Journal of English for Academic Purposes 32 (2018) 1–8

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of English for Academic Purposes

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jeap

Gender and academic writing

1. Introduction

The relationship between gender and discourse has been a focus of theoretical and empirical attention in the fields of applied and sociolinguistics for some 30 years (for overviews see Cameron, 2006, 2007, 2010; Coates, 2004; Litosseliti & Sunderland, 2002; Talbot, 2010; Wodak, 1997), with debates continuing around the extent and specific ways in which language and discourse are gendered and how such gendering is enacted and sustained, often taking spoken language as the empirical object (Swann, 2002; for recent examples, see; Baxter, 2014; Grohosky, 2014; Hultgren, 2017). The significance of gender for writing and specifically academic writing has received less attention in sociolinguistic and discourse studies but there are a number of important strands of work which this Special Issue seeks to bring together. These include:

a) feminist writings on what it means to 'write' across all discourses and genres, particularly what it means to inscribe and re-inscribe as a woman (e.g. de Beauvoir 1997; Irigary, 1993; Spender, 1980; Threadgold, 1997; Liu, Karl, & Ko, 2013) and as a feminist (Belsey, 2000; Handforth & Taylor, 2016);
b) academic writing research which has foregrounded gender as a key aspect of identity work in the production, reception and teaching of academic writing (e.g. Flynn, 1988; Nye, 1990; Kirsch, 1993; Dixon, 1995; Haswell & Haswell, 1995; Holbrook, 1991; Ivanič, 1998; Lillis, 2001; Belcher, 2009; Tse & Hyland, 2008, 2012);
c) academic writing research which has explored the specific ways in which the labour surrounding the production of academic writing, notably the teaching of student writing, is gendered (e.g. Blythman & Orr, 2006; Horner, 2007; Schell, 1998; Tuell, 1992; Turner, 2011);
d) research which documents the material conditions of academic work, including scholarly writing, and their continuing gendered impacts on career trajectories (e.g. Acker & Feuerverger, 1996; Appleby, 2014; Grummell, Devine, & Lynch, 2009; Hey, 2001; Leathwood and Read, 2009; Moi, 2008; Prozesky, 2008).

The seven papers in this SI engage with these literatures, bringing them into dialogue with work in a number of fields, including EAP, academic literacies, bibliometrics, applied linguistics, new literacy studies, feminist higher education studies and transgender studies. The papers report on research focusing on what it means to do academic writing – in terms of production, uptake and pedagogy—in a range of distinct contexts. The overarching question that the SI seeks to explore is as follows:

> *What is the significance of gender in and for the production, evaluation and teaching of academic writing in the contemporary academy?*

Why is this question of interest to JEAP readers and EAP more generally? EAP, as a research and pedagogic project, rather than a transnational commercial enterprise (British Council, 2013; Graddol, 2000), is driven by a central concern to facilitate access to English medium academic language and literacy practices. Whilst there are many debates around what constitutes 'access' and the extent to which the goal of EAP pedagogy and curriculum design is not only 'accommodationist' (helping students and scholars to work within existing regimes of academic discursive practice) but also 'transformative' (to problematize and open up existing discursive regimes), a fundamental imperative is to enable people from a wide diversity of linguistic, cultural and social backgrounds to engage in English medium rhetorical practices for the purposes of participating in academia (for discussions, see Hyland & Shaw, 2016; Lillis & Tuck, 2016). There are therefore strong academic, social and ethical reasons why EAP practitioners and researchers are likely to be interested in critically re-examining contemporary understandings about the ways in which such participation is mediated by gender.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2018.03.003
1475-1585/

The many reasons for exploring the particular significance of gender in and for *academic writing* including the following. Firstly, women academics continue to lag behind men in academia: only 20% hold professorships in UK universities even though they account for more than 45% of the workforce (Black & Islam, 2014). In the EU as a whole, women represent only 20% of 'grade A' academic staff (European Union, 2013) and the lowest proportion of women researchers is in countries with the highest research and development expenditure (Morley, 2014; for statistics on women's underrepresentation globally see http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/women-academia). Recent research studies on women in higher education have concluded that this continued vertical segregation is not accounted for in full by 'pipeline' issues – i.e. a lack of women 'coming through' the system to obtain higher positions (e.g. Dobele, Rundle-Thiele, & Kopanidis, 2014) or by greater family responsibilities (e.g. Aiston & Jung, 2015) with a number of authors arguing for continued research into the profoundly gendered practices of academia, in order to throw light on the persistent inequalities they give rise to (Acker, 2014; Blackmore, 2014). Issues of academic status and esteem, particularly in relation to prestigious forms of academic production and knowledge-making, such as the conference keynote speech, as well high status written research outputs, are a matter of live debate in professional associations (for example, in 2014 a vigorous discussion took place amongst British Association for Applied Linguistics members concerning the gender makeup of conference speaking panels). Debates currently surface regularly in the public media about sexism across all professional domains, including academic domains (for examples of reports on sexism in academia in different parts of the world, covered in the media, see http://www.news.com.au/finance/work/at-work/heinous-sexist-culture-inside-stem-industries-exposed/news-story/3956b3a88df843f63655260fdabe2a3e. Accessed 25/2/18- Australia; https://mg.co.za/article/2014-08-12-universities-remain-a-bastion-of-gender-discrimination-too-. Accessed 28/2/18- South Africa; https://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/feb/24/sexism-women-in-university-academics-feminism-U.K. Accessed 1/318.). The public expressions of misogyny directed at women experts are discussed in a recently published book by Mary Beard (2017), a senior UK classicist, who anchors the current abuse women face when speaking publically (including extreme abuse with threats of rape on social media) to long established cultural assumptions that women do (and should) not have a legitimate claim to discourse publically.

