Strategies for Resisting Sexism in the Academy

*Higher Education,
Gender and Intersectionality*

Editor

Gail Crimmins

Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education

This Series aims to provide a comprehensive space for an increasingly diverse and complex area of interdisciplinary social science research: gender and education. Because the field of women and gender studies is developing rapidly and becoming 'internationalised' – as are traditional social science disciplines such as sociology, educational studies, social geography, and so on – there is a greater need for this dynamic, global Series that plots emerging definitions and debates and monitors critical complexities of gender and education. This Series has an explicitly feminist approach and orientation and attends to key theoretical and methodological debates, ensuring a continued conversation and relevance within the well-established, inter-disciplinary field of gender and education.

The Series combines renewed and revitalised feminist research methods and theories with emergent and salient public policy issues. These include pre-compulsory and post-compulsory education; 'early years' and 'lifelong' education; educational (dis)engagements of pupils, students and staff; trajectories and intersectional inequalities including race, class, sexuality, age and disability; policy and practice across educational landscapes; diversity and difference, including institutional (schools, colleges, universities), locational and embodied (in 'teacher'–'learner' positions); varied global activism in and beyond the classroom and the 'public university'; educational technologies and transitions and the (ir)relevance of (in)formal educational settings; and emergent educational mainstreams and margins. In using a critical approach to gender and education, the Series recognises the importance of probing beyond the boundaries of specific territorial-legislative domains in order to develop a more international, intersectional focus. In addressing varied conceptual and methodological questions, the Series combines an intersectional focus on competing – and sometimes colliding – strands of educational provisioning and equality and 'diversity', and provides insightful reflections on the continuing critical shift of gender and feminism within (and beyond) the academy.

More information about this series at
http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14626

Gail Crimmins
Editor

Strategies for Resisting Sexism in the Academy

Higher Education, Gender and Intersectionality

palgrave
macmillan

Editor
Gail Crimmins
School of Communication
and Creative Industries
University of the Sunshine Coast
Maroochydore, QLD, Australia

Cover image: © Sirintra_Pumsopa/Getty

*To the women in academia and beyond who take a stand against sexism
in all its guises and disguises, and to the resisters who have come before
and on whose shoulders we stand, this book is dedicated to you.*

And to you, for sharing our resistance.

Acknowledgements

Praise for *Strategies for Resisting Sexism in the Academy*

"This collection is at once bold and brilliant, profoundly original and cutting-edge because it does much more than just fill an important gap in scholarship concerning the complexity and extent of sexual inequality in academia, and the multiple ways in which sexism impacts upon women academics, it advances direct action for all those who work towards gender e/quality. *Strategies for Resisting Sexism in the Academy* brings to the fore institutional, political, practical, pedagogical, onto-epistemological and methodological issues and uniquely conceptualises engagements with intersectionality, community, space, place, and practice and it does so affirmatively. It challenges the ways in which the neo-liberal climate of universities exacerbate masculinist, patriarchal practices, and generate gendered discrimination. This unique and international collection also offers judiciously chosen rich and diverse case studies of strategies of feminist resistance to sexism and gender inequality. This is an absolute must read (and action) for all who move within the academy and beyond."

—Pam Burnard, *Professor of Arts, Creativities and Educations, University of Cambridge, UK*

"*Resisting Sexism in the Academy* offers practical strategies and tools for individuals, organizations, and institutions to support active resistance and disruption of patriarchy, sexism, and gender inequality in higher education. A major contribution of the volume is the attention on sexist policy in higher education. While the individual acts of resistance can and have induced change, systematic change comes from dismantling policies that uphold gender inequality in higher education. The collective cases and individual narratives from around the world chronicle women's active ways of knowing and resisting to create a better academy for future generations."

—Tamara Bertrand Jones, *Associate Professor, Florida State University, USA*

"This edited collection confronts persistent challenges in higher education related to sexist and gendered practices. It provides insight into routine operations of the academy and in a refreshing approach, much needed strategies aimed at identifying and deliberately resisting everyday sexist practices and commonplace examples of gender inequality. The book is characterised by its focus on resistance, action and the significance of intersectionality, including matters related to ethnicity, class/caste, sexual orientation, and particular patterns of work. It is a call to action backed by practical strategies aimed at moving closer to achieving gender equality in all dimensions."

—Sue Grieshaber, *Professor of Education, Director of Research, La Trobe University, Australia*

"This book illuminates the challenges faced by women while simultaneously highlighting women's pre-emptive responses to the obstacles they face in the academy. These global references to position, power, and the undoing of these structures which impede women's navigation of higher education is both enlightening and motivational. Though all of the chapters stand to inform the means through which sexism in the Academy can be addressed, of particularly significant value are the chapters which guide women in shifting the typical paradigms to allow for truth telling and invocation of uplift of the experience and wisdom of women in the context of Feminisms. Chapters like Lipton

and Crimmins' *New Bottles for New Wine: Recipes on Arts-Based Research Practice as a Form of Feminist Resistance* and Moxnes' *Working Across/Within/Through Academic Conventions of Writing a Ph.D.: The Risks of Daring to Write a Feminist Thesis* not only provoke systemic thought and change, but provide models for other women to join in the resistance. It is certainly time to 'pivot the center'! Brava."

—Professor Denise Davis-Maye, *Alabama State University, USA*

Contents

Notes on Contributors

Dr. Sundari Anitha is a Reader in the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Lincoln. She has published widely in her two areas of research interest—gender-based violence and gender and work. Her recent work has examined forced marriage, transnational marriage abandonment, sex-selective abortion, gender-based violence in university communities, and the position and struggles of South Asian women workers in the UK labour market.

Dr. Elizabeth (Beth) Beckmann is an Australian National Teaching Fellow, a Principal Fellow of the Higher Education Academy (PFHEA) and a Senior Fellow of the Staff Educational Development Association (SFSEDA). Beth has an academic background in natural sciences, environmental management and higher education, with degrees from the University of Cambridge, the University of New England, and the Australian National University. As an academic for many years, Beth received national and institutional awards for her innovative work in teaching, academic professional development and gender-based personal development, including resilience programmes for woman early career academics. Since 2013, Beth's pioneering national leadership of highly inclusive professional recognition for university educators has seen the

UK-centric Higher Education Academy (HEA) fellowship scheme expand internationally and across Australia. Now an independent consultant and mentor, Beth is supporting many Australian universities as they engage with professional recognition of university educators in an internationally benchmarked context. She especially focuses on facilitating the recognition, confidence-building and leadership development of all those wonderful women who contribute so much to higher education across the world. In the broader community, Beth contributed to the Australian Capital Territory's Ministerial Advisory Council on Women from 2015–18 and instigated two Gender Equality Forums in Canberra in 2018.

Dr. Kate Carruthers Thomas is a Research Fellow and Project Manager for Athena SWAN at Birmingham City University, UK. Kate specialises in interdisciplinary enquiry into the fields of higher education and gender with a particular interest in critical mobilities and mobile/spatial methods. Between 2007 and 2014, Kate was the national convenor of the UALL (Universities Association for Lifelong Learning) Women in Lifelong Learning network. She is currently Co-convenor of the SRHE Access and Widening Participation Network.

Dr. Gail Crimmins is an Early Career Researcher at the University of the Sunshine Coast (USC), Australia. Gail's research explores gender inequity in the academy and feminist, narrative and arts informed approaches to research. Gail has authored/co-authored over 20 papers in international peer-reviewed journals including *TEXT: Journal of Writing and Writing Programs*, *Journal of Narrative Inquiry*, *Studies in Higher Education*, *Higher Education Research*, *International Journal of Academic Development* and *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*. She has also presented at international conferences, including *Gender in Education, Australian Women's and Gender Studies Biennial International Conference*, and *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*. Gail's first book, *Theatricalising Narrative Research on Women Casual Academics*, was published in the Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education Series, January 2018.

Dr. Katy Deepwell founded and edited for 20 years, *n.paradoxa: international feminist art journal* (http://www.ktpress.co.uk). This unique journal published over 550 articles in 40 volumes on the work of contemporary women artists by over 400 writers living and working in more than 80 countries. In February 2017, she launched a MOOC (Mass Open Online Course) on Feminism and Contemporary Art: http://nparadoxa.com. Katy Deepwell became Professor of Contemporary Art, Theory and Criticism at Middlesex University in 2013 where she teaches on the B.A. and M.A. and Ph.D. programmes in Fine Art. Her books include: (co-edited with Agata Jakubowska) *All-Women Art Spaces in Europe* (Liverpool University Press, forthcoming, 2018); *Feminist Art Manifestos: An Anthology* (KT press, 2014); *Women Artists Between the Wars* (Manchester University Press, 2010) on British women artists in the 1920s and 1930s; (co-edited with Mila Bredikhina) *Gender, Art, Theory Anthology* (in Russian, Moscow: Rosspen, 2005); *Dialogues: Women Artists from Ireland* (I.B. Tauris, 2005) *Women Artists and Modernism* (Manchester University Press, 1998) and *New Feminist Art Criticism* (Manchester University Press, 1995).

Dr. Susanne Gannon is Associate Professor of Education at Western Sydney University Australia. She is co-editor of the journal *Gender and Education*. She has published widely on collective biography methodology since first using it in her postgraduate and doctoral studies. She researches gender, ethnicity and equity, innovative writing practices and pedagogies, place-based learning and English education. She is co-author/co-editor of several books including *Deleuze and Collaborative Writing: An Immanent Plane of composition* (with Wyatt, Gale and Davies, 2011) and *Resisting Educational Inequality: Reframing Policy and Practice in Schools Serving Vulnerable Communities* (with Sawyer and Hattam, 2018) as well as *Becoming Girl: Collective Biography and the Production of Girlhood* (co-authored/co-edited with Marnina Gonick, 2014).

Dr. Marnina Gonick is Canada Research Chair in Gender at Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax, Nova Scotia. She is the author of *Between Femininities: Ambivalence, Identity and the Education of Girls*

(SUNY Press, 2003) and co-author of *Young Femininity: Girlhood, Power and Social Change* (with Aapola and Harris; Palgrave, 2004), as well as *Becoming Girl: Collective Biography and the Production of Girlhood* (co-authored/co-edited with Susanne Gannon, 2014). Her articles have appeared in journals including *Feminist Media Studies*, *Girlhood Studies*, *Jeunesse*, *Gender and Education* and *NWSA Journal*.

Dr. Heather Laube, Ph.D. is Associate Professor of Sociology and Chair of the Department of Sociology/Anthropology/Criminal Justice at the University of Michigan-Flint. She serves as Faculty Fellow for Faculty Mentoring, and researches faculty needs, examines institutional structures, develops programming and conducts workshops. In 2015, she was a Fulbright Scholar at Karl-Franzens University, Graz, Austria.

Dr. Ruth Lewis is Associate Professor in the Department of Social Sciences at Northumbria University. Her research focuses on feminist activism and gender-based violence. Recent work examines gender-based violence in universities and activism about it (with Sundari Anitha and Susan Marine), online abuse (with Mike Rowe and Clare Wiper) and women-only space as a political strategy (with Elizabeth Sharp). Earlier research with Rebecca Dobash, Russell Dobash and Kate Cavanagh examined domestic violence perpetrators programmes and a sociological examination of homicide.

Dr. Briony Lipton is an academic in the School of Sociology at The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia. Her research interests include gender inequality in higher education, and organisational studies, feminist methodologies, pedagogy and critical autoethnography. Briony has published in a several international peer-reviewed journals including *Leadership*, *Higher Education Research and Development*, and *Creative Approaches to Research*, along with other edited collections, and pieces in popular outlets such as *Broad Agenda*. She recently co-authored a monograph entitled *We Only Talk Feminist Here: Feminist Academics, Voice and Agency in the Neoliberal University* (Palgrave).

Anna R. Moxnes is a kindergarten teacher, Ph.D. student and teacher educator in Early Childhood Teacher Education at the Department of Pedagogy, Faculty of Humanities and Education, The University

College of Southeast Norway. Anna works with feminist questions to rethink how teaching is facilitated, and what it can offer becoming kindergarten teachers.

Dr. Sandy O'Sullivan is an Aboriginal (Wiradjuri) woman and Associate Professor in Creative Industries at the University of the Sunshine Coast, and ambassador for IndigenousX. For 25 years, she has taught and researched across gender, performance, design and First Nations' identity and holds a Ph.D. across these intersecting areas. Sandy is an enduring Australian Learning and Teaching Fellow and has recently completed an internationally focused Australian Research Council programme examining the representation and engagement of First Nations' Peoples across 470 museums and keeping places.

Dr. Ruth Pearce is a Research Fellow in the School of Sociology and Social Policy at the University of Leeds, UK. Her research explores issues of inequality, marginalisation, power and political struggle from a trans feminist perspective. She has written on topics such as the Athena SWAN gender equality scheme, LGBT music scenes and trans temporalities, and is currently working on an international project that explores transmasculine people's experiences of pregnancy and childbirth. Ruth's monograph, *Understanding Trans Health: Discourse, Power and Possibility*, is published by Policy Press. She blogs about her work at http://ruthpearce.net.

Dr. Kay Siebler, Ph.D. is a Professor of English and Women's/Gender Studies at Missouri Western State University in St. Joseph, Missouri. She has been teaching towards social justice since 1986 when she began teaching in rural Morocco as a Peace Corps Volunteer. Her most recent book, *Learning Queer Identity in the Digital Age*, was published by Palgrave Macmillan Press in 2016.

Dr. Anagha Tambe is Assistant Professor and Director at Krantijyoti Savitribai Phule Women's Studies Centre, SP Pune University. Her research areas are gender, caste and sexuality, focusing on sexualised work and popular cultural practices, and the devadasi question. Presently, she is involved in research projects on inequalities and democracy in higher education, and also disciplinary histories of Women's

Studies. She is interested in developing pedagogies and writing teaching learning resources in Women's Studies, specifically in the regional languages. She is also an office-bearer of the executive committee of the Indian Association of Women's Studies.

Dr. Maria Tsouroufli is a Reader in Women and Gender, Athena Swan Champion for Education and Lead for AS Intersectionality Working Group, Ed.D. Professional Doctorate in Education Programme Leader and Lead of Educational Policy Research Cluster at the Faculty of Education Health and Wellbeing, University of Wolverhampton, England. Maria holds a Ph.D. in gender, and her work is concerned with the relationship between policy, practice and inequalities, exploring how gender inequalities are connected to subjectivities, every day practices, pedagogy, culture, and institutional processes and policy. This research spans issues of gender, ethnicity, migration and social class and has been underpinned by engagements with feminist post-structural thinking about power, the subject, space and the political. Maria has strong expertise in ethnographic and biographic research approaches, is trained in statistics and employs narrative research and feminist autobiography to explore embodied disruptions of student and professional identities throughout learning and career trajectories across different national and sociocultural organisational contexts.

#FEAS (Feminist Educators Against Sexism) are an Australian-based international feminist collective committed to interrupting, challenging and otherwise shouting out about sexism in educational spaces. #FEAS was formed by feminists Mindy Blaise (Edith Cowan University), Emily Gray (RMIT University) and Linda Knight (QUT). They are all situated within education, but bring different expertise, including early childhood education, teacher education, qualitative research methods, performance and visual arts, to their collaborative work.

The Women Who Write practice a rejection of masculinist, auditable, individualised and affectless working practices (Dr. Linda Henderson, Monash University, Australia; Dr. Ali Black, University of the Sunshine Coast (USC), Australia; Dr. Janice K. Jones, Honorary Senior Lecturer Arts Education, University of Southern Queenslanda; and Dr. Gail Crimmins, USC, Australia).

The Res-Sisters are a feminist collective of nine early career English academics who work within the sociology and cultural studies of education and youth. They are Jessie Abrahams (Surrey University); Kim Allen (University of Leeds); Victoria Cann (University of East Anglia); Laura Harvey (University of Brighton); Sumi Hollingworth; Nicola Ingram (Lancaster University); Kirsty Morrin (University of Liverpool); Helene Snee (Manchester Metropolitan University); and Annabel Wilson (Cardiff University). The group's collective interests include challenging inequality both within and outside of academia, resisting the neoliberal agenda and making space for alternative voices to be heard. They have published collectively on this topic in the edited collection *Being an Early Career Feminist Academic: Global Perspectives, Experiences and Challenges* (2016, Palgrave, eds. Rachel Thwaites and Amy Pressland). They also host a guest blog for fellow academics: https://ressisters.wordpress.com/.

List of Figures

Part I

Initiatives and Practices of Resistance That Support Institutions, as Well as Individual Academics, to Identify and Address Sexual Disadvantage in the Academy

1

A Structural Account of Inequality in the International Academy: Why Resistance to Sexism Remains Urgent and Necessary

Gail Crimmins

The title of this collection of essays is 'strategies for *resisting sexism* in the academy'. In this chapter, I explore the definitions and associations of sexism and establish the need for resistance as a multi-pronged attack against the seven-headed dragon (van den Brink and Benschop 2012) of sexism.

Sexism is generally defined as prejudice or discrimination based on a person's sex or gender. The term was coined by feminist Caroline Bird in a speech she delivered in 1968 where she claimed, 'There is recognition abroad that we are in many ways a sexist country. Sexism is judging people by their sex when sex doesn't matter' (Bird 1968). She formulated the term to raise consciousness about the oppression of girls and women in the USA, though it has subsequently been used to also include the oppression of women, girls and intersexual and transgender people

G. Crimmins (✉)
School of Communication and Creative Industries,
University of the Sunshine Coast, Maroochydore, QLD, Australia
e-mail: gcrimmin@usc.edu.au

3

internationally (Masequesmay 2008). The main function of sexism is to maintain patriarchy through ideological and material practices that oppress people on the basis of their sex or gender. In particular, sexism is based on the notion that women and men are opposite to one another, with widely different and complementary roles. Within this view, women are conceptualised as weaker and less capable than men, especially in the realm of logic and rational reasoning. By extension, women are considered to be ineffective leaders in business, politics and academia (Masequesmay 2008) which propagates women's marginalised position in society and structural disadvantage in academia.

