The personal and general cease to be impermeable worlds. A particular account reveals a verifiable condition; scrutiny returns a more precise formulation to the account. The general need not absorb the personal, nor the personal become a law. Between them, visible reasoning remains available for objection.

This approach retains strict knowledge requirements. It broadens the question of where grounds come from and who may offer them. Experience gains a place in inquiry while the result stays open. Together, these conditions make discussion of position a way to improve justification, rather than predetermine a dispute’s winner.

What this means in practice

In your next substantive conversation, try distinguishing what someone reports about an event, how they experience it, and what explanation they propose. You need not divide every remark aloud. Avoid mistaking doubt about a cause for denial of all experience.

If checking a claim, name the question: “did extra work appear after the change?” or “do we count different participants’ proposals consistently?” Specify which observation could distinguish answers. Request only information capable of changing a decision; repeated formal descriptions consume time and trust.

Examine your criteria. Whom do you trust without clarification, and from whom do you demand details? Are differences substantively grounded? Doubt related to experience, access, or prior reliability can be explained. If based only on unfamiliar speech, begin with clarification.

For shared work, retain one trail: message, check, result, and further action. A conclusion can be confirmed, narrowed, or remain unknown. All three outcomes are legitimate. The speaker’s participation should survive an inconvenient answer, and the research aim should leave a negative result possible.

Finally, distinguish respect from agreement. Someone can know a significant aspect while a general explanation remains under examination. A hypothesis can be rejected while the event and experience’s importance are retained. This makes experience a real knowledge source: heard attentively enough to change the question, examined honestly enough that it need not confirm a preselected answer.

Key quotation

> *“drive inquiry to a predetermined conclusion”.*

Elizabeth Anderson, “Uses of Value Judgments in Science,” p. 11. The fragment follows the English original; RU uses our own translation. Anderson names this as a criterion of an impermissible role for value judgments. It expresses a limit, rather than a recommendation. Article.

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity and boundary
Feminist empiricism ↔ ordinary hypothesis testing	Both require an open result. A gender question changes the conditions investigated, rather than removing data.
Situated knowledge ↔ a participant’s practical competence	Access depends on relations with the subject. Particular access does not mean infallibility on every question.
Anderson: values and inquiry ↔ Wollstonecraft: independent judgment	Reasoning matters rather than blind submission. Wollstonecraft’s historical moral grounds differ from contemporary philosophy of science.
Longino: uptake of criticism ↔ shared discussion of a work rule	An objection must be able to affect a conclusion. The organizational example is not a scientific experiment.
Multiple experiences ↔ a shared political interest	A common aim fits different lives. Solidarity does not confirm a group’s research homogeneity.

Primary sources and research

1. Elizabeth Anderson. “Uses of Value Judgments in Science: A General Argument, with Lessons from a Case Study of Feminist Research on Divorce.” *Hypatia* 19(1), 2004, 1–24. Passages of pp. 9–12 were read, especially the criterion on p. 11: quotations and the permissible role of values. The divorce research is not directly recounted here.

2. Elizabeth Anderson. “Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science”. The introduction and Section 1 were read: a map of approaches and situated knowledge.

3. Helen E. Longino. “Cognitive and Non-Cognitive Values in Science: Rethinking the Dichotomy” (1996), pp. 39–58. Passages of pp. 39–41 were read; a brief basis for actual uptake of criticism.

4. Mary Wollstonecraft. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, Chapter IV. A historical comparison of independent judgment and educational rights, rather than a source of a contemporary empirical finding.

Tags

feminist epistemology, experience, justification, situated knowledge, Elizabeth Anderson, Helen Longino, Mary Wollstonecraft, feminist empiricism, standpoint theory, data, values, objectivity, testimony, access, trust, independence, gender, criticism, participation, hypothesis, causation, disagreement, verification, research question, interpretation, equality, responsibility, labor, solidarity, open result

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.