Secondly, and more closely linked to the focus of this SI, academic writing for publication is central to academic work for an increasing proportion of academics, constituting cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1991) towards securing academic posts and promotion. Yet women are less likely to be first named as authors in multiple-authored papers, to be cited in top-rated journals (Wilson, 2012) and to take on prestigious roles in the production of academic texts, such as being journal editors (Tight, 2008). Women academics are less well represented in national assessment regimes, e.g. in the UK RAE and REF (Blackmore, 2010). For example, in Read, Robson, and Francis, 2008, 67% of men were selected compared with 48% of women (HEFCE [Higher Education Funding Council of England] 2009, p.8 & 9), and data from HESA (Higher Education Statistics Agency) indicated "a marked difference between the rate of selection for men and women in 2014; 67 per cent of men were selected, compared with 51 per cent of women" (HEFCE, 2015). The 2009 HEFCE report concludes that they believe it is not so much a "bias in the selection process" that accounts for these differences but may be as "… a result of deeply rooted inequalities in the research careers of men and women" (p.25). At the same time, reports evaluating the equality and diversity practices of UK higher education institutions around REF 2014, stated that there was a need to "improve gender equality within academia" (EDAP [Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel], 2015) and explicitly signalled a potential gender bias in the process itself (HEFCE, 2017, p. 43).

Thirdly, powerful binaries framing what counts as academic writing/discourse, rooted in the Enlightenment tradition, prevail: these include rational-emotional, objective-subjective, mind-body, with the less prestigious of the binaries (emotional, subjective, body) frequently culturally marked as feminine/female. The specific ways in which the 'unmarked' or prestigious pairs of these binaries are entextualised in the particular genres and rhetorics of essayist literacy, such as argument rather than poetry or linearity rather than circularity and digression, standard over vernacular, have been critiqued as 'masculinist' discourse (e.g. Anzaldúa, 1987; Elbow, 1991; Frey, 1990) as well as being Anglo-centric (e.g. Bennett, 2015; Canagarajah, 2002). The binaries have long since been discussed by major feminist philosophers e.g. de Beauvoir, (1997), Kristeva, (1986) and Irigary, (1993), and are currently being revisited, e.g. in the work of Moi, (2008, pp. 23–34), Kirsch and Royster, (2010), Royster and Kirsch, (2012). New forms of academic writing, such as the academic blog and reflexive writing (usually required more of students than publishing scholars) and changing institutional demands (e.g. the requirement for greater 'impact' work alongside academic work in the UK) are challenging conventional assumptions about what kinds of writing should be valued and desired in the academy by students, scholars and teachers (see e.g. Hamilton & Pitt, 2009; Lillis, 2011; Mauranen, 2013; Schroeder, Fox, & and Bizzell, 2002) signalling that it is timely to open up debate about the kinds of conventions that should underpin academic writing (and textualised academic knowledge more generally) in the twenty first century (see *Kairos* as an initiative at journal level, http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/about.html).

The papers in this SI engage with key aspects of the many issues raised above, foregrounding in particular the following; the challenges surrounding the securing of access, participation and visibility in academia by women (Appleby, McMullan, Lillis and Curry, Nygaard and Bahgat), working class men (Preece) and transgender scholars (Thieme and Saunders); the importance of an ethics of care in intellectual work (Lillis and Curry, Tuck, Thieme and Saunders); desires for other ways of writing and engaging in academia (all papers).

In the spirit of 'writing otherwise' (Stacey & Wolff, 2013), in this Introduction we also include brief personal reflections by the editors of this SI.

Reflection 1 Jackie Tuck

The papers in this Special Issue (SI), by and large conform to the standard IMRD model for articles in academic journals in EAP and related disciplines. Both in terms of structure and of style, they represent attempts – in the editors' view, successful attempts – to present empirical work which sheds light on gender and academic writing, in ways which meet expectations in terms of the quality of evidence, modesty of claims, acknowledgment of relevant literatures and objectivity of interpretation. They are, in short, examples of "essayist" (Lillis, 2001, drawing on; Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Gee, 1996) texts; that is, they are consistent with particular ways of knowing and being derived from the Western rationalist tradition, which values linearity and explicitness, emphasises the decontextualized display of knowledge and effaces writer and reader processes and identities. In this respect, they resemble the majority of articles published in this journal and across the field of academic writing studies.