Yet, within a postfeminist sensibility there seems to be a contemporary boredom or frustration with the term sexism as a frame of reference, and with an identification of patriarchy and structural gender inequality more generally. Sexism, and the need to resist it, is considered passé—no longer relevant or applicable. Gill et al. (2017) draw attention to key features of a postfeminism that repudiate contemporary sexism. The first of these is the notion of 'pasting' (Tasker and Negra 2007) and 'overing' (Ahmed 2012), as if sexism is a thing safely located in the past or only apparent in other/'lesser' geographical locations. Such positioning frequently uses 'a racist/Islamophobic discourse in which inequalities are positioned as not here but "there"' (Gill et al. 2017, p. 227). A second feature of postfeminism that renounces sexism is gender fatigue and the premise that 'all the battles have been won', and equality has been achieved (Gill et al. 2017, p. 229). For example, Projansky identifies that for postfeminists like Hakim, 'feminism has worked, feminists are happy and thus there is no longer a need for feminist activism' (Projansky 2001, cited in Lewis and Simpson 2017, p. 118). Finally, an overlap with neoliberal ideas of individualism and individual choice dismantles the notion of contemporary structural disadvantage that requires critique. The choice and preference discourses circulate ideas that women have a choice to 'lean into' work, homemaking or both (Lewis and Simpson 2017). Such 'individualizing technologies' place blame on women themselves for their lack of academic success (in terms of promotion or decision-making capacity) and remedial professional development is introduced to change women, rather

than challenging an unjust world (Gill and Orgad 2015). Therefore, in an era of a postfeminist sensibility, the term 'sexism' is assumed to be a backward referent to the ideas and practices of a different/other place or time, and so resistance to it can be accused of being past its use by date: 'Allied with a "retreat from structural accounts of inequality" postfeminism repudiates sexism and the need for feminism' (Gill et al. 2017, p. 227). In response, I present below a structural account of inequality in the international academy in a bid to illuminate both the impact of sexism on women's roles in academia and to demonstrate why resistance to sexism remains urgent and necessary.

As far back as 20 years ago, Husu determined that the under-representation of women in senior decision-making roles in academia was an increasingly and globally recognised serious problem (Husu 2000). Yet, while the overall trend over the last 40 years has been an increase in the number of women in higher education both as students and staff in many countries (Machado-Taylor et al. 2008), their presence in the senior- and executive-level positions remains disproportionately low. The proportion of women in casual and relatively low levels of academic work in relation to those in senior and executive academic positions, and the pay gap between genders, provides evidence of unequal and patriarchal structures in contemporary universities. Hearn's assertion that academia is an 'incredibly hierarchical gendered institution' (Hearn 2001, p. 72) is internationally borne out as women remain a minority in senior appointments and leadership positions internationally (Machado-Taylor and Özkanli 2013). The trend to furnish lower academic positions with women is evident even in countries where women make up the majority of university workforce overall such as Australia (58% in 2016), and where majority of students are female as in Australia (55% in 2014) (Jarboe 2017). Studies from the UK, USA, Canada and Australia show that approximately half of the PhDs awarded go to women; however, the proportion of female tenures at the universities are lower than those for men, and it further decreases in positions as full professors (American Council on Education 2016; Canadian Association of University Teachers 2008; Lindhardt and Berthelsen 2017).

Even though the percentage of women academics varies across the world, a general picture of women's disadvantage remains coherent. In Europe, the proportion of women in faculty ranges from 32% (Malta) to 56% (Latvia) with an average of 41% female academics in the 28 countries of the European Union (European Commission 2015). Women represent less than 40% of the academic workforce in nine European countries and less than 45% in five countries (Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, and the UK). Six countries in Europe can claim close to gender-balanced numbers (Finland, Norway, Ireland, Bulgaria, Norway and Serbia). Three countries (Denmark, Lithuania and Latvia) can boast to have more than 50% female academic workforce (European Commission 2017). Similarly, in Indian higher education institutions, 44% of students are women and 36% of academic staff are women (Morley and Crossouard 2014). However, when it comes to the high academic ranks of professorship in academia, the gender imbalances significantly increase at senior levels.

The gender gap increases with higher academic ranks across all nations. In Europe, the proportion of women academic staff in lowest academic entry grade D is 47%, grade C at 45% and grade B at 37%. Women on average occupy only 21% of A level (full professorship) academic positions in the European Union with just over one per cent progress at this level compared to previous three years to 2013 (European Commission 2015). There is one woman for every five male professors in countries such as Germany, Italy, Hungary, Poland and Portugal but fewer female professors than this in Ireland, Greece, Cyprus, Netherlands and Belgium. One professorial position in four is held by a woman in the UK, Sweden, Norway and Switzerland, and only one in three professors is a woman in Malta (European Commission 2017). The national data for the USA show similar patterns where 24% of professors, 38% of associates, 46% of assistants and 56% of lecturers/instructors are women (Monroe et al. 2014).

Disparities are evident in women's representation in the upper institutional hierarchy of Australian academia also, where in 2016, 68% of positions above Senior Lecturer roles (Associate Professors and Professors)

were occupied by men (Australian Government Department of Education and Training 2016). Finally, in India, the total of 26% of professors, 31% of associate professors and 39% of lecturers/assistant professors were female in 2011 (Morley and Crossouard 2014).

Moreover, intersectional factors provide further evidence of structural de/privilege in academia. For instance, only 2% of Asian females are full Professors in Australian universities, compared to 7% male (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.) and in the UK, according to HESA data, there are around 350 Black female professors in the UK, out of a total number of 18,000 professors across the UK, meaning that Black women make up less than 2% of the professoriate in higher education (Solanke 2017). In the USA, in 2015, among full-time professors, 27% were White females and 2% each were Asian/Pacific Islander females (U.S. Department of Education 2017). In India, gender intersects with caste identities to provide varying levels of privilege where in a state university in western India, women make up only 39% of faculty, and yet 78% of women faculty come disproportionately from 'upper castes' (Tambe 2019).

Women who are mothers also fare worse than nonmothers. Parenting or caring responsibilities in the academy are known as a 'motherhood penalty' as it is well established that mothers and pregnant women are rated as less competent, committed and dependable than nonmothers with identical qualifications (Cuddy et al. 2008). Also, employers are less likely to recruit or promote mothers compared to otherwise equivalent nonmothers, and when they do, they pay mothers significantly less than nonmothers for doing the exact same job, though fathers are paid the same as nonfathers (Correll et al. 2007). Differences are noted that indicate a potential toll on women's personal lives at the expense of an academic career compared to their male. Among American higher education institution presidents, fewer women are married (71% compared to 90% of married men) and have children (72% compared to 90% of men) (American Council on Education 2016). Lindhardt and Berthelsen (2017) point out that women professors who are not divorced and enjoy a family life with children are a rarity, and more often women in academia are single parents and/or unmarried. These statistics support the notion that 'having children seems to be a career

advantage for men, while it for women seems to be a career killer' (p. 1249) though evidence suggests that having a young family does not appear to form a barrier for an academic career for men. Relatedly, even heterosexual women who are partnered or married (both with and without children) also face discrimination when applying for an academic appointment. Rivera (2017) identified that academic hiring committees in the USA penalise heterosexual female—but not heterosexual male—applicants who have partners working in academia or in high-status professional jobs. In particular, 'committee members believed that partnered women were less likely to accept job offers when a geographic move was involved. They excluded partnered women from offers when there were viable male or single female alternatives' (Rivera 2017, p. 3).

Significantly, there is only one female higher education institution leader for every three to five male counterparts. In European countries, in the USA and Canada there has been noted a slow overall increase over the last decades in number of women in academic leaderships (Catalyst 2015). Women still constitute only 27% of university presidents in the USA, 23% in Canada, and 20% in the European Union (American Council on Education 2017; European Commission 2015). Furthermore, at the current rate of academic promotions and appointments, it will take 119 years for women to achieve equal numbers in the professoriate (Savigny 2014).

This is an interesting phenomenon considering that majority of the student populations in these countries tend to be female, and as is true for the USA, women have granted more than half of bachelor's degrees since 1981, master's degrees since 1991 and Ph.D. degrees since 2001 (Cromwell 2017; Johnson 2017). In the USA, women are persistently a minority also on the university governing boards where their proportion has remained at around 30% for the past 20 years (American Council on Education 2016). For historical and cultural reasons, the gender imbalance in some Asian countries fairs worse. For example, between 5 and 10% (one in 15) of academic leadership positions is filled by a woman in China and some institutions lack in female leaders altogether (Yinhan et al. 2013; Zhao and Jones 2017). The number of women Vice-Chancellors varies greatly globally also. According to Morley (2015), only 16% of Vice-Chancellors in the

European Union higher education institutions are women, and only one in four Deputy Vice-Chancellors in Australian universities is a woman (Jarboe 2017). However, other countries such as Japan (2%), India (3%) and Hong Kong (0%) fair even worse in terms of gender imbalances at these academic levels.

There is a difference in the types of work in which women academics engage, compared to male academics where teaching roles are increasingly held by women and research roles by men. Across the 28 countries of the European Union, only close to a third of researchers (33%) are women (European Commission 2015). As one example, in the UK, teaching roles in 2015/2016 were held by 52% of women whereas research only roles were occupied by 53% of men, and 59% of men were in combined positions of teaching and research (Higher Education Statistics Agency 2017). These figures can be considerably worse in certain sectors such as business enterprise research, where in the European Union four out of five researchers are men (European Commission 2015). Similarly, research in the US higher education institutions supports this data on gender inequality (Curtis 2011). Misra et al. (2011) established that women and men in the same academic ranks spent their work time differently—women spent more time on teaching and mentoring whereas men worked on research. Misra and colleagues (2011) found that by spending around seven hours per week of their time differently, men accumulated over 200 additional research hours per year to women's similar time spent on teaching and service.

International data indicate that women in academia are generally more likely than men to enter casual, fixed-period, short-term, part-time and contractual agreements ('precarious contractual arrangements'). However, there is much variety across countries in terms of engagement in part-time and fixed-term academic employment. For instance, in the UK, permanent full-time contracts were held by 61% of men compared to 39% women, and permanent part-time contracts were signed by 42% men versus 58% women. Concurrently, full-time fixed-term contracts were held by 57% of men and part-time contracts by 53% of women (Higher Education Statistics Agency 2017). In the European Union at country level, on average more women researchers (14%) than men (9%) worked part-time in 2012, and 11% of women

and 7% of men were employed by precarious contracts (fixed term or no contracts). In total of 18 of the European Union countries, female academics had higher levels of part-time employment than their male colleagues. Considering the whole of EU economy, the rates of researchers engaged in part-time work in 2012 were 9% for men and 32% for women (European Commission 2015).

Precarious employment was lower for men than for women in higher education institutions also. The precarious employment rate was at least 15% for women researchers in nine countries. Hungary and the Czech Republic were among the countries with biggest gaps in part-time employment rates for women and men—with 10 percentage points each. Overall, the gender gaps in part-time employment rates were bigger than for precarious employment rates in Europe (European Commission 2015). In the USA, women have consistently been found to be more disadvantaged in terms of tenure. A study of 106 cases of junior faculty at one US university by Junn (2012) examined tenure offers and established that in the period of 1998–2012, as many as 92% of male academics were offered tenure compared to only 55% of women. More recent data by the U.S. Department of Education (2016) concur that female academics hold fewer tenured positions across the US higher education institutions (43% of women compared to 57% men). In Australia, 75% of the fractional full-time and the majority of academics at Level A (associate lecturer/tutor) are women (May et al. 2011, pp. 310–311), the majority of whom aspire to ongoing or permanent appointments (May et al. 2011).

There is also a persistent gender gap in earnings that favours men in academia across the world. The extent of gender differences varies across types of institutions. Since this financial data are often not publicly shared, particularly in terms of discretionary allowances where women are feared to fall much shorter, it is hard to paint a consistent picture of the extent of the gender pay gap in academia in many countries (Bailey et al. 2016). Nevertheless, women academics in the USA are paid on average $13,616 less than male academics at public institutions and $17,843 at private institutions, which means that women only earn about 80–85% of salaries awarded men (American Council on Education 2016). In fact, in the USA, men of all academic ranks and

institutions receive on average higher salaries for the same work and this is a trend that has remained largely constant over the last three decades. Similarly, the U.S. Department of Education (2016) sets the average salary for male academics at 21% above that for females (2014–2015).

Pay disparities in the UK also vary across types of universities with largest gender pay gaps for academic staff reaching up to 27% found at research-intensive higher education institutions (the Russell Group universities) (Hall 2017). Aggregated data from the Higher Education Statistics Agency show that in 2015–2016, women in the UK received an annual pay that was about 12% less than male scholars (Higher Education Statistics Agency 2017). Other countries such as Canada mirror these gender imbalances in pay, as women academics here receive 89% of the average salaries of their male colleagues (Canadian Association of University Teachers 2011). In the European Union, in 2010 women academics had average gross hourly earnings that were 18% lower than for men. In eight countries, the gender gap in average gross hourly earnings exceeded 20 percentage points. This included Cyprus (27%), Estonia (26%), Ireland, the Netherlands and the UK (25%), the Czech Republic (24%), Slovakia (21%) and Sweden (20% difference in average salaries between men and women in academia) (European Commission 2015). Relatedly, Currie and Hill (2013) found that in Australia men on average were paid around $8700 more than women in terms of discretionary allowances for research and travel in 2016.

Gender salary difference has been found to increase with age. In the EU, women in academia receive an average of 7% lower salaries than men until up to when they are 35 years old, 15% less when they are between ages 35 and 44, 18% less when they are between ages 45 and 54, and 23% smaller pay when over the age of 55. In six European countries—Hungary, Belgium, the UK, the Netherlands, Lithuania and Switzerland—the gender difference in pay for women aged above 55 years exceeds the level of that in the below 35 years of age category by 20% points (European Commission 2015). And in terms of academic seniority, the average salary for Australian women who were Vice-Chancellors in Australia was $831,000 compared to $874,000 for men and only one woman Vice-Chancellor received a pay package that exceeded one million dollars compared to nine men (Hare 2016).

I have deliberately presented these statistics, percentages and figures above with little commentary in order to illuminate the presence and impact of structural sexism in the international academy and in doing so I resist a postfeminist sensibility of 'pasting' (Tasker and Negra 2007) and 'overing' (Ahmed 2012) sexism. The evidence of structural sexism validates Ahmed's assertion that 'Sexism seems to operate as a well-oiled machine that runs all the more smoothly and efficiently for being in constant use' (2015, p. 5) and her warning that sexism might drop out of the feminist vocabulary. 'Not because of our success in transforming disciplines, but because of the exhaustion of having to keep struggling to transform disciplines. It might be because of sexism that we do not attend to sexism. We lose the word; keep the thing' (Ahmed 2015, p. 6).

Similarly, in 2004 Acker and Armenti identified that a 2001 edited collection on gender and education contained no chapters on women academics, and their review of the 2001 and 2002 issues of some key journals on gender and education, sociology of education, and higher education revealed that only about one article per year per journal was devoted to women in academia. They use these phenomena to argue that times 'have not changed so much that we should abandon the effort to expose deleterious working conditions for women academics. In fact, the situation is quite the opposite: underlying structures and ideologies that work to the disadvantage of women in academe continue to exert a strong, if increasingly unheralded, impact' (Acker and Armenti 2004, pp. 3–4).

I suggest, too, that the structures in academia continue to disadvantage women and underlying ideologies, including postfeminist sensibilities that feminism is no longer needed, allow sexism to go/grow unchecked. Therefore, sexism needs to be named so that it can be rendered visible and challenged. For this reason, and galvanised by Ahmed's (2015) refusal to allow the term 'sexism' to slip out of focus (as if it somehow belongs to the past/the previous/the once-was/the elsewhere/ the 'otherwhere'/the non-West), the following chapters in this collection harness the ingenuity and persistence of women who resist sexism in the academy. They provide resources to throw a spanner in the works (of sexism) or to use Sarah Franklin's evocative phrase, a 'wench in the works' (Ahmed 2015, p. 5).

References

Acker, A., & Armenti, C. (2004). Sleepless in academia. *Gender and Education, 16,* 3–24.

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2015). Sexism—A problem with a name. *New Formations: A Journal of Culture/Theory/Politics, 86,* 5–13.

American Council on Education. (2016, January 15). *New report looks at the status of women in Higher Education.* http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/New-Report-Looks-at-the-Status-of-Women-in-Higher-Education.aspx. Last accessed September 2018.

American Council on Education. (2017, January 15). *American college president study 2017.* http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Pages/American-College-President-Study.aspx. Last accessed September 2018.

Australian Government Department of Education and Training. (2016). *Higher Education Statistics Data Cube (uCube)—Staff 2016 count by gender.* http://highereducationstatistics.education.gov.au/Default.aspx. Last accessed September 2018.

Bailey, J., Peetz, D., Strachan, G., Whitehouse, G., & Broadbent, K. (2016). Academic pay loadings and gender in Australian universities. *Journal of Industrial Relations, 58*(5), 647–668.

Bird, C. (1968). On being born female. *Vital Speeches of the Day, 25*(3), 88–91.

Canadian Association of University Teachers. (2008, March). Women's university enrolments: Trends by level of study and discipline, 1992–2003. *CAUT Equity Review, 3,* 1–8.

Canadian Association of University Teachers. (2011, March). The persistent gap: Understanding male-female salary differentials amongst Canadian academic staff. *CAUT Equity Review, 5,* 1–8.