Reflecting on this, in the light of findings and analyses within the papers themselves, raises a number of issues for me as one of the editors of the SI. One is the possibility that, in conforming to and in acting as brokers of other contributors' texts towards these norms, we have collectively produced a volume whose polished academic surface hides a number of messier, but important, things. For example, as a textual product, the SI disguises the dialogic nature of the writing process, and the contingent nature of the final wording of a 'finished' text – an issue which Theresa Lillis has explored in her 2011 paper "Legitimising Dialogue as Textual and Ideological Goal". In reproducing the conventional rhetorical disembodiment of academic prose, the SI as a whole also, somewhat ironically, disguises the material practices which gave rise to it: the physical, intellectual and emotional labour of authors and editors in crafting and recrafting texts, often in circumstances not unlike the participants in Jenny McMullan's paper in this issue. And along with the occlusion of these textual practices, the final text is also foregrounded at the expense of the many occluded genres which contributors, editors and journal staff have engaged with during the process towards publication: emails, letters and the proformas we have wrangled with on electronic platforms. What makes such labour a source of satisfaction and pleasure rather than resentment, on the whole, is that it is co-labour, done alongside and with the mutual support of colleagues – and thus, our work is recognised by one another.

Another question raised as I reflect on the nature of the SI is – what of the desire 'to write differently'? A desire which I share with participants quoted in Theresa Lillis and Mary Jane Curry's paper in this issue, and which has been articulated in relation to academic writing by a number of feminist authors, as we've set out in this introduction. Are we also just 'playing the game'? At one level, possibly, yes: we are not unaware of the exchange value of our work in the academic economy. At another, however, I'd like to reject any sense that what appears merely to conform or to make only an incremental challenge to rhetorical norms is necessarily a hollow game. In this I am reassured by recent arguments put forward by the critical Compositionist Bruce Horner, particularly in his 2016 book 'Rewriting Composition: Terms of Exchange'. Horner argues that we should not be trapped by dominant discourses of writing into believing that the only way of 'writing differently' is to be overtly 'alternative' or 'revolutionary', as we may thus run the risk of defining our own efforts and purposes through the false binaries of the discourses we seek to challenge. Writing differently – and making a difference – can and does happen in small ways when we work at, and collaborate in, making meanings in academic writing, even when apparently within conventional practices and genres. So my hope for this SI is that our attempt to push boundaries – perhaps gently, from the inside – will be recognised by, and resonate with, many readers, as worthwhile.

2. Methodological challenges and the question of boundaries

2.1. Yes but is it gender (Swann, 2002)?

A growing body of work in EAP/applied linguistics over the past 20 years and evident in JEAP has focused on the significance of identity in academic writing, including the representation of the author in knowledge making (e.g. Hyland, 2015; Johns & Swales, 2002; Morgan, 2009). Whilst some attention has been paid to the significance of gender in JEAP (e.g. Starfield & Ravelli, 2006; Phan Le Ha, 2009), as a category of identity which is significant to EAP, and the principal focus of this SI, *writing*, gender has remained largely 'occluded' (after Swales, 1996) a point reiterated by the authors in this SI.

One reason for its occlusion can in part be explained by the predominant tendency in EAP to foreground textual dimensions (see Lillis & Scott, 2007; Lillis & Tuck, 2016) but it is also because - and this is an issue across the social sciences - gender is also a complex area to research. The challenge of researching the potential significance of gender to any social practice, including language practices, has been discussed in terms of data collection/research design and also in terms of using empirical data to warrant claims and interpretations made about gender, captured in Joan Swann's question, 'Yes but is it gender?' (2002). In other words, how do we know that a particular experience or practice can be accounted for in terms of gender specifically, (rather than for example, social class, ethnicity, age, sexuality). Theoretically one response has been to argue for approaches which foreground 'intersectionality' in accounting *for* practices, that is, acknowledging the interdependence and intrinsic links between gender and other aspects of identity, as illustrated by Preece's article in this issue where social class is explicitly foregrounded. The layering of multiple dimensions to identity is also signalled in other papers, for example by Lillis and Curry where the significance of locality alongside gender is outlined and by Nygaard and Bahgat who employ a series of quantitative measures to carefully identify where gender may be intersecting with other factors, such as mobility, discipline and career stage. However, there is no straightforward empirical response to the question of how we

warrant accounts *of* gender and gendered practices. The challenge is perhaps most clearly evident in the paper by Lillis and Curry where the significance of gender is evident in participants' accounts at the same time as participants themselves question whether gender constitutes a warrant for key aspects of those accounts. This and other papers indicate the need for methodologies which look under the surface and offer nuanced answers to the question 'is it gender?'.

In terms of research design, the authors in this issue adopt different approaches, with some putting gender on the agenda explicitly with research participants, as a way of making gender a visible and a legitimate focus of study (see Lillis and Curry, 2018 McMullan, 2018) and others focusing on gender as a theme to emerge from a research designed to explore other practices (see Tuck, 2018 who draws on Acker & Armenti, 2004, p. 19 to argue that "practices that are not at first glance gender-specific … need to be examined through the lens of gender analysis").

Whether claims made about gender can be warranted, of course also depends on how gender is defined in the first place. All the papers in this issue work with definitions of gender as a lived reality – lived as man, woman, cis or transgender-whilst emphasising the ways in which these realities are worked at discursively, interactionally and institutionally. All of the papers articulate that there is both a material and a discursive element to gender but also that the relation between the two is a source of dynamism and change in relation to people, places and times. The papers fall along a continuum in this respect: for example, the lived realities of being a woman, man, transgender student or scholar are foregrounded in most papers -by Appleby, McMullan, Lillis and Curry, Preece, Thieme and Saunders - with the discursive dimension most obviously emphasised in the paper by Tuck.