Catalyst. (2015, July 9). *Quick take: Women in academia.* http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/women-academia. Last accessed September 2018.

Correll, S., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology, 112*(5), 1297–1339.

Cromwell, C. (2017, January 30). Why 27 percent of university presidents being women isn't enough. *Entity Magazine.* https://www.entitymag.com/not-enough-women-as-university-presidents/. Last accessed September 2018.

Cuddy, A., Fiske, S., & Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the bias map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 40,* 61–149.

Currie, J., & Hill, B. (2013). Gendered universities and the wage gap: Case study of a pay equity audit in an Australian university. *Higher Education Policy, 26*(1), 65–82.

Curtis, J. W. (2011, April 11). *Persistent inequity: Gender and academic employment.* Prepared for 'New Voices in Pay Equity': An Event for Equal Pay Day. https://www.aaup.org/NR/rdonlyres/08E023AB-E6D8-4DBD-99A0-24E5EB73A760/0/persistent_inequity.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

European Commission. (2015). *She figures 2015.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice. (2017). *Modernisation of higher education in Europe: Academic staff—2017. Eurydice report.* Brussels and Belgium: Education Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency.

Gill, R., & Orgad, S. (2015). The cult(ure) of confidence. *Australian Feminist Studies, 30*(86), 324–344.

Gill, R., Kelan, E., & Scharff, C. (2017). A postfeminist sensibility at work. *Gender, Work and Organization, 24*(3), 226–244.

Hall, R. (2017, May 26). Gender pay gap in academia will take 40 years to close. *The Guardian.* https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/2017/may/26/gender-pay-gap-in-academia-will-take-40-years-to-close. Last accessed September 2018.

Hare, J. (2016, August 31). Michael Spence and Greg Craven top Vice-Chancellor pay rises. *The Australian.* http://www.theaustralian.com.au/higher-education/michael-spence-and-greg-craven-top-vicechancellor-pay-rises/news-story/5c76b0cecbdf31261a28dda764ad60d8. Last accessed September 2018.

Hearn, J. (2001). Academia, management and men: Making the connections, exploring the implications. In A. Brooks & A. McKinnon (Eds.), *Gender and the reconstructed university: Changing management and culture in higher education* (pp. 69–89). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Higher Education Statistics Agency. (2017). *Higher education statistics for the UK 2015/16.* https://www.hesa.ac.uk/data-and-analysis/publications/higher-education-2015-16. Last accessed September 2018.

Husu, L. (2000). Gender discrimination in the promised land of gender equality. *Higher Education in Europe, 25*(2), 221–228.

Jarboe, N. (2017). *WomenCount: Australian universities 2016.* https://women-count.org/portfolio/womencount-australian-universities-2016/. Last accessed September 2018.

Johnson, H. L. (2017). *Pipelines, pathways and institutional leadership: An update on the status of women in Higher Education.* http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/HES-Pipelines-Pathways-and-Institutional-Leadership-2017.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Junn, J. 2012. *Analysis of data on tenure at USC dornsife.* https://feministphilosophers.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/c9093-junnreport.pdf. Last accessed September 17, 2017.

Lewis, P., & Simpson, R. (2017). Hakim revisited: Preference, choice and the postfeminist gender regime. *Gender, Work and Organization, 24*(2), 115–133.

Lindhardt, T., & Berthelsen, C. B. (2017). h-index or G-spot: Female nursing researchers' conditions for an academic career. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 73*(6), 1249–1250.

Machado-Taylor, M., & Özkanli, Ö. A. (2013). Gender and academic careers in Portuguese and Turkish higher education institutions. *Egitim ve Bilim, 38*(169), 346–356.

Machado-Taylor, M., Carchalo, M. T., & White, K. (2008, December). *Women and higher education leadership in Portugal and Australia.* Paper presented at the Society for Research in Higher Education (SRHE) Conference, Liverpool, England.

Masequesmay, G. (2008). Sexism. In J. O'Brien (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Gender and Society.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

May, R., Strachan, G., Broadbent, K., & Peetz, D. (2011). The casual approach to university teaching; Time for a re-think? In K. Krause, M. Buckridge, C. Grimmer, & S. Purbrick-Illek (Eds.), *Research and development in Higher Education: Reshaping higher education* (Vol. 34, pp. 188–197). Gold Coast, Australia: Research and Development Society of Australasia.

Misra, J., Lundquist, J. H., Holmes, E., & Agiomavritis, S. (2011). The Ivory Ceiling of service work. *Academe, 97*(1), 22–26.

Monroe, K. R., Choi, J., Howell, E., Lampros-Monroe, C., Trejo, C., & Perez, V. (2014). Gender equality in the ivory tower, and how best to achieve it. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 47*(2), 418–426.

Morley, L. (2015). *Lost leaders: Women in the global academy.* Paper presented at the Sixth Annual Gulf Comparative Education Society Symposium 'Inclusion Not Exclusion: Comparative Educational Perspectives at the Heart of Sustainable Development', Dubai, United Arab Emirates. http://info.british-council.hk/edu/ged/S4A_Louise_Morley.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Morley, L., & Crossouard, B. (2014). *Women in Higher Education leadership in South Asia: Rejection, refusal, reluctance, revisioning*. https://www.british-council.org/sites/default/files/morley_crossouard_final_report_22_dec2014.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Rivera, L. (2017). *When two bodies are (not) a problem: Gender and relationship status discrimination in academic hiring*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University.

Savigny, H. (2014). Women, know your limits: Cultural sexism in academia. *Gender and Education, 26*(7), 794–809.

Solanke, I. (2017). *Black female professors in the UK (March 2017)*. https://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/BlackFemaleProfessorsMarch2017.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Tambe, A. (2019). (Hyper)Visible 'Women'/Invisible (Dalit) Women: Challenging the elusive sexism in Indian universities. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy* (pp. 129–149). Gender and Education Series. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.

Tasker, Y., & Negra, D. (2007). *Interrogating postfeminism: Gender and the politics of popular culture*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Fast facts*. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=61. Last accessed September 2018.

U.S. Department of Education. (2016). *Digest of Education Statistics 2017, Table 315.20*. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d16/tables/dt16_315.20.asp?current=yes. Last accessed September 2018.

U.S. Department of Education. (2017). *The condition of education. Characteristics of postsecondary faculty*. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_csc.asp. Last accessed September 2018.

van den Brink, M., & Benschop, Y. (2012). Slaying the seven-headed dragon: The quest for gender change in academia. *Gender, Work and Organization, 19*(1), 71–92.

Yinhan, W., Qi, Y., & Kai, Y. (2013). Women leaders of Higher Education: Female executives in leading universities in China. *Cross-Cultural Communication, 9*(6), 40–45.

Zhao, J., & Jones, K. (2017). Women and leadership in higher education in China: Discourse and the discursive construction of identity. *Administrative Sciences, 7*(3), 1–17.

Moving Through the World as a Woman

Ruth Pearce

Who—Or What—Is a Woman?

> In feminist philosophy, it's often been thought important to answer the question 'What is a woman?' in order to delimit the purview of inquiry. Since feminism is concerned with the oppression of women, goes the thought, it should be able to determine whose oppression is at stake. (Bettcher 2017)

This question is central to any discussion of sexism. The chapters in this book tend to take 'women' as their subject, and women's activism (especially feminism and womanism) as the primary mode of resistance to sexism within the academy. As a feminist, I understand sexism to describe both the systemic marginalisation of women with regards to men, and interpersonal dynamics in which men's voices, actions and interests are prioritised over women's. This is a process which

R. Pearce (✉)
University of Leeds, Leeds, UK
e-mail: R.Pearce1@leeds.ac.uk

relies on the interplay of structural and individual barriers. Gender stereotypes and cultural norms inform (and are constructed through) acts of discrimination and harassment against women, while laws and institutional policies constrain women or otherwise fail to account for our needs.

To understand what sexism *is* and how it operates, however, we need to talk about *who* is a 'woman' (or, indeed, a 'man'). That is to say: Who is it that is subject to sexism? Who is it that we wish to support, and who is it to which we refer when we talk about the challenges that women face in social and institutional arenas such as the academy?

I write as a trans woman. I am the subject and object of heightened public anxiety and interest; I see myself presented as a cipher, an intellectual curiosity, a threat. Debates over my belonging within the category of womanhood can be found not only within sensationalist news stories, gossip columns, reality television shows, tragic movies and legal battles, but also in feminist books, queer theory essays, medical papers and academic conferences.

As of 2018, a growing number of universities are creating trans equality policies, collecting data on the experiences of trans staff and students and adapting gendered spaces such as toilets and changing rooms. Concurrently, a growing number of women scholars in fields such as law, philosophy, politics and disability studies are 'coming out' as 'gender critical': that is, critical of trans people's claims to gendered belonging. To paraphrase Sandy Stone (2006), it feels like my body and my experiences are the 'battleground' upon which wars over the meaning of womanhood are being fought.

This chapter is intended primarily as a think piece, to encourage readers to think through these questions when undertaking anti-sexist work and assessing research findings. I utilise trans womanhood as a running example in my examination of what it might mean to be (or not be) a woman; I also draw from the insights of other marginalised groups, including disabled and black women. The chapter begins with a look at debates over gender recognition in the UK, as an illustration of what can be at stake in these discussions. I then show how unstable and incoherent the notion of womanhood can be when we take marginal experiences seriously, before looking at how we

might move forward with a political project for 'women' regardless. I conclude with an introduction to the notion of 'moving through the world as a woman' as a means for conceptualising womanhood in doing this work.

Gender Recognition and the Boundaries of Womanhood

I was reminded of the pressing nature of these issues during the writing of this chapter, upon receiving a message from an academic mailing list. The message consisted of a forwarded email thread about a draconian proposed ban on the teaching of Gender Studies in Hungary, with the author inviting members of the mailing list to consider how we might support our Hungarian colleagues.[1] Contained within this thread was a response from a British academic who argued that her country was facing comparable challenges. She asserted that proposed changes to the Gender Recognition Act 2004—through which trans people might more easily change their legal sex/gender—threaten to fundamentally undermine women's safety in public toilets, refuges and rape crisis centres, and disrupt the collection of statistical data on gendered inequalities.[2] The idea that an easier route to legal sex/gender change is as dangerous as a government's attempt to outlaw the very teaching of gender studies shows just how fraught debates over the boundaries of womanhood can be.

People living in Britain who wish to change the gender on their birth certificate from 'male' to 'female' or vice versa must have documented evidence that they have lived for at least two years in their 'new' gender role (e.g. bank statements and employment contracts) and letters from mental health specialists confirming a diagnosis of gender dysphoria. They have to fill in an extensive form and submit this with relevant evidence and payment to the Gender Recognition Panel, a group of legal and medical professionals who may either approve or decline the application. At the time of writing, the UK and Scottish governments are consulting on proposals to replace this with a system of statutory self-declaration, though which an

individual can change their own legal sex/gender. This is similar to current arrangements by which individuals can change their legal name in Britain and follows the passage of other gender 'self-declaration' laws in countries such as Argentina, Malta and Ireland (Davy et al. 2018). A new UK legal framework may also recognise non-binary gender possibilities.

Many trans rights advocates, including feminist and LGBT activists, have welcomed the government consultations. They argue that the current process takes too long, is too expensive, and centres the opinion of doctors and psychiatrists rather than an individual's lived experience. However, other feminist writers and campaigners have extensively criticised both the proposed changes and the original Gender Recognition Act. They insist that gender recognition puts women at risk by enabling a male encroachment on female identity and female space. This is not a new or unique claim, but instead echoes historical 'trans-exclusionary' positions within feminism, as well as contemporary arguments from groups campaigning against trans women's access to women's toilets in countries such as South Africa and the USA (Patel 2017).

Some argue that relaxing gender recognition laws will enable men to pretend that they are women for the purposes of invading gender facilities and disrupting women's political activities. While no evidence exists demonstrating that this is an actual problem in jurisdictions where self-declaration is already a legal reality, the scenario is frequently referred in campaigning materials, on social media, and in response to government consultations. Others posit that trans women are 'actually' men, due to the sexing of our bodies at birth and our upbringing as male in a patriarchal society. For example, a blog post on the Oxford Human Rights Hub written by two legal scholars opens with the following statement: 'In this post we use the word women to refer to individuals born as women (also known as "natal women")' (Fredman and Auchmuty 2018). Having implicitly established that the authors regard trans women as 'men', the post proceeds to refer repeatedly to instances of male violence against women, thereby discursively positioning trans women as inherently threatening.

This ideological approach typically relies on a particular form of the sex/gender distinction, a curious combination of biological essentialism and (supposed) social constructionism. For example, Fredman and Auchmuty (2018) state that '[b]eing a woman is about sex and biology, in that our bodies determine so much of our experience, and also about the way we are constructed socially, which also helps determine our lived experiences'. This argument assumes that there is something essential and inherent about a 'woman's body', that can be shared by cis women (individuals assigned female at birth who do not reject this assignation) but not trans women. It moreover posits that there is something universal about the shared social experiences of cis women that trans women cannot share, thereby positioning the 'social construction' of womanhood as a deterministic form of socialisation rather than evidence of gender's artifice and malleability.

A less nuanced version of this position can be seen in the 'penis sticker' or #stickerwoman campaign, which is underway at the time of writing. Numerous groups campaigning against gender recognition have printed stickers which feature a pink penis and testicles emblazoned with the slogan 'WOMEN DON'T HAVE PENISES', in reference to the fact that some trans women retain their penis (due, for example, to long waiting lists for medical treatment, or a personal choice not to undergo surgery). In an ironic move for organisations that supposedly oppose the symbolic and actual presence of 'male' body parts in women's spaces, these have been distributed across the UK, in locations such as university campuses and public toilets.

In this chapter, I work from the assumption that the self-declaration or self-*identification* of sex/gender is the only practical means by which we can define womanhood for the purposes of resisting sexism both within and beyond the academy. As I show below, this is not simply a matter of 'trans inclusion'. Rather, it is a question of solidarity and justice for all individuals who move through the world as marginal women: those who find that their status *as* women may be questioned in the context of an ableist racist cis heteropatriarchy.

Deconstructing Womanhood

In most societies people who are *identified* as women by themselves and/
or others are consistently subject to multiple forms of disadvantage. In
the context of universities alone, empirical research has indicated that
women are less likely to occupy senior positions, are typically paid less
than men working in equivalent positions and are more likely to be sub-
ject to discrimination, harassment and sexual misconduct (Araújo 2014;
Courtois and O'Keefe 2015; Winslow and Davis 2016; Anitha and
Lewis 2018). Clearly, it is important to talk about women's experiences,
and the disadvantages we face.

Consequently, the very category of *womanhood* often remains
unquestioned in anti-sexist work. Womanhood is assumed: we assume
that we know what a woman looks like, how a woman behaves and the
kinds of challenges that women face. We may ask 'women' to respond
to a survey, or we may seek to create support groups or affirmative
action programmes for 'women'. Outside of debates over trans inclu-
sion, the presumed membership of this category is rarely subject to
interrogation.

However, the more carefully the category of womanhood is exam-
ined the less coherent it appears. Social norms and gender roles differ
both within and between societies, according to factors such as tra-
dition, religion, class and caste. It is impossible to consistently define
womanhood on the basis of factors such as employment, social rank and
culturally appropriate clothing or adornments. Definitions of woman-
hood grounded in biological essentialism do not fare much better. If we
are to define womanhood on the basis of genetics, how can we account
for intersex conditions such as androgen insensitivity syndrome, which
mean that some people born with XY chromosomes have 'female' gen-
italia and secondary sexual characteristics? If we are to define a wom-
anhood on the basis of an ability to conceive, carry a pregnancy, give
birth and breastfeed a child, how are we to account for hysterectomy,
mastectomy, sterility, women born without wombs? How, moreover, are
we to account for a woman's right *not* to be defined by her reproductive
capacity?

Jacob Hale ([1996](#)) outlines 13 defining characteristics of women, which include biological sex characteristics, gender roles, gendered behaviour and sexual cues, and the production of a consistent gendered history. He notes that while some characteristics may be more heavily weighted than others (such as not having a penis, or providing textual cues that lead others to read the individual as a 'woman'), various characteristics or combinations thereof may serve to override or contradict others. For example, having a penis is frequently perceived as a strong disqualifier for womanhood (as seen for instance in the penis sticker campaign), but this may be socially irrelevant if a person dresses and behaves in a manner that means they are consistently read as a woman by others (Kessler and McKenner [1978](#)). Hale therefore concludes that none of the identified characteristics are necessary *or* sufficient condition of womanhood.

When these incoherencies and uncertainties meet with structural power inequalities, some groups effectively find themselves excluded from normative categories of womanhood. Within Western societies, this usually includes (but is not limited to) women of colour, disabled women, lesbians, bisexual women and intersex women as well as trans women. Consequently, numerous feminist and womanist writers have analysed how 'womanhood' might become fragile or even untenable at these intersections. For example, disabled women are frequently desexualised and/or infantilised as a consequence of their failure to meet ableist norms of (re)productive adult womanhood (Begum [1992](#); Ghai [2002](#); Slater and Liddiard [2018](#)). This may reflect the individual's actual ability to conceive or deliver a child, but more often reflects the social construction of disabled women's bodies as 'unfeminine' and thereby inherently unattractive and asexual. This is especially the case when disability intersects with other forms of marginalisation such as racism and ageism. As Jennifer Scuro remarks, 'The non-productive, non-sexual bodies of women [are] threatening to a system that wants only productive, ablebodied people to perform naturalized, domesticated and gendered tasks. Bodies that are not young, white or exotically nonwhite, and "sexy" are disposable, especially if they age and become infertile' (Scuro et al. [2018](#), p. 70).

Jen Slater et al. ([2018](#), p. 416) describe this process as 'ableist heteronormativity'. They illustrate their argument with reference to an entry from abled researcher Slater's fieldwork diary, which describes the authors preparing for a night out in Iceland. While Slater wears no make-up and dresses as a 'scruff' in jeans, wooly jumper, raincoat and snow boots, Ágústsdóttir wears a black dress, leather jacket and heeled boots, and Haraldsdóttir is delayed because she is doing her make-up. When Slater remarks on this, Ágústsdóttir responds that it's 'it's okay for you; you're not disabled. I have to get dressed up; I don't want to live the disability stereotype'. Ágústsdóttir and Haraldsdóttir feel they have to perform as recognisably 'femme' in order to be consequently recognised *as* women. By contrast, as a *non-disabled* (white) person who was assigned female at birth and passed through the world as a woman, Slater had the privilege of being more intelligibly read as a woman by others.

This example also serves to counteract the notion that there is some universal experience of girlhood and growing up as 'female' that women might share. Disabled women such as Ágústsdóttir and Haraldsdóttir have not been raised to embody femininity or womanhood in the same way as Slater due to the infantilisation of their bodies; hence, their desire to put an extra effort into 'doing' womanhood. Contrary to the claims of Fredman and Auchmuty, there is no one means by which women are 'socially constructed'. Rather, as Emi Koyama ([2006](#)) highlights, differing experiences of girlhood and access to women's communities are mediated by factors such as dis/ability, race and class as well as by an individual's social positioning as trans or cis.

One solution to this problem is the proposal that there are many differing types of womanhood, a matter I return to. However, various writers have instead contested that if womanhood is to be defined in a normative manner that prioritises (for instance) heterosexuality, whiteness, abled bodies and middle-class sensibilities, then less intelligible 'female' subjects might in fact *not* occupy womanhood. For instance, Monique Wittig proposed that 'man' and 'woman' are political concepts of opposition rather than necessarily distinct categories, and that the very idea of a woman makes little sense outside of a paternal and/or heterosexual power dynamic. Consequently, 'Lesbians are not women' (Wittig [1980](#), p. 110).

Similarly, many black feminist theorists have argued that black women 'exceed' white definitions of womanhood within racist Western societies (Green and Bey 2017). Hortense Spillers (1987) links the *ungendering* of black female bodies to the logic of the racial slave trade, in which African bodies were subject to a total objectification, as captive flesh rather than human subject. With a nod to Spillers, C. Riley Snorton (2017) examines how the science of gynaecology emerged through horrific experiments on captive bodies. The presumed availability of the black female body subject to these violent procedures contrasts dramatically with the contemporaneous treatment of white women patients, who were typically draped in sheets to preserve their modesty (to the detriment of the male doctor's actual ability to operate). Snorton (2017, p. 33) contends that '[i]n this arrangement, gender socially constructs sex, and captive flesh becomes the material and metaphorical ground for unsettling a view of sex and gender as neatly divided according to each term's relation to medicoscientific knowledge'.

All of this raises not only the issue of who 'counts' as a woman, but also the matter of whether or not expanding our definitions and understandings of womanhood can sufficiently address the social, historical and linguistic problems inherent in the category. Gender equality projects within Higher Education frequently construct 'women' in a generalistic manner that is both insensitive to and implicitly perpetuates the historical ungendering of many women. For example, critical analyses of the UK's Athena SWAN gender equality charter have shown that it relies on a homogenising approach to womanhood, with little room for specific analyses of how experiences of sexist disadvantage might differ according to factors such as ethnicity, disability and trans status (Bhopal 2018; Tzanakou and Pearce 2019).

In a dialogue with Marquis Bey on black and trans feminist intersections, Kai M. Green asks: 'If the category "woman" becomes more inclusive so as to include Black and women of color, and queer and transgender women, then does the category still function in a way that is useful?' (Green and Bey 2017, p. 439). Below, I argue that it *can*; but also that this is necessarily demands that we remain attentive to matters of difference and intersectional power dynamics.

Reconstructing Womanhood

I now turn to look at how understandings of womanhood may attempt to account for and build across the differences and exclusions I examined above.

Ameliorative analyses of womanhood aim to 'consider what concept of woman would be most useful in combatting gender injustice' (Jenkins 2016, p. 395). Sally Haslanger's (2000) ameliorative analysis echoes second-wave feminist accounts of woman as 'social class'; according to Talia Mae Bettcher's reading of this account, 'one *functions* as a woman in some context just in case one is subordinated on the basis of presumed female sex (i.e., the female biological role in reproduction)' (Bettcher 2017, p. 3). This analysis takes into account that women might not necessarily have the same reproductive capacity or social positioning but acknowledges that they are liable to be subject to sexism regardless due to their presumed membership of the 'female' sex class. However, Haslanger's account relies on the assumption that an individual 'functions as a woman' if she is 'observed or imagined' to have 'certain bodily features' (Haslanger 2000, p. 228). Jenkins and Bettcher respectively note that this approach may fail to account for some women, such as trans women who have not undergone body modification or otherwise do not consistently 'pass'.

An alternative approach is semantic contextualisation, which looks to how terms such as woman are used in 'ordinary' contexts, and the relevance of this usage to feminist goals. For instance, a 'woman' may be a person with XX chromosomes, or a 'woman' may be a person 'sincerely self-identifying as a woman'; these contexts usually but do not necessarily overlap, as evidenced in the experiences of intersex and trans women (Saul 2012, cited in Bettcher 2017, p. 4). Philosophers such as Jennifer Saul argue that whether or not a person counts as a 'woman' depends on what widely accepted standards of womanhood are relevant in a given context. For the purposes of feminist advocacy, the latter example ('self-identifying') is likely to be far more relevant than knowledge of an individual's chromosomes. However, Bettcher suggests that this approach is still limited in that some individuals (such as intersex women) may justifiably *not* be women in some contexts.

Bettcher therefore proposes a 'multiple meanings' account, which focuses on analysing the use of the term 'woman' rather than the term's referent(s). Bettcher (2017) notes that it is the term *woman* itself that is subject to political contestation, and therefore may mean different things in different contexts. The question for feminists, therefore, is how inclusive we can make the term 'woman' while still seeking to productively account for and respond to sexism.

Following Katherine Jenkins (2016), I am particularly interested in how an ameliorative analysis of womanhood may potentially function to justify the use of a fully inclusive meaning of 'woman'. Jenkins' solution is to propose two 'senses' of gender: 'gender as class', (as in Haslanger), and 'gender as identity', which aims to account for the diversity of women's experiences. Jenkins is wary of the notion of a *feminine* gender identity that would involve having 'internalised norms of appropriate feminine behaviour' (Jenkins 2016, p. 409); this, of course, would fail to account for either the diversity of femininities across boundaries of culture and class, or for women who refuse or otherwise fail to conform to normative notions of appropriately feminine behaviour. Instead, she draws on William E. Cross' (1991, p. 214) description of (racial) identity as a *maze* or *map* 'that functions in a multitude of ways to guide and direct exchanges with one's social and material realities'. With this in mind, she proposes that a person has a 'female gender identity' if her 'internal "map" has formed [her] through the social or material realities that are, in that context, characteristic of women as a class' (Jenkins 2016, p. 410). In this way, women whose bodies do not necessarily conform to normative understandings of reproductive possibility might nevertheless be understood to belong to 'womanhood' as a social class.

Given the inherent contradictions of womanhood, however, it is important that neither woman-as-class or woman-as-identity are understood as monolithic categories. Black feminist theorists have long highlighted that the sexism experienced by black women cannot be fully understood without taking into account factors such as racialisation, economic inequality and homophobia. The Combahee River Collective describes how they 'often find it difficult to separate race from class from sex oppression because in our lives they are most often experienced

simultaneously. We know that there is such a thing as racial-sexual oppression which is neither solely racial nor solely sexual' (Combahee River Collective 1983, p. 267). Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991) famously described this phenomenon as 'intersectionality', highlighting how individuals encounter specific forms of marginalisation at the intersection of multiple axes of oppression. In this sense, drawing again on Cross (1991), womanhood might be a 'maze' as much as a 'map', in which an individual's membership of gender-as-class and sense of gendered identity shift according to their intersectional experience.

Moving Through the Academy as a Woman

My womanhood can be called into question, for while I am white, abled and middle-class, my experiences as a woman intersect with my marginalisation as trans and as a bisexual person in a relationship with another woman. What, therefore, do I mean when I say that *I* am a woman; and what might this mean for the fight against sexism in Higher Education?

Most often, I explain my experiences by saying that I *move through the world as a woman*. 'Moving through the world' is a phrase I seemingly absorbed through osmosis years ago from fellow feminists and queers. I use it to refer to the intersubjective experience of being and being seen, of internalising discourse and encountering social structures.

When I say that I move through the world as a woman, I mean that prior to hormone therapy and genital reconstruction, my sense of sexual embodiment—the experience Julia Serano (2007) describes as 'subconscious sex'—felt like a *maze* I could not solve (Cross 1991). Now, the mental matrix that somehow marks the flesh I expect to see and feel when I behold myself, *maps* comfortably onto my body.

When I say that I move through the world as a woman, I recognise that beyond the bounds of my personal relationship with my body, sex and gender are social constructs that ascribe hegemonic power to the supposedly male and masculine. Like everyone else, I find myself negotiating a society where we cannot simply reject sex/gender because

we are *gendered* constantly by others. When, like Jenkins (2016), I talk about 'gender identity', I mean that the body I inhabit, my personal interests, the ways in which I communicate, the clothes I prefer to wear all fit better into the socially contingent category of 'woman' than the socially contingent category of 'man'.

When I say that I move through the world as a woman, I mean that I am regarded as a woman by others. This is not, of course, a wholly negative experience; being a 'woman' is not about suffering, and my sense of identification is about desire and belonging much as it is about a rejection of the wrongness of masculinity, and it has brought me friendship and love. However, I have also faced harassment and difficulty *as* a woman. In UK universities, a quarter of woman students have faced unwanted sexual attention (Phipps and Smith 2012); during my student years, I was groped, leered at and stalked. Women are overrepresented in junior and insecure positions within academia (Maddrell et al. 2016); as a doctoral researcher, I worked for part-time for years on exploitative casual teaching contracts. In some of these instances the people around me knew I was trans, and in others they did not. Regardless, in failing to *move through the world as a man* I inevitably face sexism.[3]

When I say that I move through the world as a woman, I mean that my supposedly 'male' upbringing did not prevent me from being subtly and unknowingly socialised into 'feminine' language patterns and behaviours. As a teenager, this led my peers to question my sexual orientation. In adulthood, I find myself frustrated at my own passivity, as men push past me on university campuses, talk over me in meetings, and I frequently apologise for myself in both personal and professional interactions.

When I say that I move through the world as a woman, I also mean that my experience of womanhood is mediated by my experience of being trans. Barriers to trans people's participation in Higher Education include administrative failings, hostility in gendered spaces such as toilets and changing rooms, isolation and mental health issues, all of which are likely to be more severe for trans staff and students than for their cis peers (Nicolazzo 2017; McKendry and Lawrence 2017). When I

want to discuss issues such as this but instead find myself encouraged to debate 'gender critical' narratives and penis stickers by anti-trans campaigners, I know that if I carefully monitor my demeanour and tone I may be accused of embodying a false feminine stereotype, whereas if I overcome my tendency towards passivity and assert myself I am told that I am displaying 'male' behaviour.

I outline these experiences in part to counter the endemic *transmisogyny* present within the academy (Serano 2007), whereby trans women such as myself experience the irony of being told that we are not (and cannot) be women, even as we face a myriad of misogynistic behaviours and structures that are only intensified by their intersection with transphobia.[4] More importantly though, I hope that readers will begin to think through how they might take an appropriately expansive approach to womanhood when setting out to fight sexism within the academy. As I have shown, this is not simply a matter of *trans* inclusion: my experiences are merely examples. Instead, I hope to promote an intersectional approach that acknowledges the breadth and diversity of womanhood, the variation in women's experiences and the continuing *disadvantage* that those who name themselves as women face regardless due to their membership of womanhood as social class and identity.

There are numerous arenas in which we can take an expansive approach to womanhood in our work as feminist and womanist scholars. We can do so in our campaigning networks and meetings and writing, thinking about who is (and is not) present, and *which* women's experiences of sexism we are (and are not) addressing. We can think about this when we create sampling frames for our surveys and interviews and secondary statistical analyses, both for our own research and for institutional gender equality projects such as Athena SWAN. We can think about this when we organise events, when we book speakers, and—as Sara Ahmed (2017) has eloquently highlighted—when we cite others. This has to be an active politics, the *work* of naming women in a way that includes rather than excludes, recognising difference rather than attempting to flatten it.

Notes

1. The Hungarian government has justified this move by claiming that gender studies courses are not 'economically rational' (Adam 2018). In the recent past, government figures have also argued that these courses threaten to destroy traditional 'values': presumably, these include traditional gender roles and the primacy of men. This opposition to feminist teaching reflects both historic dismissals of women's and gender studies as irrational or unscientific (Pereira 2017) and a more recent international backlash against feminist ideals and social gains (Vasvári 2013).
2. I use the phrase 'sex/gender' for two reasons. Firstly, UK legislation does not draw a clear or consistent distinction between these concepts. Secondly, I aim to highlight how they might be understood as mutually constitutive, with social readings of sexed bodies frequently following from normative gender ideologies.
3. This is also the case for many non-binary and genderqueer individuals as well as some trans men, who may face misogyny through being understood and treated by others as women even if they do not identify as such (Green and Bey 2017). Bettcher's (2017) 'multiple meanings' account may be of use here, in exploring how people who are not women may nevertheless experience discrimination as such.
4. I do fear, however, that transmisogynistic readers who glance across this chapter will reject my account regardless of any appeal to their rationality or their emotions.

References

Adam, C. (2018, August 10). Gender studies programs to be banned in Hungary. *Hungarian Free Press*. http://hungarianfreepress.com/2018/08/10/gender-studies-programs-to-be-banned-in-hungary/. Last accessed September 2018.

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Anitha, S., & Lewis, R. (Eds.). (2018). *Gender based violence in university communities: Policy, prevention and educational interventions*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Araújo, H. C. (2014). Women, universities, leadership and citizenship. In J. Laker, C. Naval, & K. Mrnjaus (Eds.), *Citizenship, democracy and higher education in Europe, Canada and the USA* (pp. 267–285). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Begum, N. (1992). Disabled women and the feminist agenda. *Feminist Review, 40*(1), 70–84.

Bhopal, K. (2018). *White privilege: The myth of a post-racial society*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Bettcher, T. M. (2017). Trans Feminism: Recent philosophical developments. *Philosophy Compass, 12*(11), e12438.

Combahee River Collective. (1983). The Combahee River Collective Statement. In B. Smith (Ed.), *Home girls: A Black Feminist anthology* (pp. 264–274). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Courtois, A. D. M., & O'Keefe, T. (2015). Precarity in the ivory cage: Neoliberalism and casualisation of work in the Irish higher education sector. *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies, 13*(1), 43–66.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241–1299.

Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of Black: Diversity in African-American identity*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Davy, Z., Sørlie, A., & Schwend, A. S. (2018). Democratising diagnoses? The role of the depathologisation perspective in constructing corporeal trans citizenship. *Critical Social Policy, 38*(1), 13–34.

Fredman, R., & Auchmuty, R. (2018, August 17). *Women's rights and the proposed changes to the Gender Recognition Act*. Oxford Human Rights Hub. http://ohrh.law.ox.ac.uk/womens-rights-and-the-proposed-changes-to-the-gender-recognition-act/. Last accessed September 2018.

Ghai, A. (2002). Disabled women: An excluded agenda of Indian feminism. *Hypatia, 17*(3), 49–66.

Green, K. M., & Bey, M. (2017). Where Black feminist thought and trans* feminism meet: A conversation. *Souls, 19*(4), 438–454.

Hale, J. (1996). Are lesbians women? *Hypatia, 11*(2), 94–121.

Haslanger, S. (2000). Gender and race: (What) are they? (What) do we want them to be? *Noûs, 34*(1), 31–55.

Jenkins, K. (2016). Amelioration and inclusion: Gender identity and the concept of woman. *Ethics, 126*(2), 394–421.

Kessler, S. J., & McKenna, W. (1978). *Gender: An Ethnomethodological approach*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Koyama, E. (2006). Whose feminism is it anyway? The unspoken racism of the trans inclusion debate. In S. Stryker & S. Whittle (Eds.), *The transgender studies reader* (pp. 698–705). London, UK: Routledge.

Maddrell, A., Strauss, K., Thomas, N. J., & Wyse, S. (2016). Mind the gap: Gender disparities still to be addressed in UK higher education geography. *Area, 48*(1), 48–56.

Mckendry, S., & Lawrence, M. (2017). *TransEdu Scotland: Researching the experience of trans and gender diverse applicants, students and staff in Scotland's colleges and universities*. Glasgow, Scotland: University of Strathclyde.

Nicolazzo, Z. (2017). *Trans* in college: Transgender students' strategies for navigating campus life and the institutional politics of inclusion*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Patel, N. (2017). Violent cistems: Trans experiences of bathroom space. *Agenda, 31*(1), 51–63.

Pereira, M. d. M. (2017). *Power, knowledge and feminist scholarship: An ethnography of academia*. London, UK: Routledge.

Phipps, A., & Smith, G. (2012). Violence against women students in the UK: Time to take action. *Gender and Education, 24*(4), 357–373.

Scuro, J., Havis, D. N., & Brown, L. X. Z. (2018). Intersectionality: A dialogue with Devonya N. Havis and Lydia X. Z. Brown. In J. Scuro (Ed.), *Addressing ableism: Philosophical questions via disability studies* (pp. 41–94). Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Serano, J. (2007). *Whipping girl: A transsexual woman on sexism and the scapegoating of femininity*. Emeryville, CA: Seal Press.