For the purpose of empirical study, 'gender' is operationalised in different ways: by using names as a proxy to track gender in Nygaard and Baghat's quantification of productivity, or by working with a clear distinction between two categories of being, 'woman' and 'man', in papers by Appleby, Preece, Lillis and Curry, McMullan and Tuck, with transgender being used in contrast to cisgender in the paper by Thieme and Saunders.

2.2. Academic writing-what counts as a legitimate object of study?

Drawing boundaries around the phenomenon of 'academic writing' – what counts as 'academic writing'- is a long standing issue of debate, most typically framed in terms of a distinction between 'text' and 'practice' (for discussions, see Lillis & Scott, 2007; Coffin & Donohue, 2012) All papers in this issue work with a notion of academic writing as a social practice, conceptualized as: 1) a historically specific and identifiable cluster of linguistic-rhetorical conventions which are used as a resource for knowledge and meaning making; 2) involving issues of identity, power which entail methodological attention to emic perspectives; and 3) a particular form of labour, in terms of practices around production and evaluation, including the teaching and assessment of student academic writing and the production and review of scholarly writing for publication.

However, once again, whilst theoretically it may be relatively straightforward to claim that academic writing is a social practice, empirically such claims throw up fundamental questions about the boundaries we place around the empirical object or phenomenon. 'Context', which is crucial to a social practice account of academic writing, is potentially infinite in time and space-and even in ethnographic studies which seek to explore writing over long periods of time and in a range of contexts, it is not possible to study everything (Lillis, 2008). Thus boundaries are always imposed on our phenomena. In this SI we have adopted a broad approach towards what counts as relevant context, with some papers clearly having writing at the centre, whether as textual objects (Nygaard and Bahgat) or processes of writing and teaching (McMullan, Tuck) whilst others have at the centre of their empirical gaze other aspects, such as spoken discourse (Preece), EAP more generally (Appleby) and key identity markers such as transgender (Thieme and Saunders). Some papers include a focus on writing but set this alongside other aspects, such as research and careers (Lillis and Curry).

We have sought to hold steady a focus on writing without imposing *a priori* boundaries which might unnecessarily constrain the phenomena under exploration and therefore limit understandings. We consider that together the papers offer important insights into phenomenon of academic writing in terms of production, evaluation teaching and capital.

Reflection 2 Jenny McMullan

Working on the paper for this SI and the SI overall, alongside completing my PhD thesis, as a single, working mother, has meant I have had to become better at locating small moments, in amongst the drop-offs, pick-ups, domestic tasks, doctor's appointments; teaching and research assistant work (RA) (which pays the rent) to do my own writing. Currently, I like to fold up the 'side-bed' in my bedroom and create a writing chair. My daughter, who has been through tremendous change over the last eighteen months, sleeps in this bed most nights for security. I like to sit in this bed/chair which faces the window, with my laptop on a makeshift table, and write. My bedroom is also next to my little girl's room so I can hear her play when she retreats into her own space. In my bookshelf, I have academic texts I refer to when writing, as well as articles I would like to get to when I have a spare minute – they are (miraculously) organised at the minute. There is also a space on this bookshelf which is dedicated to my RA work: articles I need to review, grant applications I am drafting, reviewing or editing – all for more senior academics. When writing for my own research, I try to keep my gaze on my laptop, or the window in front of me. I do my best to ignore the mass of bits and pieces that are directly to the right of my bedroom door - an assemblage of just some of the domestic chores I need to complete: clothes that need to be taken to a charity shop; a vacuum cleaner I've left upstairs as a reminder I need to vacuum my asthmatic daughter's bedroom; bags of washed clothes; bags of dirty clothes – to name just a few. My bedroom is a symbol of the jumble of needs and priorities that make up my life. On the one hand, to feel

whole and sane, I need to write and think — on the other, I need to prioritise my family. A difficult balance, but for me — a necessary one.

3. The papers in this SI

The first two papers in the SI focus on student academic writing at undergraduate and postgraduate levels. In her paper, *Identity work in the academic writing classroom: where gender meets social class*, Siân Preece draws on a 2 year ethnographic study in an academic writing classroom to present a detailed analysis of spoken interaction to show how the learning and teaching of academic writing is shot through with gender and social class relations. She demonstrates how young male working class students perform laddish identities in response to their sense of being 'out of place' in relation both to the language and the literacy practices of academia, with consequences for the learning environment and for their own, and others', negotiations towards a scholarly identity. Focusing on the postgraduate experience, in *Becoming a researcher: re-inventing writing spaces*, Jenny McMullan draws on an ethnographically oriented study to present four carefully crafted 'writing tales'. These tales trace the ways in which women postgraduate research students forge new identities as academic meaning-makers through their engagement with academic writing. McMullan traces the significance of gender for this engagement by showing how her study participants create and inhabit new 'spaces' for thinking, as they find ways to write and study amidst the everyday places and demanding routines which shape their lives as women. The tales reveal the importance of occluded genres in these women's writing lives, suggesting that a greater focus on these may be appropriate in doctoral writing pedagogies.