Slater, J., & Liddiard, K. (2018). Why disability studies scholars must challenge transmisogyny and transphobia. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies, 7*(2), 83–93.

Slater, J., Ágústsdóttir, E., & Haraldsdóttir, F. (2018). Becoming intelligible woman: Gender, disability and resistance at the border zone of youth. *Feminism and Psychology, 28*(3), 409–426.

Snorton, C. R. (2017). *Black on both sides: A racial history of trans identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Spillers, H. J. (1987). Mama's baby, papa's maybe: An American grammar book. *Diacritics, 17*(2), 65–81.

Stone, S. (2006). The empire strikes back: A posttranssexual manifesto. In S. Stryker & S. Whittle (Eds.), *The transgender studies reader* (pp. 221–235). New York, NY: Routledge.

Tzanakou, C., & Pearce, R. (2019). Moderate feminism within or against the neoliberal university? The example of Athena SWAN. *Gender, Work & Organisation*, in press.

Vasvári, L. O. (2013). Gendered hate speech and political discourse in recent US elections and in postsocialist Hungary. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, 15*(4), 1–14.

Winslow, S., & Davis, S. N. (2016). Gender inequality across the academic life course. *Sociology Compass, 10*(5), 404–416.

Wittig, M. (1980). The straight mind. *Feminist Issues, 1*(1), 103–111.

3

An Examination of the Athena SWAN Initiatives in the UK: Critical Reflections

Maria Tsouroufli

Introduction

This chapter offers a critical examination of Athena SWAN, a national scheme for promoting and certifying gender equality in the UK. The limited research on the implications and effectiveness of the scheme as well as the increasing evidence of sexist policy and practice in higher education in the UK render the critical discussion of Athena SWAN a timely and important project. In what follows I explore some of the achievements and limitations of Athena SWAN and I consider the challenges in promoting and supporting change and exposing male privilege and sexism in higher education in the UK.

M. Tsouroufli (✉)
Faculty of Education Health and Wellbeing,
University of Wolverhampton, Wolverhampton, UK
e-mail: M.Tsouroufli@wlv.ac.uk

History and Evolvement of Athena SWAN

Athena SWAN is an equality charter for universities and colleges, managed by the Equality Challenge Unit (ECU) (2014), UK, which has recently been renamed to Aspire HE. It is a successor to the Athena project, a national diversity scheme for science, technology, engineering, maths and medicine (STEMM) which aimed to promote and advance the careers of women researchers in these subjects. The Athena project ran from 1999 to 2007, and it was set up by women in the academic community. SWAN stands for 'Scientific Women's Academic Network'. The project was funded by different organisations throughout its lifetime, including the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE), the Office of Science and Technology and the Scottish Funding Council. The first phase of the project from 1999 to 2002 was concerned with the identification and development of good practice in higher education whereas the second phase from 2003 to 2007 was concerned with the development of tools and methodologies for measuring good practice and cultural change in universities. The Athena SWAN Charter emerged from the conference of one of the local networks funded by the Athena project—the Scientific Women's Academic Network (https://www.Athenaforum.org.uk). Athena SWAN was formally launched in the UK in 2005 at the Institute of Physics with the support of ECU and the UK Research Councils (UKRC), and the first awards were conferred in 2006. The agreed Athena SWAN principles at the time were:

– *'To address gender inequalities requires commitment and action from everyone, at all levels of the organisation'.*
– *'To tackle the unequal representation of women in science requires changing cultures and attitudes across the organisation'.*
– *'The absence of diversity at management and policy-making levels has broad implications which the organisation will examine'.*
– *'The high loss rate of women in science is an urgent concern which the organisation will address'.*

– *'The system of short-term contracts has particularly negative consequences for the retention and progression of women in science which the organisation recognises'.*
– *'There are both personal and structural obstacles to women making the transition from PhD into a sustainable academic career in science which require the active consideration of the organisation'.* (https://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/about-athena-swan/history-of-athena-swan/)

In 2011 and 2012, important developments improved the status of Athena SWAN and encouraged medical and dental schools in the UK to work closely with ECU. National Institute for Health Research and Patient Safety Research Centre funding was linked to Silver Athena SWAN accreditation. Research Councils in UK (RCUK) do not link Athena SWAN to funding. However, its '*Statement of Expectations for Equality and Diversity*' launched in 2013 stated that it expects those in receipt of Research Council funding to embed equality and diversity in aspects of research practice (https://www.ukri.org/).

Although these initiatives were extremely important and there was certainly an increase in the number of medical and dental academic schools that have received Silver Athena SWAN awards, there is currently no evidence to suggest a positive correlation between Athena SWAN and the employment of academic women, or their position in the labour market. There is also no substantial evidence to demonstrate a strong link between Athena SWAN accreditation and the eradication of sexism in British academia, although positive structural and cultural changes have been identified in the few evaluations of the impact of Athena SWAN. This will be discussed later in more detail in the section about the impact and effectiveness of Athena SWAN.

Furthermore, in a major national initiative supported by the Higher Education Academy, Athena SWAN Charter was launched in Ireland in early 2015 to address the under-representation of women in senior leadership in higher education. In addition, in June 2015 and May 2016, SAGE released a call for applications for institutions to participate in the SAGE Pilot of Athena SWAN in Australia. Applications

were competitively judged to ensure a wide range of institutional types and sizes. There is also increasing interest in gender equality certification systems and processes across Europe, and in 2017 a number of relevant 'Science with and for Society' (SwafS) funding calls were announced, including the following: '*Supporting research organisations to implement gender equality plans', and 'Scenarios for an award/certification system for gender equality in research organisations and universities in Europe'*.

Athena SWAN Breadth, Focus and Successes

The April 2017 round saw 143 applications, with 4 Gold awards, 22 Silver awards and 59 Bronze awards being conferred. The three levels of Athena SWAN award: Bronze, Silver and Gold may be held by both institutions and individual departments. The overall success rate was fifty-nine per cent (59%). Applications for awards are assessed by peer-review panels, and awards are valid for up to four years. After four years, the applicant must demonstrate progress to renew or upgrade their award. ECU's Athena SWAN Charter is a highly successful international programme. It has grown from ten founding university members in 2005 to 146 UK university and research institute members, recognising institutions' and departments' commitment to tackling gender inequality in higher education and research (https://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/athena-swan-members/).

Although many of the younger universities (Post-1992) have joined the scheme and have received departmental and institutional Bronze awards, most of the Silver and all the Gold Athena SWAN awards have always been received by the Russell Group Universities that include some of the leading universities in the UK and the world (e.g. the Universities of Oxford, Queen's University Belfast, King's College, University College London and Imperial College London).

The Russell Group Universities are a group of 24 research-intensive universities that produce two-thirds of the world leading research in the UK. They have high economic output and attract a very high number of talented non-UK staff and students. There has been no systematic research that compares the Athena SWAN initiative to the submissions

by the Russell Group and the Post-1992 Universities in the UK; however, in my review of the Post-1992 University submissions and my own experience, the Russell Group is more well-resourced in terms of time and finances to prepare for and achieve the most competitive Athena Charter awards (Silver and Gold). This raises concerns. The Athena SWAN representative at the University of Wolverhampton suggests that the unintended consequences of the Athena SWAN accreditation process are in perpetuating hierarchies within the UK higher education landscape and gender inequalities in the less prestigious universities.

The first Post-1992 University department to receive a Bronze award was the Psychology group at the Sheffield Hallam University, and the Silver award was granted to the Department of Biosciences at Sheffield Hallam University in 2012. The School of Sport at Loughborough University also received its Silver award in 2012 and as part of its action plan it organised leadership programmes in 2014 and 2015; hosted Ph.D. student conferences; organised a promotion workshop in 2015; developed mentoring by supporting a university-wide scheme for researchers; improved the induction process for new staff and their managers; promoted training to research staff and information about teaching qualifications for all relevant staff; ensured consistency of experience for staff at all levels particularly in appraisal and support for professional development; clarified the support available for staff during pregnancy, maternity and on their return; and celebrated work undertaken by female researchers, for example during International Women's Day in 2015 (http://www.lboro.ac.uk/departments/ssehs/about/athena-swan/).

In 2013, three ex-polytechnics, the Universities of De Montfort, Wolverhampton and the West of England, Bristol, received University Bronze awards following the success of Loughborough University and Sheffield Hallam. In the latest review round, John Innes Centre was the first research institute to become a member of an exclusive group of Gold award institutions and departments. Additionally, the Roslin Institute at the University of Edinburgh, the School of Psychology at Queen's University Belfast and the Institute of Integrative Biology at the University of Liverpool have achieved Gold departmental awards, bringing the number of Gold award-holding departments in the UK to ten.

The Russell Group University Departments which hold the Gold Gender Equality Charter Mark have invested substantial resources in becoming beacons of gender equality in higher education and in the national and international research community. They have achieved remarkable results in terms of gender representation at all levels. For example, the Imperial University received its Bronze award in 2009 and the Department of Chemistry its Silver award in 2009 (renewed in 2011). In 2013, the Department of Chemistry achieved Gold having provided strong evidence of action and achievement in supporting the careers of women and supporting an inclusive culture. Female and male members of staff—of different grades, management and leadership roles—were members of the self-assessment team. The department evidenced to provide excellent working conditions, a sustained collaborative environment, high satisfaction rates as well as 100% success in the applications of women for promotion. These achievements are the result of a systematic approach to gender mainstreaming which included supporting the careers of women from undergraduate level to Chair; monitoring gender participation at all levels (committee membership, UG and PG champions, outreach activities, undergraduate and postgraduate courses, PhDs, research fellows and early career academics, senior members of staff); raising the profile of female role models by instigating prizes named after women chemists; monitoring feedback from student and staff; actively encouraging senior members of staff to consider their mentoring role (mentoring is actually rewarded in the promotion process) and bringing opportunities to the attention of female staff; carefully monitoring and reviewing workloads aiming to achieve gender equity and excellent maternity and paternity provision. Some of the events organised to promote gender equity included the Irene Joliot-Curie conference in collaboration with Warwick University; the Springboard Women's Development Program; the Fellowships for Researchers event, the Post-Doc symposium and 10-day career development for early career academics. These events would indeed be very difficult to finance and organise in some of the less affluent universities. (https://www.imperial.ac.uk/media/imperial-college/faculty-of-natural-sciences/department-of-chemistry/public/academic-oppps/Imperial_Comined_2013_application_action_plan.pdf.)

Less affluent universities are not able to allocate large funds to support Athena SWAN initiatives and also have limited resources for analysing large quantitative and qualitative data. Most good practice examples of financial investment in Athena SWAN by universities come from affluent universities (ECU Awards Booklet April 2017). For example, the allocation of £100 K central funds by Ulster University to support the Athena SWAN initiatives, the returning carers' scheme and the offer of paid shared parental leave before the statutory rate by Brunel University. The School of Environmental Sciences at the University of East Anglia has offered a bridging fund for those with short-term interruptions between contracts. The Queen Mary University of London School of Geography offers support for staff teaching on field trips, including accommodating staff on field trips closer to home or contributing to childcare costs. The School of Economics University of East Anglia offers a £5000 training budget per person that can be used as part of the keeping in touch process or on return to work as part of the process of supporting return to work. The Archaeology Department Durham University archaeology offers buy-in teaching cover to support staff during intense grant writing periods.

Athena SWAN Post-2015: Gender Parity or Gender Equality?

The requirements and prerequisites for Bronze, Silver and Gold awards as well as the principles of Athena SWAN have been adapted and expanded post-2015 to address the under-representation of women in senior roles in arts, humanities, social sciences, business and law (AHSSBL); to address the gender pay gap, the intersections of gender with other factors and the challenges that transsexual staff and students face in higher education. The ECU's Athena SWAN Charter now covers women (and men where appropriate) in academic roles in all disciplines, professional and support staff, and transsexual staff and students, in relation to their representation, gender pay gap, short-term contracts, progression of students into academia, journey through career milestones and working environment for all staff.

ECU offers Bronze, Silver and Gold awards at departmental and institutional level. Whereas Bronze awards '*recognise that the institution has a solid foundation for eliminating gender bias and developing an inclusive culture that values all staff*', (https://warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/cedar/about_us/athenaswan/) institutions with higher awards are expected to demonstrate through convincing data and narratives that they have made an impact on promoting and sustaining gender equality. At Bronze and Silver level, institutions are expected to consider the role of the intersection of gender with ethnicity for academic, professional and support staff. At Gold level, the institution should demonstrate that they have taken an intersectional approach to analysing data and devising possible solutions to identified challenges.

The language of the Athena SWAN Charter and the revised Athena SWAN principles have received limited, if any attention by researchers and self-assessment teams across UK universities. For example, no systematic research has looked at how self-assessment teams perceive and define '*gender bias*' and '*inclusive culture*', or how they might operationalise the terminology in gender action plans, and in the collection and analysis of Athena SWAN submission data. Gender equality is only mentioned in the second and eighth principle and although there is reference to gender mainstreaming and cultural changes in the eighth and ninth principle, the emphasis is on gender parity/representation.

2nd principle: '*We commit to advancing gender equality in academia, in particular addressing the loss of women across the career pipeline and the absence of women from senior academic, professional and support roles*'.

8th principle: '*We acknowledge that advancing gender equality demands commitment and action from all levels of the organisation and in particular active leadership from those in senior roles*'.

9th principle: '*We commit to making and mainstreaming sustainable structural and cultural changes to advance gender equality, recognising that initiatives and actions that support individuals alone will not sufficiently advance equality*'.

Discrimination is only mentioned in principle 7 in relation to the experiences of trans people. '*We commit to tackling the discriminatory treatment often experienced by trans people*'.

Interestingly, the reference to obstacles in the fifth principle turns attention *on* women rather than the discriminatory practices of academic institutions, their exclusionary and 'othering' mechanisms (Tsouroufli 2012), the white privilege and misogynist values entrenched in universities (David 2016a).

> We commit to removing the obstacles faced by women, in particular, at major points of career development and progression including the transition from PhD into a sustainable academic career. (https://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/about-athena-swan/)

Interpretations of gender equality as gender parity might lead departments to focus on men especially, for example through encouraging men into primary school teaching or nursing. Such initiatives might happen at the expense of analysing discriminatory practices and sexist cultures that disadvantage women even in those fields that are highly feminised. In feminised academic disciplines, such as education or nursing men are often over-represented within senior positions, proportionate to the number of women in the department. Problematic interpretations of Athena SWAN's requirements can have implications also for STEMM departments. For example, if self-assessment teams achieve gender parity within heavily male-dominated departments, this means that a disproportionate number of female staff will be expected to work on the team (Pearce 2017).

Although the neutral language of the Athena SWAN principles and the Athena SWAN Charter may appear more attractive to academic institutions, they do not reflect or address some of the gender issues studied extensively in academia. These include the presence of masculine principles that lead to advantages for male staff and disadvantages for female staff; power relations (Morley 2015); male domination (Morley and Walsh 1995), and more recently, gender-based violence on campus including sexual harassment.

It is surprising that despite the increasing interest and research evidence on gender-based violence in education (Anitha and Lewis 2018), Athena SWAN does not address this issue. Research on student experiences has indicated that one in four student women are subject

to unwanted sexual behaviour during their studies (Phipps and Smith 2012). Tiffany Page argues sexual misconduct is a structural problem sustained by organisational cultures (Pearce 2017). The Athena SWAN accreditation process requires more attention, as instances of harassment, discrimination, bullying or violence among or between staff and students perpetuate power relations within universities and prevent gender equality. At the moment the materials provided by the Athena SWAN institutional application include a section on 'organisation and culture' but the guidelines do not require universities to provide evidence on how they address and combat sexual and gender-based violence. Also, although many universities have a portfolio of equality and diversity policies and initiatives, these do not necessarily translate into cultural change. For example, despite the successes of Imperial College with Athena SWAN, it was felt by staff that '*Athena SWAN had merely scratched the surface of issues or had just provided a veneer which concealed continuing inequalities and that events such as the Athena SWAN lecture were little more that "a box ticking exercise"*' (Imperial College Report by Changing University Cultures 2016, https://chucl.com). The project for which the Imperial College Report was produced was commissioned in 2015 and was the first of its kind in the UK Higher Education sector, prompted by serious concerns about sexism in sport following the College's 2015 Varsity rugby tournament.

Initiatives for raising awareness about sexual misconduct, sexual violence and gender-based violence as well as developing effective sexual misconduct reporting mechanisms and policies is certainly an area that requires more attention and commitment from universities submitting applications for Athena SWAN accreditation. The University of Oxford offers an example of good practice in this direction as it has recently introduced compulsory sexual consent workshops for first year undergraduates.

Another area of cultural change that has not received sufficient attention by ECU and HEIs holding Athena SWAN awards is the curriculum. An educational institution that claims to be a beacon of gender equality should provide a gender inclusive curriculum and opportunities to reflect on gendered higher educational pedagogies (Henderson 2015; Tsouroufli 2018a). Such a curriculum (formal and informal)

should be relevant to both female and male students of different ethnicities and also provide opportunities for students to think critically about injustices and inequalities, the persistent lack of attention to gender in research and the assumed neutrality of all knowledge. In what follows I refer briefly to some examples of good practice with regard to curriculum initiatives. Oxford Brookes University Faculty of Technology Design and Environment has designed a shared spreadsheet to record examples of inclusive teaching, role models, gender-focused research and links with external environments outreach activities. City University has plans to analyse data from module feedback to examine any gender bias. Kings College History Department has added new model topics to incorporate history of and historical scholarship by women and under-represented group (ECU Award Booklet 2017).

Athena SWAN: Inclusivity and Intersectionality

Principle 10: '*All individuals have identities shaped by several different factors. We commit to considering the intersection of gender and other factors wherever possible*'.