The following two papers centre on the labour of teaching writing and specific ways in which this labour is gendered. Jackie Tuck's paper *I'm nobody's Mum in this University": the gendering of work around student writing in UK Higher Education* draws on an ethnographically oriented study exploring the perspectives and practices of 14 academic teachers towards the teaching of writing across a range of disciplinary areas. Her paper focuses on the gendering of academic writing labour through the subtle operations of what she identifies as a 'feminising discourse' in academic teachers' accounts of their work with student writing and student writers in the disciplines. Gendered metaphors which construct writing work as a form of baby care or mothering, and language which frames writing as a personal, rather than an intellectual, activity, contribute to the devaluing of this work and, she argues, to a damaging separation of writing from disciplinary learning, teaching and knowledge-making. The paper by Roslyn Appleby *Academic English and elite masculinities* also focuses on the labour of teaching, drawing on an interview based study with 18 teachers to explore the particular context of EAP teaching in universities in Japan. Whilst this paper does not focus on the teaching of writing per se, the higher status of the particular professional positions discussed in the paper is certainly in part due to the specific EAP work centring on written disciplinary discourses (as compared with lower status conversation classes). Appleby explores the specific ways in which 'hegemonic masculinity' (Connell, 2005) is enacted in the context of TEAP (EAP in universities) in Japan.

The final three papers in the SI centre on writing for publication. The paper by Theresa Lillis and Mary Jane Curry *Trajectories of knowledge and desire: Multilingual women scholars researching and writing in academia* explores the perspectives of scholars from several national contexts — Hungary, Slovakia, Spain and Portugal — on the significance of being a woman in academia, specifically with regard to research and academic writing. The methodology involved a gender-specific interview set within a longitudinal study (ranging between 11 and 14 years) which enabled key gendered dimensions to their experiences to emerge, including the imperatives driving their research, the cultural capital of academic publications and networks of research and writing activity. Lillis and Curry argue for the value of exploring women scholars' perspectives over long periods of time, as these offer glimpses of enactments of desire and agency across academic careers, rather than snapshots based on single research moments that become reified accounts.

The following paper by Lynn P. Nygaard and Karim Bahgat addresses an issue of increasing importance to academics given the growth of auditing practices, that of 'productivity'. Focusing on one Norwegian social science research institute, they adopt a quantitative approach to explore the documented 'gender gap' in research productivity, where men are consistently shown to produce more than women and, in so doing, open up debate about what is meant by research productivity and how it is measured. In their paper *What's in a number? How (and why) measuring research productivity in different ways changes the gender gap,* they draw on a dataset of 91 authors associated with 979 publications to probe the idea of a 'gender gap' and argue that the nature of this 'gap' varies significantly depending on how productivity is conceptualized and measured.

The final paper in the SI *How do you wish to be cited? Citation practices and a scholarly community of care in trans studies research articles* by Katja Thieme and Mary Ann Saunders focuses on a core textual academic practice, that of citation. Locating their work within the trans rights advocacy movement and drawing on two datasets — a web-based archive of writers' perspectives and a corpus-based study of 14 research articles published in *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly* — they explore the politics of citation through two key themes: 'erasure'and 'outing'. They argue that the concept of a 'scholarly community of care' can help frame the relationships and ethical concerns that underlie emergent practices of citation in the field of trans studies and point to the relevance of the findings to citation practices in general.

Reflection 3 Theresa Lillis

And so this job is done

Or is it? We began our work on the SI almost 4 years ago now and have gone through enthusiasm to exhaustion, with pleasures and frustrations at what we seemed to achieve and what we failed to achieve. I am painfully aware of the limits of my intellectual imagination — trying to reach out for ways to articulate dimensions to the practice of writing that I 'know' are important, like gender in this SI– engaging with empirical and theoretical work. But always a sense of just skimming the surface, tip of the iceberg …

Of course the job is not done

There is much unfinished business- some of which is a direct consequence of the constraints framing the texts we have written in the SI. Papers had to be of a certain genre/style (not a criticism of the JEAP editor who worked with us on the SI– Paul has allowed us to go well over the 8000 word limit in some cases, been flexible about what we do, fully engaged with the issues we wanted to grapple with) but the article genre does have a huge impact on what can be said. Even though the paper I wrote with Mary Jane is a long one for a journal, we still cut massively, including auto-ethnographic accounts based on interviews we did with each other about being women scholars from very different social and geographical backgrounds. One troublesome consequence from my perspective is that social class hardly figures (but see Preece) yet filters every aspect of my lived existence: not least, I am conscious that I grew up expecting to labour.

But of course some unfinished business is because there is always more to do.