Principle 10 of Athena SWAN, as well as the ECU publication about intersectional approaches to equality and diversity, makes reference to intersecting identities and experiences of gender with age, disability, gender, race, religion and sexuality, of which institutions should be mindful (ECU 2018). It seems that strands of diversity are constructed as add-on, innocuous perspectives, rather than entrenched inequalities and injustices against women of colour, academic mothers, the disabled, migrant, ethnic minority and working-class women and men; within aggressively neoliberal contexts of higher education where popular individualist discourses of success operate (Tsouroufli 2018c).

Significantly, neither class nor migration are mentioned or recognised as strands of diversity that seriously impact on the academic careers of women despite the increasing body of work on migrant academics (Sang et al. 2013), and the classed experiences of female and male

students and staff in higher education (Archer et al. 2007; Reay et al. 2010; Walkerdine 2011). However, ECU's website (ECU 2014) contains some very interesting publications that would be helpful to institutions in addressing intersectionality in their submissions, including: intersectional approaches to equality research and data (2017) and Intersectionality in Scottish Higher Education (2016).

Until recently, gender has been treated as a homogenous identity in the preparation for Athena SWAN accreditations even by universities that won Gold awards. There was of course no requirement for universities to address intersectionality in the pre-2015 submissions. However, it is interesting that prestigious universities including Imperial, University College London (UCL) and Oxford, which have attracted many distinguished migrant academics particularly in the sciences, have not made attempts to highlight some of the challenges faced by migrant women. The University of Wolverhampton, a Post-1992 University with a high number of migrant academics, has made good progress with intersectionality and in 2016 it offered an Athena SWAN Ph.D. studentship to Andrea Mondokova, aiming to address intersecting inequalities of gender, migration, motherhood/caring responsibilities and academic grade in the careers of women. An Athena SWAN intersectionality working group was also founded in 2016 by Dr. Maria Tsouroufli, one of the Athena SWAN University representatives, to inform and support the Silver submission of the university. The launch of the group in October 2016 was combined with a lecture about intersectionality research by Professor Mustafa Ozbilgin, Professor of Human Resources Management and Organisational Behaviour from Brunel University, London. The Athena SWAN intersectionality group has received university funding for a 'speakers series' and a research symposium.

Interest in intersectionality research has increased in the post-2015 Athena SWAN period and some very good initiatives have taken place across the UK, including research and outreach activities with students. Bristol Dental School has made a strong commitment to promoting ethnic diversity including conducting qualitative research with black and ethnic minority students. Leeds Beckett which joined the Athena SWAN scheme in 2014 added intersectional objectives in its outreach activities including the Larkia summer programme for girls from South Asian

backgrounds (ECU Awards Booklet April 2017). As these initiatives are quite recent no data are available about their impact on widening participation in higher education and promoting the careers of black and ethnic minority women in the STEMM subjects. Further research and coherent policies are required to protect and support the careers of academic and non-academic staff that face intersecting inequalities and privileges of gender, ethnicity, socio-economic background, religion or creed, able-bodiness, sexual orientation and maternity/caring responsibilities.

Section 3: Athena SWAN—Who Gets Involved?

The Athena SWAN application for Bronze, Silver and Gold at departmental and institutional level is prepared by a self-assessment team, a representative group of staff that prepare and analyse data about their institution or department's progress in addressing gender equality and representation. They are also expected to prepare an action plan for further progressive change. The resulting submission is then reviewed by a panel of academic peers, hosted by ECU (Pearce 2017). Panels consist usually of academics who receive ECU training prior to the reviews and panel decision-making. Panels are expected to evaluate the evidence provided with regard to actions taken to promote and sustain gender equality, the reasons for such actions and the steps taken to measure success across different areas as well as plans for future work.

In this section, I explore diversity and inclusion issues in the Athena SWAN review panels and self-assessment teams, in an attempt to draw attention to the apparent absence of gender experts and under-representation of ethnic minority/migrant academics in review panels. I also discuss and problematise the over-representation of full-time female academics, usually from lower academic grades in Athena SWAN self-assessment teams at departmental and institutional levels, and the under-representation of students and non-academic staff other than HR professionals. These issues have only recently received attention by members of self-assessment teams and thus require systematic and substantial empirical research evidence to inform future planning and decision-making by ECU and Athena SWAN award holders.

Munir et al. (2014) in their evaluation of the effectiveness and impact of Athena SWAN certification in advancing women's careers in STEMM and changing the culture of the institutions have found limited impact of the charter on postgraduate students and no impact on undergraduate students. They recommended more commitment and clear plans for HEIs in engaging and involving students in the certification process and senior management. This is the only evaluation research on the subject commissioned by ECU.

In their qualitative research, Caffrey et al. (2016) found that gender inequity was reproduced in the programme's enactment as female staff was undertaking a disproportionate amount of Athena SWAN work, with potential negative impacts on individual women's career progression. Early career researchers experienced problems accessing Athena SWAN initiatives. The burden that Athena SWAN accreditation process can cause and its unintended consequences for women was a topic of discussion at a national event, which focused on Athena SWAN reflections and was organised by the University of Warwick, Centre for the Study of Women and Gender (Pearce 2017).

There is a risk that Athena SWAN accreditation process and all equality certification in higher education might exacerbate gender divisions of labour and intersecting inequalities of gender and race in the academic profession. The emphasis on research performativity, instrumentalisation of teaching and learning, and disembodiment of academic work and their associated structures such as the Research Excellence Framework (REF) in the UK have had negative implications for the recognition of teaching, good academic citizenship and the overall contribution of academic women within the neoliberal context of higher education (Acker 1992; Bagilhole 1993; Tsouroufli 2012, 2018b). To reduce the gender gap (Baker 2012) and actively value 'the burden' of gender equality work, HEIs and research institutions will need to develop mechanisms and structures for formally recognising Athena SWAN work in promotions and senior management roles.

The ethnic mix and gender equality expertise and commitment of those involved in review panels also require consideration and attention. So far, the Athena SWAN panels have been predominantly white with little

representation from British ethnic minority women and migrant women from and outside the European Union. With Brexit, and its associated challenges for academics fast approaching, it would be appropriate and indeed necessary for Athena SWAN accreditation process to address such issues from an intersectionality perspective. It is also fair to ensure that both ethnic minority and migrant academics are represented in Athena SWAN review panels in numbers that actually reflect the ethnic mix of the staff employed across different academic institutions and regions in the UK.

As Athena SWAN Charter and accreditation process have evolved and expanded to encompass the progression of non-scientific women, student experiences and the careers of non-academic staff, it would beneficial for ECU to work closely with gender equality experts and distinguished academics in the field of gender inequities and intersectionality in higher education. The absence of a strong contingency of feminist academics, feminist activists and gender equality experts in the Athena SWAN review panels and often in self-assessment teams is not only puzzling but alarming.

Section 4: Athena SWAN—Can It Really Eradicate Sexism in Academia?

Gender equity programmes have the potential to address inequity. However, they can also unintentionally reproduce and reinforce gender inequity through their enactment (Morley 2005). A number of studies in the UK higher education have highlighted the difficulties and micropolitics in formal gender equality policy enactments, informal processes and strategies (Morley 2003; Deem 2003). Like many equality policies in UK higher education, Athena SWAN focuses mainly on enabling a social group (women) to be included equally within predominantly white, classed and gendered institutions of higher education driven by economic imperatives rather than commitment to reducing inequalities in education and society (Morley 2007). Neoliberalism with its market ethos and performativity culture has exacerbated

gender inequalities in higher education while at the same time leaving little, if any room, to deconstruct gender or other privileges and focus attention on structures rather than individuals in institutions of higher education (Tsouroufli 2012, 2018a). Within this context of exaggerated educational opportunity, reflexivity, self-regulation and patriarchal rules, Athena SWAN offers yet another opportunity; the improvement of women's position in academia! As Miriam David has argued (David 2016b) it is the patriarchal rules of the games that we should change and question the gender norms, stereotypical ideas as well as deal with violence and sexual abuse in order to promote gender equality in education.

Has Athena SWAN actually reduced or eradicated sexism in academia? Has it changed the patriarchal rules of the game? Has it had a positive impact on women's academic careers? The only independent evaluation of Athena SWAN commissioned by ECU (Munir et al. 2014) has shown that academic/research staff were more satisfied with their career development and performance in the Silver award departments than staff in no award departments. Also, this evaluation has shown that in all departments holding awards academic/research staff rated their universities higher for the promotion of equality and diversity. In 2016 with funding from the Welcome Trust, ECU's research team analysed 62 successful Athena SWAN submissions from medical and related disciplines (2007–2014) to identify good practice initiatives that had a positive impact on gender equality. ECU has created a digital resource bank with examples of good practice, including for example the high uptake of diversity courses by staff. Although such initiatives are positive, they do not on their own constitute evidence of gender equality.

Research by Barnard (2017) conducted with universities holding gold awards found that Athena SWAN Charter rarely has impact on middle and senior management. Gregory-Smith (2015), an economist from the University of Sheffield, analysed data about clinical academic employment from UK medical schools and concluded that early adopters of Athena SWAN did not increase female participation by more than other schools that signed up later. Also, his findings suggest that tying Athena SWAN silver award status to research funding has not yet had a significant impact on women's careers in clinical medicine.

The impact of Athena SWAN on women's academic careers and sexism in higher education is a very under-researched area. Future research should be encouraged and commissioned by various UK research councils, including the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Medical Research Council (MRC), in an attempt to produce a strong body of evidence informed by different theoretical (economic, sociological, feminist) and methodological perspectives (qualitative, quantitative or mixed). I would also argue for more attention to current challenges in UK Universities including violence on campus, sexual harassment, laddish and rape culture (Jackson et al. 2015) and the implications and intersections of all the above with women's multiple identities. Athena SWAN Charter has expanded since their inception and Athena SWAN along with the organisation (now Aspire HE) that manages it will continue to change in an attempt to respond to higher education and societal challenges. However, it is important that Athena SWAN award holders and those working towards one do not lose sight of what really matters: ***Doing Gender Equality rather than simply Certifying Gender Equality***.

Concluding Remarks

In this chapter, I discussed the achievements and challenges of Athena SWAN since the inception of the scheme in the UK. Athena SWAN has created important strategies and programmes for promoting the careers of women in the STEMM subjects and recently other disciplines. It has been an important tool in certifying organisational progress with equality and inclusion, but it has also created, perhaps unintentionally, new inequalities within and among different universities in the UK. Within a nexus of inequalities in higher education in the UK and a context of financial and political challenges, Athena SWAN will need to continue to evolve and perhaps redefine itself in order to create affordances for the eradication of sexism and misogyny in higher education.

References

Acker, S. (1992). New perspectives on an old problem: The position of women academics in British Higher Education. *Higher Education, 24,* 57–75.

Anitha, S., & Lewis, R. (2018). *Gender-based violence in university communities: Policy, prevention and educational interventions in Britain.* Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Archer, M., Hollingworth, S., & Halsall, A. (2007). University's not for me—I am a Nike person: Urban, working-class young people's negotiations of 'style', identity and educational engagement. *Sociology, 41*(2), 219–237.

Bagilhole, B. (1993). Survivors in a male preserve: A study of British women academics' experiences and perceptions of discrimination in a UK university. *Higher Education, 26,* 431–447.

Barnard, S. (2017). The Athena SWAN Charter: Promoting commitment to gender equality in Higher Education. In P. O'Connor & K. White (Eds.), *Gendered success in Higher Education: Global perspectives* (pp. 155–174). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baker, M. (2012). *Academic careers and the gender gap*. Vancouver, Canada: UBC Press.

David, E. M. (2016a). *Reclaiming feminism: Challenging everyday misogyny*. Bristol, UK: Polity Press.

David, E. M. (2016b). *A feminist manifesto for education*. Bristol, UK: Polity Press.

Deem, R. (2003). Gender, organisational cultures and the practices of managers-academics in UK Universities. *Gender, Work and Organisation, 10*(2), 240–259.

Caffrey, L., Wyatt, D., Fudge, N., Mattingley, H., Williamson, C., & McKevitt, C. (2016). Gender equity programmes in academic medicine: A realist evaluation approach to Athena SWAN processes. *British Medical Journal Open, 6*(9), 1–9.

Changing University Cultures. (2016). *Imperial college report*. https://chucl. com. Last accessed August 2018.

Equality Challenge UK (ECU). (2014). *Evaluating the effectiveness and impact of the Athena SWAN Charter*. Written by F. Munir, C. Mason, H. McDermott, J. Morries, B. Bagilhole, & M. Nevill. https://www.ecu. ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/external/evaluating-the-effectiveness-and-impact-of-the-athena-swan-charter.pdf. Last accessed August 2018.

Equality Challenge UK (ECU). (2017). ECU Awards Booklet, April 2017. https://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/xxxx_ECU_Awards_Booklet_April_2017-V4.pdf.

Equality Challenge UK (ECU). (2018). *Intersectional approaches to equality and diversity*. https://www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/intersectional-approaches-equality-diversity/.

Gregory-Smith, I. (2015). The impact of Athena SWAN in UK medical schools. Sheffield Economic Research Paper Series. Sheffield, UK: Department of Economics, University of Sheffield.

Henderson, E. (2015). *Gender pedagogy: Teaching, learning and tracing gender in Higher Education*. London, UK: Palgrave.

Jackson, C., Dempster, S., & Pollard, L. (2015). They just don't seem to really care, they just think it's cools to sit there and talk: Laddism in university-teaching and learning contexts. *Educational Review, 67*(3), 300–314.

Morley, L. (2003). *Quality and power in Higher Education*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Morley, L. (2005). Gender equity in Commonwealth Higher Education. *Women's Studies International Forum, 28*(2), 209–221.

Morley, L. (2007). Gender and UK Higher Education: Post-feminism in a market economy. In M. A. D. Sagaria (Ed.), *Women, universities and change* (pp. 133–144). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Morley, L. (2015). Troubling intra-actions: Gender, neo-liberalism and research in the global academy. *Journal of Education Policy, 23*(3), 1–18.

Morley, L., & Walsh, V. (1995). *Feminist academics: Creative agents for change*. London, UK: Taylor and Francis.

Pearce, R. (2017). *Certifying equality? Critical reflections on Athena SWAN and equality accreditation*. Coventry, UK: Centre for the Study of Women and Gender.

Phipps, A., & Smith, G. (2012). Violence against women students in the UK: Time to take action. *Gender and Education, 24*(4), 357–373.

Reay, D., Crozier, G., & Clayton, G. (2010). 'Fitting in' or 'standing out': Working class student in UK Higher Education. *British Educational Research Journal, 32*(1), 1–19.

Sang, K., Al Dajani, H., & Ozbilgin, M. (2013). Frayed careers of migrant female Professors in British academia: An intersectional perspective. *Gender, Work and Organisation, 20*(2), 158–171.

Tsouroufli, M. (2012). Breaking in and breaking out a medical school: Feminist academic interrupted. Special issue on 'Being a feminist academic'. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Journal*, *13*(5), 467–483.

Tsouroufli, M. (2018a). Gender, pedagogical identities and academic professionalism in Greek medical schools. *Gender and Education*, *30*(1), 45–78.

Tsouroufli, M. (2018b). 'Playing it right?' Gendered performances of professional respectability and 'authenticity' in Greek academia. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, *19*(6), 53–69.

Tsouroufli, M. (2018c). Gendered and classed performances of motherhood and good academic. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, first published 24th September 2018.

Walkerdine, V. (2011). Neoliberalism, working-class subject and Higher Education. *Contemporary Social Science, 6*(2), 255–271.

4

Fellowship as Resistance: How Women Educators in Higher Education Benefit from International Professional Recognition

Elizabeth (Beth) Beckmann

The impact of complex gender climates is evident in Australian universities, where women comprise more than half the Ph.D. graduates and early career academics yet observe 'ongoing systematic under-representation' of their gender in career-track and higher-status academic roles (Marchant and Wallace 2013, p. 69; Winchester and Browning 2015). Despite gender equity initiatives, in 2016 just 27% of Professors or Executive leaders were women (Universities Australia 2017). This is not surprising given that the gold standard and role models of academia are still too often explicitly and implicitly represented as male. Why else would recent research on the 'intelligent career success' of 28 distinguished academics (Beigi et al. 2018) be deemed acceptable when the sample constituted 25 men and 3 women—with two of the latter married to men in the sample, and only one woman having had children? As neither the paper's title nor abstract alluded to the male-dominated sample, it can be assumed that the authors (two women, one man) and journal editor accepted this extreme gender

E. Beckmann (✉)
Beth Beckmann & Associates PL, Canberra, Australia

disparity as a legitimate research protocol. While the authors briefly note the gender bias under 'limitations', they then compound their complacency by recommending that future researchers should 'study gender differences among a balanced participant group' and examine 'career challenges and obstacles among female professors … trying to make it [as distinguished academics] but [failing] to do so' (Beigi et al. 2018, p. 273). One wonders just what implicit messages are being transmitted to any young woman academic who dares to dream and accesses this paper for apparent evidence on career-building trajectories.

Importantly, this kind of under the radar sexism—related to the 'microinequities' identified by Stout et al. (2007, p. 137)—is particularly relevant to women who teach in universities. For diverse reasons, women academics are disproportionately more visible than men in teaching and student support roles (Gibney 2017), especially at lower to mid-range academic levels. Yet even though universities subsidise their research through income from student fees (Cram 2009; Olive 2017), the consistent message to academics is that research activities are more highly valued and rewarded than teaching (Marchant and Wallace 2013; Willetts 2013). As Blackmore et al. (2016, p. 4) explain—'excellence in research attracts prestige, but excellence in teaching does not'. This deep-seated teaching-research divide impacts on career progression, characterised by the need for individuals to acquire personal prestige that is 'relatively scarce, hard to measure; slow to gain or lose; and often decided on by insiders' (Blackmore et al. 2016).