Quickly tracking back over my notes (quickly because we are now up against the deadline for completing the SI) I am brought back to voices that were clearly important to me as I tried to think through some of the issues and remind me I need to reread, think more, that the work achieved is just a tiny bit …

Snippets from notes

Sue Clegg's (2006) work helping me through some thorny issues. Reminds me also I need to continue reading Archer 'Being human: the problem of agency'. [Note 2/3/18, still haven't read in full]

Reading Toril Moi, (2008, pp. 23–34) is a joy, such generosity towards another scholar. I like what she points to as de Beauvoir's collusion (or some such wording, mine??) of sex and gender and the importance of holding on to both to account for what it means to be a women intellectual

Nicely captured point by Bronwyn Davies and colleagues 'We must accept that the self both is ***and*** *is not a fiction, is unified and transcendent* ***and*** *fragmented and always in the process of being constituted, can be spoken of in realist ways* ***and*** *cannot–'*

(Davies et al., 2004.384)

The issue of definitions- academic, intellectual Stuart Hall (1992:278). 'Academic work is inherently conservative inasmuch as it seeks, first, to fulfil the relatively narrow and policed goals and interest of a given discipline—intellectual work, in contrast, is relentlessly critical, self-critical, and potentially revolutionary, for it aims to critique, change, and even destroy institutions.'

Conventions, conventions, conventions – what intellectual work do they enable us to do, or not? Anzaldúa 1987:54 says 'En boca cerrada no entran moscas' and 'for anyone like me to make any changes or additions to the model [of writing] takes a tremendous amount of energy, because you're this little fish going against the Pacific Ocean and you have to weigh the odds of succeeding with the goal that you have in mind' (Anzaldúa, 2006, p. 19).

The pleasures and pains of academic work

*A huge pleasure has been reading and re-reading Simone de Beauvoir, strongly critiqued I know but she worked hard to resist the many binaries that frame academic work- body/mind, objective/subjective, rationality/emotion. As a young woman beginning her intellectual journeys (*de Beauvoir, 2006 *[1926–7])–*

'I put reason into my feelings and spontaneity into my ideas' (139)

'Now I am no longer mildly interested in anything but ideas that I elaborate painfully with all my being' (126)

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Paul Thompson for his enthusiasm and support throughout the preparation of this SI and the reviewers who gave so generously of their time: Claire Aitchison, Sally Frances Burgess, Mary Jane Curry, Julio Cesar Gimenez, Barbara Mary Grant, Yoko Kobayashi, Janet Maybin, Diane Hawley Nagatomo, Victoria Odeniyi, Anthony Paré, Carmen Perez-Lllantada, Pia Pichler, Joan Turner, Agnete Vabø.

References

Acker, S. (2014). A foot in the revolving door? Women academics in lower-middle management. *Higher Education Research and Development, 33*(1), 73–85.
Acker, S., & Armenti C.. (2004). Sleepless in academia. *Gender and Education, 16*(1), 3–24.