The baseline prestige of being research-active comes from having a Ph.D. In 2017, three-quarters of academic staff in Australia already had a doctoral degree, and most of the rest were engaged in doctoral studies (Australian Government Department of Education and Training 2018). In contrast—even though legislation dictates that those teaching in Australian universities have 'skills in contemporary teaching, learning and assessment principles relevant to their role, models of delivery and the needs of … student cohorts' (Australian Government Higher Education Standards Framework [Threshold Standards] 2015, Section 3.2.3)—relatively few academics have formal teaching qualifications. Moreover, unlike the universal Ph.D., institutions are free to choose how they encourage, provide or mandate professional skills

development in teaching and learning (Smith et al. 2016, p. 9). In the absence of universally accepted Australian standard qualifications for university teachers, the Ph.D. has become a 'de facto' qualification for teaching, and academic research opportunities generally continue to be privileged over teaching workloads.

While trustworthy information on gendered aspects of university teaching is rare, a gender divide undoubtedly parallels the functional research-teaching divide. Women academics—even those in research-focused positions—are more likely than their male counterparts to take on heavy teaching loads (Gibney 2017) and the associated administration and pastoral care. The latter is not insignificant when classes routinely reach 500–2000 enrolments, especially for first-year undergraduates. Marchant and Wallace (2013) summarise many studies showing that, compared to men, women academics invest more in their identity as a teacher, spend more time on teaching matters, and are more likely to be involved in teaching scholarship. Many women academics especially like to bridge the generations and nurture students through successful learning experiences. They are also less likely to say 'no' to requests to support colleagues or students. All the above can be seen as institutionally supportive strengths.

However, there is often a toll to be paid for being community- and student-focused. The fact that women academics are more prone to taking on heavier teaching loads than their male counterparts requires them to focus on the demands of teaching large classes, maximising students' transition success, developing student support, being available for student consultations, and picking up the pieces when someone in the department is on planned or unforeseen leave (Gibney 2017). This workload often limits women's capacity to develop research track records, especially as women are less likely to be granted research sabbaticals than men (Smith et al. 2016). Women are also more likely to accept short-term contracts in teaching-only or teaching-focused roles: the increasing casualisation of the academic teaching workforce has seen women become the majority in sessional staff cohorts, often travelling from campus to campus to pull together a living wage (Gottschalk and McEachern 2010; Lopes and Dewan 2014; James et al. 2015; May et al. 2013; Crimmins 2015). This impoverished capacity to build the

elusive 'prestige' so valued in tenure and promotion cases feeds the gender bias evident in academic hierarchies and maintains the fiction of the so-called merit-based status quo. It is thus because of the relative status of teaching and research that women academics' stronger alignment with teaching has become problematised in the literature, especially in terms of career progression (Marchant and Wallace 2013, p. 61).

In this chapter, I argue that professional recognition of women who teach in universities increases their access to externally referenced esteem indicators that contribute to academic prestige and supports a quiet but active resistance to gender-relevant barriers to academic recognition. I write through the lens of my own extensive experience as an academic developer working in, and researching, the professional development of teaching and its recognition, and specifically supporting university educators across Australia and New Zealand to gain institutional, national and international criterion-referenced recognition. In the past six years, I have facilitated the latter, partly supported by an Australian Government National Teaching Fellowship, by advocating and mediating the introduction into Australia of the internationally benchmarked Advance HE (formerly Higher Education Academy, HEA) educational fellowship scheme (Beckmann 2016, 2017).

I have been influenced in my thinking particularly by Broido et al.'s (2015) research that considered the lived experience of women who had spent more than 25 years at one university. They proposed a conceptual framework—the model of Women's Responses to Gendered Dynamics—that considers not only women's lived experiences but 'how they label what they experience' as a way of understanding women's response patterns. To my mind, resisting, or at least adapting to, sexism in the academy requires women to proclaim their specific successes as educators. Drawing deeply from the personal commentaries of 25 key informants (some interviewed in 2015 and some providing written reflections in 2018) on their lived experiences as women academics successfully applying for HEA fellowships, this chapter explores the potentialities of professional recognition of women university educators as a gender equity initiative in the academy.

Recognition and Reward for Women Who Teach: Some Observations

While many Australian universities now have promotion criteria that theoretically allow staff with successful education achievements to be judged equitably to those with successful research achievements, the actual likelihood of success—not for the loudly trumpeted one or two, but for the majority who try that path—is anecdotally very low. Promotion committees may find themselves less comfortable in judging applicants' education capabilities and outcomes without anything comparable to measurable external esteem—the numbers describing indices, rankings and funding of a traditional research case—except perhaps student satisfaction ratings, statistically suspect though these may be. While practice, if not policy, maintains the divide between low-status teaching and high-status research, the divide between women and men is exacerbated. My strong and successful advocacy for professional recognition of university educators in Australia through HEA fellowships has thus been fuelled by a desire for equity—to have those who teach recognised as key contributors to the work of universities, and rewarded accordingly:

> People see research publications and that is great; but no one sees you teach. This [fellowship] is an acknowledgement of my educational work. That was particularly attractive to me. Shortly after I received SFHEA, I was promoted to Senior Lecturer which I don't think would have happened without that external acknowledgement … I [was then] appointed [Faculty] Associate Dean of Education. If I had not been promoted, that would have not happened. If I hadn't got SFHEA, the promotion would have not happened. (SFHEA)

Women academics also tend to be highly collaborative as teachers, working often in teams rather than alone, easily engaging with and valuing the contribution of professional staff (e.g. librarians, educational designers, academics skills providers). While leading such

multi-functional teams for the benefit of students and teaching quality, such women are often reluctant to claim their leadership, not least because success in team-building comes from a willingness to focus on non-hierarchical functionality rather than hierarchical status. In this case, while the impact of the team may be noticed, the leadership of that team by a woman may not. Interestingly, in their later years as an initiative of the Australian Government (now the responsibility of Universities Australia), the prestigious Australian Awards for University Teaching increasingly recognised teams as well as individuals.

Whenever women academics talk about career paths and promotion, the gendered likelihood of success remains a significant issue, one that is much more complex than suggested by simplistic calculations of promotion success rates (Winchester and Browning 2015). Women may delay applying for tenured positions or promotion until they are completely confident of success, or more usually until others tell them they should be confident, whereas men may 'give it a go' at an earlier career stage. Women may then be regarded as overskilled when applying for positions and over-ready when applying for promotion. Similarly, men appear more willing to apply repeatedly for promotion or a teaching award until they achieve success, ascribing their initial failures to problems in the relevant selection processes rather than any unpreparedness or lack of prowess on their part as applicants. In sharp contrast, in many conversations about such scenarios with women academics across Australasia, I have found most women very reluctant to reapply after even one rejection, as the negative feedback is seen to confirm their 'impostor syndrome' doubts (Clance and Imes 1978). I have not yet discovered any woman who could even imagine herself applying four times for any recognition, let alone one who has actually done so, but I have met several men who boast of such persistence before final success in promotion or awards. I believe this speaks most directly to an all too common characteristic of many women academics, namely a lack of confidence or self-belief, which becomes a key area for discussion later in this chapter.

Professional Recognition of University Teaching

Although there are many avenues for the recognition of individuals who display teaching excellence or innovation, including teaching awards and fellowships, I am focusing here on HEA fellowships because they are non-competitive and open to higher education educators of all levels of experience globally. HEA fellowships are administered by the UK-based Advance HE, which champions teaching and learning in the tertiary sector internationally. Since 2011, the quality-assured professional recognition (HEA fellowship) scheme has been based on the *UK Professional Standards Framework for Teaching and Supporting Learning in Higher Education 2011* (PSF; Higher Education Academy 2011). The latter identifies 15 universal elements across three dimensions of practice (activity, knowledge, values), and across four descriptors of relative expectations of experience and expertise. It is the descriptors that stipulate the criteria for the four categories of recognition in higher education teaching and learning—Associate Fellowship (AFHEA, career entry); Fellowship (FHEA, for competent, experienced educators); Senior Fellowship (SFHEA, for educators with extensive experience, expertise and peer leadership); and Principal Fellowship (PFHEA, for those sustaining strategic institutional or national leadership in teaching and learning). Impact has been significant: there are now (September 2018) some 106,000 HEA fellows (almost 4000 outside the UK), with Advance HE supporting higher education institutions in 40 countries.

Fellowships are generally awarded through written or dialogic reflective narratives against the PSF. The fellowship application narratives require a relatively complex mix of description of an applicant's evidence-based practice as a university educator and personal reflection on that practice, ideally incorporating motivations, philosophical rationale, strategic intentions, challenges, professional learning and effective responses to failures and successes. Unlike curricula vitae, publication/presentation lists and promotion cases—which all focus on so-called objective measures of success and esteem easily ranked and judged on quantity as well as quantitative impact—the fellowship applications require a level of personal insight and introspection into teaching practice beyond the factual.

When asked to write reflectively in the first person—to claim ownership of their practice as an educator—most academics are surprisingly anxious, having been thoroughly schooled to remove themselves as human entities from the reporting of their research or their claims as academic professionals. Both women and men find a personally centred writing style hard to maintain, so feedback on application drafts often centres on 'Where are *you* in this paragraph?' Self-promotion—'pointing with pride to one's accomplishments, speaking directly about one's strengths and talents, and making internal rather than external attributions for achievements' (Rudman 1998, p. 629)—is often disparaged by the many teaching-focused academics—again both female and male—who value humility and service. Nevertheless, they accept that self-promotion pervades all academic promotion games and so-called objective esteem measurements instigated by governments, funding bodies and institutions.

However, women's reluctance to engage in self-promotional processes may be more widespread and stem from experience: women who self-promote receive more hostility in the workplace than men (Rudman and Glick 2008). The same may well be true for teachers compared to researchers. Gendered differences in academics' confidence in self-acknowledgement led one informant to join some surprising dots:

> I went to school in the 1970s, 80s and 90s … a poster child of the 'girls can do anything' era. … I understood that sexism was a thing but … a thing of the past … any talk of sexism or – even more confusing, feminism – was something that didn't really concern me … I could do anything. It mostly hit me (this seemingly obvious epiphany) when people approached us to do their fellowship applications and for the first time ever I saw a powerful confidence come from the men. Pretty much without exception they put themselves forward for the 'highest' or most senior categories regardless of their actual experience. Women put themselves forward for the less experienced categories. Women could do everything it seemed – except feel confident about it. … This is what the fellowship has given me – the strength to fight for the confidence that I didn't know I didn't have! (SFHEA)

The stepping stone of motivation is crucial—why should women educators apply for professional recognition? Many reasons appear shared with male counterparts—gaining an otherwise elusive esteem indicator in teaching to support career progression, sharing a successful innovation and benchmarking one's practice against an international standard:

> I undertook [the application] for myself and it has succeeded in providing me with international credibility which is ultimately what I sought! (PFHEA)

For early career women academics aspiring to become educators, rather than researchers, complex motivations around recognition often blossom into new and unexpected pathways.

> I was only an undergraduate [peer learning mentor] at the time of receiving Associate Fellowship … the official recognition definitely helped me to apply, seek and gain employment subsequently as a tutor and assistant course designer. Having AFHEA gave me the confidence to feel that I was competitive among my peers, or indeed those more senior to me… (AFHEA)

Applications can also be motivated by a desire to draw the attention of the powers-that-be to the inequities that arise from sloping and competitive playing fields.

> I was motivated by the determination to get education activities more highly recognised within my research institute environment. (SFHEA)

> I was thrilled to receive a nomination … for the [Faculty] teaching excellence award. I spent a long time putting together the application … but I didn't get it [or] any recognition … the next year, my colleagues said 'We'll nominate you … [apply] again'. So, I did, but I still didn't get the award and didn't get any recognition! Then I went along to the [fellowship session] and [found it was] not competitive… I was able to re-direct all that effort into [my fellowship] application … a much better way of recognising teaching excellence … because there aren't one or two excellent teachers in every [Faculty], there are many, and every excellent teacher should … receive recognition. (FHEA, now SFHEA)

For many women applicants, there also appear to be more subtle motivations at play, often focused towards personal and institutional values rather than personal benefit:

> My motivation in applying for HEA fellowship was about integrity. As part of the team that would be delivering [this recognition] programme to our staff and as one of the designers of [our values-based professional learning framework], I needed to go through the process to empathise and speak as an expert to colleagues, academics and management [and] refine the … framework from the knowledge that comes from 'doing' … (FHEA)

Mentors can help overcome the crises of confidence that might otherwise deter many women from stepping, even briefly, into any form of the limelight.

> Successfully applying [initially] to be a Fellow … profoundly impacted on my career … [giving] me confidence in my skills and the ability to recognise and claim my work and my professional identity. …The Fellowship process and the mentorship gave me the confidence …. to apply for an education-focused position … I honestly would not have applied … without the support of senior [SFHEA/PFHEA] mentors as well as the self-knowledge and belief that came from obtaining Fellowship. (FHEA, then SFHEA)

Reflecting on practice (Schön 1983) is potentially both revealing and empowering. Fellowship applicants are asked to deconstruct their practice against specific activities (designing, teaching, assessing, giving feedback, supporting learners, creating learning environments), in the context of their acquired specialist knowledge (theories, frameworks and pedagogies associated with design, delivery, technologies, evaluation and quality assurance) and their professed values (to engage with students as individuals, to seek equity in higher education participation) while evidencing a commitment to evidence-based, societally relevant practice mediated through ongoing professional development. Gaining a deeper appreciation of both the overarching determinants and the diverse subtexts and minutiae of one's practices as educators is a powerful outcome of reflection, especially under the guidance of an experienced mentor.

Those seeking senior categories of fellowship are also required to review their contributions to peer engagement and peer/discipline/institutional/sector-wide influence, whether mediated through position or capability. In my experience, mentors often find it challenging to encourage women (and, to be fair, some men) to 'own' their leadership, even when the latter comes from a named position. The power of language to convey confidence, or a lack thereof, is striking: in first drafts, women are much more likely than men to prefer circumlocutions. For example, they may write in ways that focus their leadership activities on assistance ('I tried to help students/colleagues to …'), delegation ('I was asked to …'; 'in this leadership role, I …') or accident ('I happened to end up …') rather than a more deliberate choice ('I developed a strategy to..' or 'I led …'). This is not just an exercise in semantics: most of the women I have mentored have a strong affect underlying their initial choice of language, essentially declaring 'I don't lead, I just help people'.

Similarly, it is predominantly women fellowship applicants who prefer the collaborative ownership of 'we' rather than the individualistic 'I'. These women are so immersed in their collaborative contribution to a team that they can't separate themselves out as participatory leaders of that team. Of course, they may be correct—in contrast to the heroic (and traditionally 'masculine') traits of 'individualism, control, assertiveness, and skills of advocacy and domination', the predominance of women in a team may genuinely lead to more shared and distributed leadership, exemplified by the post-heroic (traditionally considered 'feminine') traits that include 'empathy, vulnerability, and skills of inquiry and collaboration' (Fletcher 2004, p. 650). One informant described her revelation during the application process that she was indeed a leader:

> … the biggest change … from doing the fellowship application has been from my own understanding of myself and my contribution to the learning and teaching community. In the busyness of day to day life I had forgotten most of what I had done … I literally had to google myself – and wow, I was amazing… I particularly benefited [through the reflective process] from connecting my own recent work to my family, values, education and earliest years as a lecturer – it really made me feel calm

and grounded about 'me' – 'yes, this makes sense … what I have to say is worth saying/sharing/contributing'. I think of this [outcome] as a benefit over and above any esteem indicators as perceived by others, although the fellowship did make it easier [for me] to apply [successfully] for promotion. (SFHEA)

Through the reflective, ideally mentored, HEA fellowship process, women are strategically facilitated to write about their practice in the active self-promoting ways that are valued in current higher education hegemonies, even while the process is being softened by opportunities for genuine reflection on challenges and professional learning.

Definitely an affirmative process of my professional achievements, outcomes and impact. The application process was very challenging … analogies to promotion applications and similar but the process was not intuitive. The moral … you need to practice being tenacious. (PFHEA)

While holding up a rear-view, today-informed mirror to one's career activities can raise countless questions and anxieties, it can also address others, and become ultimately enriching, satisfying and empowering:

The reflection caused me to really bring the various threads of my career together into a single narrative. Pausing to reflect on this helped me to see some coherence in a career which otherwise perhaps was a set of separate threads rather than a woven pattern. (SFHEA)

The HEA fellowship [application] allowed me the luxury to reflect deeply on my practice as an educator … we often don't allow ourselves the time to contemplate 'who we are' as teachers and what drives or motivates us to do what we do. The PSF provided the scaffolding for this reflection and prompted me to deeply consider facets of my working/learning life that I had not previously contemplated … the PFHEA [application] provided a more embodied and descriptive narrative of who I am and what I stand for. (PFHEA)

I have been involved in education for thirty years [in all sectors]. Yet I was really nervous about going through the HEA fellowship process … about being judged by my [higher education] peers … [I now have] the confidence to make judgements about other educators. (SFHEA)

Informants explained that experiencing the power of the reflective process often drove their subsequent generosity to ensure that peers and colleagues also enjoyed this opportunity:

[Having gained] a stronger understanding of the issues … driving my career … [I wanted] to enable others to benefit from reflective practice and thus I became a strong advocate for HEA fellowships through reflective pathways. (SFHEA)

Interestingly, this willingness to put time and energy into strong advocacy and mentoring others in applying for recognition indirectly contributes to networking with other women and other educators:

When I did an interview with a female academic for her SFHEA application, she said 'This is the most mentoring I've ever had'. That's quite telling. (PFHEA)

[Gaining recognition] helped me to realise that there is a community of tertiary [educators]. (SFHEA)

A successful assessment process—the award of a fellowship in this case, a teaching prize in another—is of course ideally just a beginning. What happens in the personal and public spheres to women who gain such recognition is crucially relevant in terms of reward and recognition becoming effective mechanisms for resisting sexism. Many of my mentees and informants in this research have reported differences in themselves, or in other women who have gained this recognition, both in their confidence as educators and especially in their capacities to see

themselves as leaders. One of the most common immediate responses from women mentees telling me of their success is that, contrary even to their own expectations, they found the news personally exciting.