Acker, S., & Feuerverger, G. (1996). Doing good and feeling bad: The work of women university teachers. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 26*(3), 401–423.
Aiston, S. J., & Jung, J. (2015). Women academics and research productivity: An international comparison. *Gender and Education, 27*(3), 205–220.
Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/la frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
Anzaldúa, G. (2006). Gloria Anzaldúa. In G. Olson, & L. Worsham (Eds.), *Critical intellectuals on writing* (pp. 15–29). New York: Suny Press.
Appleby, R. (2014). *Men and masculinities in global English language teaching*. Bristol, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
Baxter, J. (2014). *Double-Voicing: Power, gender and linguistic expertise*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Beard, M. (2017). *Women and power: A manifesto*. London: Profile Books/London Review of Books.
Belcher, D. (2009). How research space is created in a diverse research world. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 18*, 221–234.
Belsey, C. (2000). Writing as a feminist. *Signs, 25*(4), 1157–1160.
Bennett, K. (2015). Introduction. In K. Bennett (Ed.), *The semiperiphery of academic writing. Discourses, communities, practices* (pp. 1–9). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Black, C., & Islam, A. (2014). Women in academia: What does it take to reach the top?, 24th February. Available at:. In *The Guardian [online]* http://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2014/feb/24/women-academia-promotion-cambridge. (Accessed 10 August 2015).
Blackmore, J. (2010). Research assessment: A calculative technology governing quality, accountability and equity. In J. Blackmore, M. Brennan, & L. Zipin (Eds.), *Repositioning the university* (pp. 67–84). Rotterdam: Sense.
Blackmore, J. (2014). 'Wasting talent'?: Gender and the problematics of academic disenchantment and disengagement with leadership. *Higher Education Research and Development, 33*(1), 86–99.
Blythman, M., & Orr, S. (2006). Mrs Mop does magic. Available at: *European Journal of Writing* http://ualresearchonline.arts.ac.uk/638. (Accessed 17 August 2015).
Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Trans. G. Raymond and M. Adamson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
British Council. (2013). *The English effect*. The British Council.
Cameron, D. (2006). *On language and sexual politics*. London: Routledge.
Cameron, D. (2007). *The myth of Mars and Venus: Do men and women really speak different languages?* Oxford: Open University Press.
Cameron, D. (2010). Sex/gender, language and the new biologism. *Applied Linguistics, 31*(2), 173–192.
Canagarajah, A. S. (2002). *The geopolitics of academic writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
Clegg, S. (2006). The problem of agency in feminism: A critical realist approach. *Gender and Education, 18*(3), 309–324.
Coates, J. (2004). *Women, men and language*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.
Coffin, C., & Donohue, J. P. (2012). Academic Literacies and systemic functional linguistics: How do they relate? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*(1), 64–75.
Connell, R. W. (2005). *Masculinities* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
Davies, B., Browne, J., Gannon, S., Hona, E., Laws, C., Mueller-Rockstroh, B., et al. (2004). The ambivalent practices of reflexivity. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*, 360–389.
de Beauvoir, S. (1997). *The second sex* [1949] Trans H. Parshley. London: Vintage.
de Beauvoir, S. (2006), 1926-27. In B. Klaw, S. Le Bon, & M. A. Simons (Eds.). *Diary of a philosophy student* (Vol. 1). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Dixon, K. (1995). Gendering the 'personal'. *College Composition & Communication, 46*(2), 255–275.
Dobele, A. R., Rundle-Thiele, S., & Kopanidis, F. (2014). The cracked glass ceiling: Equal work but unequal status. *Higher Education Research and Development, 33*(3), 456–468.
EDAP. (2015). *Equality and diversity in the 2014 research excellence framework*. REF 2014 http://www.ref.ac.uk/2014/media/ref/content/equal/EDAP%20final%20report.pdf. (Accessed 15 August 2017).
Elbow, P. (1991). Reflections on academic discourse: How it relates to freshmen and colleagues. *College English, 53*(2), 135–155.
European Union. (2013). *The she figures 2012*. Available at: Gender in Research and Innovation http://ec.europa.eu/research/science-society/document_library/pdf_06/she-figures-2012_en.pdf. (Accessed 10 August 2017).
Flynn, E. (1988). Composing as a woman. *College Composition & Communication, 39*(4), 423–435.
Frey, O. (1990). Beyond literary Darwinism: women's voices and critical discourse. *College English, 52*(5), 507–526.
Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). Basingstoke: Falmer Press.
Graddol, D. (2000). *The future of English?* The British Council.
Grohosky, M. (2014). Moving Words: Words that move. *Women and Language, 37*(1), 121–130.
Grummell, B., Devine, D., & Lynch, K. (2009). The care-less manager: Gender, care and new managerialism in higher education. *Gender and Education, 21*(2), 191–208.
Hall, S. (1992). Cultural studies and its theoretical legacies. In L. Grossberg, C. Nelson, & P. A. Treichler (Eds.), *Cultural studies* (pp. 277–286). New York: Routledge.
Hamilton, M., & Pitt, K. (2009). Creativity in academic Writing: Escaping from the straitjacket of genre? In A. Carter, T. Lillis, & S. Parkin (Eds.), *Why Writing Matters: Issues of access and identity in writing research and pedagogy*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Handforth, R., & Taylor, C. (2016). Doing academic writing differently: A feminist bricolage. *Gender and Education, 28*(5), 627–643.
Haswell, J., & Haswell, R. E. (1995). Gendership and the miswriting of students. *College Composition & Communication, 46*(2), 223–254.
HEFCE. (2009). *Selection of staff for inclusion in RAE2008*. Available at: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/data/Year/2009/Selection_of,staff,for,inclusion,in,RAE2008. (Accessed 1 August 2017).
HEFCE. (2015). *Selection of staff for inclusion in the REF 2014*. Available at: http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/year/2015/201517/. (Accessed 1 August 2017).
HEFCE. (2017). *Consultation on the second research excellence framework (REF 2017/2)*. Available at: http://www.ref.ac.uk/media/ref,2021/downloads/REF_2017_02.pdf. (Accessed 13 February 2018).
Hey, V. (2001). The construction of academic time: Sub/contracting academic labour in research. *Journal of Education Policy, 16*, 67–84.
Holbrook, S. E. (1991). Women's work: The feminizing of composition. *Rhetoric Review, 9*(2), 201–229.
Horner, B. (2007). Redefining work and value for writing program administration. *Journal of Advanced Composition, 27*(1–2), 163–184.
Hultgren, K. (2017). New perspectives on language and gender: Linguistic prescription and compliance in call centres. *Language in Society, 46*(5), 671–695.
Hyland, K. (2015). Genre, discipline and identity. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 19*(1), 32–43.
Hyland, K., & Shaw, P. (2016). Introduction 1–15. In K. Hyland, & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 1–15). London: Routledge.
Irigary, L. (1993). *Je, tu, nous. Toward a culture of difference*. Trans A. Martin. London: Routledge.
Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discoursal construction of identity in academic writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Johns, A., & Swales, J. (2002). Literacy and disciplinary practices: Opening and closing perspectives. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 13–28.
Kirsch, G. E. (1993). *Women writing the Academy: Audience, authority, and transformation* (Second Printing 1995). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
Kirsch, G. E., & Royster, J. J. (2010). Feminist rhetorical practices: In search of excellence. *College Composition & Communication, 61*(4), 640–672.
Kristeva, J. (1986). In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Le Ha, P. (2009). Strategic, passionate, but academic: Am I allowed in my writing? *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*(2), 134–146.
Leathwood, C., & Read, B. (2009). *Gender and the changing face of higher education*. Maidenhead: SRHE/Open University Press/McGraw Hill.
Lillis, T. (2001). *Student Writing: Access, regulation and desire*. London: Routledge.
Lillis, T. (2008). Ethnography as method, methodology and deep theorising: Closing the gap between text and context in academic writing research. *Written Communication, 25*(3), 353–388.

Lillis, T. (2011). Legitimising dialogue as textual and ideological goal in academic writing for assessment and publication. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 10*(4), 401–432.
Lillis, T., & Curry, M. J. (2018). Trajectories of knowledge and desire: Multilingual women scholars researching and writing in academia. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 32*, 53–66.
Lillis, T., & Scott, M. (2007). Defining academic literacies research: Issues of epistemology and strategy. *Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*(1), 5–32.
Lillis, T., & Tuck, J. (2016). Academic literacies: A critical lens on reading and writing in the academy. In K. Hyland, & P. Shaw (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English for academic purposes* (pp. 30–43). London: Routledge.
Litosseliti, L., & Sunderland, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Gender identity and discourse analysis*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Liu, L., Karl, R., & Ko, D. (2013). *The birth of Chinese Feminism: Essential texts in transnational theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Mauranen, A. (2013). Hybridism, edutainment, and doubt: Science blogging finding its feet. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 13*(1), 7–36.
McMullan, J. (2018). Becoming a researcher: re-inventing writing spaces. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 32*, 21–31.
Moi, T. (2008). *Introduction, Simone de Beauvoir. The making of an intellectual woman*. Oxford: Open University Press.
Morgan, B. (2009). Fostering transformative practitioners for critical EAP: Possibilities and challenges. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 8*(2), 86–99.
Morley, L. (2014). Lost leaders: Women in the global academy. *Higher Education Research and Development* (Vol. 33,(1), 114–128.
Nye, A. (1990). *Words of power*. New York: Routledge.
Prozesky, H. (2008). A career-history analysis of gender differences in publication productivity among South African academics. *Science Studies, 21*(2), 47–67.
Read, B., Robson, J., & Francis, B. (2004). Re-viewing undergraduate writing: Tutors' perceptions of essay qualities according to gender. *Research in post-Compulsory Education, 9*(2), 217–238.
Royster, J. J., & Kirsch, G. E. (2012). *Feminist rhetorical Practices: New horizons for rhetoric, composition, and literacy studies* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois).
Schell, E. (1998). *Gypsy academics and mother-teachers: Gender, contingent labor and writing instruction*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton.
Schroeder, C., Fox, H., & Bizzell, P. (Eds.). (2002). *Alt-Dis: Alternative discourses and the academy*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton Cook.
Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. B. K. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
Spender, D. (1980). *Man made language*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Stacey, J., & Wolff, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Writing Otherwise: Experiments in cultural criticism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Starfield, S., & Ravelli, L. J. (2006). The writing of this thesis was a process that I could not explore with the positivistic detachment of the classical sociologist: Self and structure in New Humanities research theses. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 5*(3), 222–243.
Swales, J. (1996). Occluded genres in the academy: The case of the submission letter. In E. Ventola, & A. Mauranen (Eds.), *Academic Writing: Intercultural and textual issues* (pp. 45–58). Amsterdan: John Benjamins.
Swann, J. (2002). Yes, but is it gender? In L. Litosseliti, & J. Sunderland (Eds.), *Gender identity and discourse analysis* (pp. 43–67). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Talbot, M. (2010). *Language and gender* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press.
Threadgold, T. (1997). *Feminist Poetics: Poiesis, performance, histories*. London: Routledge.
Tight, M. (2008). Higher education research: A citation analysis. *Higher Education Review, 38*(2), 42–59.
Tse, P., & Hyland, K. (2008). 'Robot kung fu': Gender and professional identity in biology philosophy reviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 1232–1248.
Tse, P., & Hyland, K. (2012). 'She has received many honours': Identify construction in article bio statements. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 11*(2), 155–165.
Tuell, C. (1992). Composition teaching as 'women's work': Daughters, handmaids, whores and mothers. In S. Fontaine, & S. Hunter (Eds.), *Writing ourselves into the story: Unheard voices from composition studies* (pp. 123–139). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
Tuck, J. (2018). "I'm nobody's Mum in this University": the gendering of work around student writing in UK Higher Education. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 32*, 32–41.
Turner, J. (2011). *Language and the academy*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
Wilson, R. (2012, October 22). Scholarly publishing's gender gap: Women cluster in certain fields, according to a study of millions of journal articles, while men get more credit. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. http://chronicle.com/article/The-Hard-Numbers-Behind/135236/?cid=wb&utm_source=wb&utm_medium=en Accessed March 13 2018.
Wodak, R. (Ed.). (1997). *Gender and discourse*. London: Sage.

Theresa Lillis*
School of Languages and Applied Linguistics, Stuart Hall Building, The OpenUniversity, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK

Jennifer McMullan
The Open University, PO Box 968, North Sydney, NSW, 2059, UK

Australian Catholic University, Level 10, 33 Berry St, North Sydney, 2060, UK

Jackie Tuck
School of Languages and Applied Linguistics, Stuart Hall Building, The OpenUniversity, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA, UK
* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: Theresa.Lillis@open.ac.uk

Available online 6 April 2018