> I didn't expect to be so excited to be awarded this recognition … I knew I should get it, that I met all the criteria … but I am really excited. (SFHEA)

> This is the best news I have received in ever such a long time. Thank you so much for all your support and encouragement through the process! I'm really excited! (SFHEA)

> Receiving the news [of success] was delightful. I was literally bursting to tell people that the award had been conferred! (SFHEA)

From the perspective of an institution, recognition is ideal and most cost-effective when it delivers a more highly motivated, competent and ideally content employee. Often this is demonstrated when women academics, newly confident as HEA fellows and reassured of their capabilities as educators, go forward for promotion or into new positions:

> [In my job interview] I got a very strong sense that building 'Learning & Teaching' leadership was a high priority. I am sure [having] SFHEA helped: it was highlighted in the [institutional] announcement that went out. (SFHEA)

> I subsequently used sections of the fellowship assessors' report and feedback, and the SFHEA award itself, in my successful application for promotion. I have no doubt that the recognition of my contribution to learning and teaching by peers and the international community was instrumental in my successful promotion application. (SFHEA)

> I'm applying for promotion from Associate Professor to Professor. I think the PFHEA will count for something for this application, because it's an international recognition … [with a] small number of PFHEAs in the large pool of fellows. (PFHEA)

> [I used] some of the content of my fellowship [portfolio] in my successful application for promotion to Associate Professor. The SFHEA recognition provided an important level of support … I was

motivated to apply for this promotion to increase the profile of education more broadly across [my institution] and our stakeholders. (SFHEA)

Women appear especially likely to use their boosted personal confidence as educators to prompt more advanced contributions to enhanced teaching and student experiences.

[Achieving Associate Fellowship] triggered a path for ongoing professional development ... I subsequently continued to receive pedagogic training and engaged in opportunities [because]... I [had] begun to identify myself as a university educator. (AFHEA)

With HEA fellowships increasingly being identified by name in academic standards and promotion criteria across Australia, professional recognition is clearly feeding into existing promotion processes.

... [My institution] has recently developed a process for non-traditional academic pathways to be recognised in promotion... I received [encouragement] from senior managers for me to use the SFHEA achievement to go into the promotion process. My role is not classified as academic... and there has [previously] not been a promotion process for me... But my senior managers recognise it really is an academic role and showing senior leadership, and they believed the independent recognition of the SFHEA would add weight to the case for me to have academic promotion. (SFHEA)

Being recognised can help women spotlight their activities and role as well as their personal achievements.

It is not just individuals who benefit from award schemes – the whole university sector does too. If women enjoy career success as a result of the recognition they receive as leaders of learning and teaching it promotes the importance of learning and teaching within the university, and helps to promote a positive set of role models for female students. As 'we have to see it to be it', it's crucial that women see other women in senior and decision-making roles to aspire to those roles themselves in their future careers. (SFHEA)

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have considered some of the issues that create elements of sexism in the academy and a potentially gendered dimension to the benefits accruing from professional recognition of university teaching. Through the latter, women academics are supported in their confidence to own not only their experience, expertise and practice as educators but especially their successes as innovators and leaders in teaching and learning. By sharing the insights of diverse key informants, I have provided a glimpse into their perceptions of the benefits of recognition. Developing reflective accounts of practice, for example, can help women counter concerns about impostor syndrome and self-promotion. Professional recognition through a criterion-referenced process transitions women away from the competitive processes that dominate academic life. Instead, this avenue for personal reflection leads to developmental and professional enhancement, with the capacity to flatten the mountain peaks between the genders by removing seniority as a primary assessment of capacity and capability, and replacing it with an internationally benchmarked standards-based appraisal of lived experience and demonstrated expertise. Based on their analysis of women's university-lived experiences over the long term, Broido et al. (2015, p. 613) considered that the action of 'adaptation' to complex gendered contexts involves being visible, credible, involved and professional. All these characteristics are evident in my sample of women who have gained professional recognition as university educators through HEA fellowships. By boosting confidence and providing esteem that can be tendered in promotion, tenure and employment applications, professional recognition through established and peer-referenced mechanisms appears to provide a tangible pathway towards adapting to, and potentially resisting in future, both the overt and covert sexism that women educators may face in the academy.

References

Australian Government Department of Education and Training. (2018). *2017 staff highest qualification*. https://docs.education.gov.au/node/46151. Last accessed September 2018.

Beckmann, E. A. (2016, July 4–7). *Teaching excellence: Recognising the many as well as the few*. Paper presented at the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) Conference, Fremantle, Australia.

Beckmann, E. A. (2017). Leadership through fellowship: Modelling distributed leadership in a professional recognition scheme for university educators. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 39*(2), 155–168.

Beigi, M., Shirmohammadi, M., & Arthur, M. (2018). Intelligent career success: The case of distinguished academics. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 107,* 261–275.

Blackmore, P., Blackwell, R., & Edmondson, M. (2016). *Tackling wicked issues: Prestige and employment outcomes in the teaching excellence framework*. Oxford, UK: Higher Education Policy Institute.

Broido, E. M., Brown, K. R., Stygles, K. N., & Bronkema, R. H. (2015). Responding to gendered dynamics: Experiences of women working over 25 years at one university. *The Journal of Higher Education, 86*(4), 595–627.

Clance, P. R., & Imes, S. A. (1978). The impostor phenomenon in high achieving women: Dynamics and therapeutic intervention. *Psychotherapy Theory, Research and Practice, 15*(3), 241–247.

Cram, L. (2009). *How Australian universities fund the student experience*. In The student experience. Proceedings of the 32nd Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) Conference (Australia), Darwin, Northern Territory (pp. 90–99). Milperra, NSW: HERDSA.

Crimmins, G. (2015, April 10). *The lived experience of women casual academics: What we can learn from those that teach at university*. National Keynote Presentation at the Benchmarking Leadership and Advancement of Standards for Sessional Teaching (BLASST) National Leadership Summit, Sydney, Australia.

Fletcher, J. K. (2004). The paradox of postheroic leadership: An essay on gender, power, and transformational change. *Leadership Quarterly, 15,* 647–661.

Gibney, E. (2017, April 13). Teaching load could put female scientists at career disadvantage. *Nature*. https://www.nature.com/news/teachingload-could-put-female-scientists-at-career-disadvantage-1.21839. Last accessed September 2018.

Gottschalk, L., & McEachern, S. (2010). The frustrated career: Casual employment in higher education. *Australian Universities Review, 52*(1). https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ877046.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Higher Education Academy. (2011). *The UK Professional Standard Framework (UKPSF)*. https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/uk-professional-standard-framework-ukpsf. Last accessed September 2018.

James, R., Baik, C., Millar, V., Naylor, R., Bexley, E., Kennedy, G., et al. (2015). *Advancing the quality and status of teaching in Australian higher education: Ideas for enhanced professional recognition for teaching and teachers.* Report to Office for Learning and Teaching. http://www.olt.gov.au/system/files/resources/SP12_2330_James_Report_2015.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Lopes, A., & Dewan, I. (2014). Precarious pedagogies? The impact of casual and zero-hour contracts in Higher Education. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship, 7*(8), 28–42.

Marchant, T., & Wallace, M. (2013). Sixteen years of change for Australian female academics: Progress or segmentation? *Australian Universities Review, 55*(2), 60–71.

May, R., Strachan, G., & Peetz, D. (2013). Workforce development and renewal in Australian universities and the management of casual academic staff. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice, 10*(3). https://ro.uow.edu.au/jutlp/vol10/iss3/3/. Last accessed September 2018.

Olive, V. (2017). *How much is too much? Cross-subsidies from teaching to research in British universities* (HEPI Report 100). Oxford, UK: Higher Education Policy.

Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counter-stereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(3), 629–645.

Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (2008). *The social psychology of gender*. New York, NY: Guilford.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic.

Smith, D., Spronken-Smith, R., Stringer, R., & Wilson, C. A. (2016). Gender, academic careers and the sabbatical: A New Zealand case study. *Higher Education Research & Development, 35*(3), 589–603.

Stout, P. A., Staiger, J., & Jennings, N. A. (2007). Affective stories: Understanding the lack of progress of women faculty. *NWSA Journal, 19*(3), 124–144.

Universities Australia. (2017, August). *Selected inter-institutional gender equity statistics*. https://www.universitiesaustralia.edu.au/uni-participation-quality/Equity-and-Participation/Women-in-universities/Selected-Inter-Institutional#.W6QUexMzaM8. Last accessed September 2018.

Willetts, D. (2013). *Robbins revisited: Bigger and better higher education*. London, UK: Social Market Foundation.

Winchester, H. P. M., & Browning, L. (2015). Gender equality in academia: A critical reflection. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 37*(3), 269–281.

5

Explorations on the Nature of Resistance: Challenging Gender-Based Violence in the Academy

Ruth Lewis and Sundari Anitha

Introduction

Gender-based violence (GBV) in universities is well established as a matter of concern in the USA (e.g. Fisher et al. 2010) and Canada (e.g. DeKeseredy and Schwartz 2011). In Europe and elsewhere, attention to it has developed more recently (Anitha and Lewis 2018). With that attention comes resistance to all forms of GBV, defined here as 'behaviour or attitudes underpinned by inequitable power relations that hurt, threaten or undermine people because of their (perceived) gender or sexuality' (Anitha and Lewis 2018, p. 1). This chapter explores

R. Lewis (✉)
Department of Social Sciences and Media,
Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK
e-mail: ruth.lewis@northumbria.ac.uk

S. Anitha
School of Social and Political Sciences, University of Lincoln,
Lincoln, UK

the different kinds of resistance that are emerging, including attempts to eradicate GBV (by national bodies, higher education institutes, campaigning groups and activists) and strategies of resistance by those whose actions can be characterised as comprising a 'backlash'[1] to (perceived) feminist gains and an attempt to retain a gendered status quo.

Gender-Based Violence in Universities

Scholarship has generated robust evidence demonstrating the prevalence, nature and impacts of GBV in university environments, although it has tended to focus on sexual violence and harassment, rather than other forms, such as homophobia, intimate partner abuse, and violence and abuse towards trans people. Research from the USA (Cantor et al. 2015), sampling 27 higher education institutions (HEIs) and 150,000 students found that 23% of women experienced sexual contact involving physical harm or incapacitation and 62% experienced sexual harassment. Across Europe (Spain, Italy, Poland, Germany and the UK), Feltes et al. (2012) found that 35% of women experienced sexual violence during their time at university and 61% experienced harassment. The Australian Human Rights Commission (2017) surveyed 30,000 students across all 39 universities about their experiences over the previous year and found that 63% of women students were sexually harassed and 10% were sexually assaulted. In the UK, the *Hidden Marks* survey (NUS 2011) found that 14% of women students experienced serious physical or sexual assault and 68% of women experienced verbal harassment during their time at university. Overall, despite differences in methodologies and definitions of the behaviours investigated, rates are fairly consistent across geographical boundaries; between a tenth and a quarter of women students experience some form of unwanted physical sexual encounter and about two-thirds experience sexual harassment. Where surveys investigate men's experiences too, they reveal that women are significantly more likely than men to be victimised; the Australian Human Rights Commission (2017) found that women were three times more likely to be sexually assaulted. This is clearly a

gendered phenomenon; the vast majority of victims are women who are victimised by men, which reflects the prevalence of other forms of GBV in society (Walby and Towers 2017).

These are not isolated incidents but suggest patterns or cultures of GBV in universities. Phipps and Young's research with the National Union of Students (NUS) about 'lad culture', 'a group mentality residing in behaviours such as sport, heavy alcohol consumption, casual sex and sexist/discriminatory "banter", …found that many of the behaviours collected under this banner actually constituted sexual harassment' (Phipps 2018, p. 42). Such problematic cultures affect women and sexual minorities' experiences on university campuses, in social spaces such as nightclubs (Brooks 2011), in online communities and on social media (Jane 2017), and in university teaching and learning contexts (Jackson and Sundaram 2015; Jackson et al. 2015).

Recent events and research have revealed that GBV by staff against students is also a feature of university life. Professor Sara Ahmed's resignation from Goldsmiths, University of London in protest at institutional failures to address staff sexual misconduct against students (Ahmed 2016), and Sussex University's failure to take action against a lecturer convicted of assaulting a postgraduate student (Pells 2017) have brought attention to these issues. Staff sexual misconduct has also been covered repeatedly through investigative journalism in the mainstream press, sometimes with an unfortunately alarmist tone which refers to "epidemic" levels in universities (Batty et al. 2017). In an increasingly competitive environment, wherein numerous league tables rate universities' performance, it is likely that this national news coverage has some impact on university management and decision-making.

Research evidence about GBV by university staff against students is also available. Campaigning organisation, the 1752 Group, in collaboration with the NUS surveyed 1839 current and former higher education students and conducted focus group with 15 and found that the majority of those who experience 'sexual misconduct' by a member of university staff reported that the institution did not respond adequately to their complaint (NUS 2018). In India, a list naming 72 academics who were reported to have committed sexual harassment or violence

was compiled from first-person accounts by women who responded to Rayar Sakar's post on Facebook (see Chowdhury and Deep 2017). The list has received considerable attention in India and beyond, including resistance from some feminists who argue we should use institutional policies and procedures to seek justice, rather than public exposure. Others argue that it is the failure of 'due process' that has led people to publicly expose abusers via lists (see Anitha et al., forthcoming, for a fuller discussion). This debate and the list itself have undoubtedly fuelled the growing public attention to GBV in universities and the exposure of institutional failures to take action against it. It has also revealed the various forms of resistance to it, which we discuss in the following section.

Resisting GBV in the UK and Beyond

In the UK, efforts to resist GBV in universities have taken several forms, including policy initiatives by national bodies, HEIs and Students Unions; project-based activities, such as bystander interventions[2] and consent training; and activism by students and staff. Given that no single approach can provide a panacea to the problem, together they comprise a vital 'jigsaw of strategies' (Lewis and Anitha 2018, p. 235). While we cannot do justice here to the variety of such initiatives, a brief overview indicates the energy and resources currently expended on tackling this problem in UK universities.

Although they were not the first initiatives to emerge in the UK to tackle GBV in universities, national policy developments are important because they signal political attention. In response to increasing attention to this issue by media, and campaigning by student groups such as the NUS, in 2015, the UK Government tasked Universities UK (UUK)—a representative organisation for UK universities whose members are university vice-chancellors and principals—with examining harassment, hate crime and sexual violence amongst students. Prioritising the issues of sexual violence and harassment, the UUK (2016) report, *Changing the Culture*, recommended a series of actions to improve responses to and prevention of GBV in universities. Despite its shortcomings—it did not

examine students' experiences of intimate partner violence, or GBV committed by staff—the report and its recommendations represented a major overhaul of previous approaches in higher education. A year on, UUK's follow-up report found universities had made 'significant but highly variable progress' (UUK 2017, p. 6). Progress was aided by a £2.45 million funding stream provided by Higher Education Funding Council for England to tackle sexual harassment on campus. While this has been an important catalyst for initiatives, it remains to be seen whether institutions continue to fund and support such initiatives once this funding stream dries up.

Within HEIs a range of initiatives developed, some of which predated the national attention to the topic. For example, Rachel Fenton and colleagues, funded by Public Health England (an executive agency of the government Department of Health and Social Care), developed the first UK version of bystander interventions, *The Intervention Initiative*, which addressed both sexual and domestic violence (Fenton et al. 2014). In Scottish HEIs, Scottish Women's Aid piloted the first bystander interventions (Hutchinson 2018), 'Get SAVI' ('Students Against Violence Initiative'), which was based on a feminist understanding of GBV and drew upon US-based bystander initiatives. In a pioneering move, Durham University instituted a Sexual Violence Task Force to examine their existing university policies and to devise a set of policy responses (Towl 2016). Throughout UK HEIs, institutional initiatives to address GBV are becoming more common but the focus often remains only on sexual violence[3] and, as UUK (2017) notes, progress is patchy.

The NUS has led research to address GBV in universities. Their survey of women students, *Hidden Marks* (NUS 2011), provided the first and, to date, the only, national prevalence data about GBV amongst UK students. Since then, they have collaborated with academics to conduct further examinations of particular expressions of GBV such as 'lad culture' (Phipps and Young 2013) *and GBV by university staff (NUS 2018). These reports, and other NUS communications about this topic, are generally well covered in the national media, bringing attention to the issues from 'the voice of students'. In addition, the NUS has developed campaigns and interventions to tackle GBV. For example,* the 'I heart consent' initiative in 2014 provided consent workshops for students to

foster knowledge, conversations and campaigns about sexual harassment and assault. *The* '#StandByMe' campaign in 2015 lobbied universities to improve their responses to GBV by providing services for victims, and training staff about how to deal with disclosures. Scottish NUS operationalised a broader definition of GBV by campaigning to raise awareness of coercive control in intimate relationships and to push universities to improve their responses, prompted by the suicide of student, Emily Drouet, whose boyfriend, Angus Milligan, also a student, was abusive to her.

Individual universities and Students Unions have also taken action against GBV. Jordan et al. (2018) present findings from a University of Lincoln action research project comprised of bystander intervention training, awareness-raising campaigns, a domestic abuse conference and a theatre project. The project was funded by the university, implemented by academics, supported by the Students Union and involved collaboration with voluntary sector groups. Other Students Unions have adopted 'zero tolerance' policies, supported 'It Happens Here' campaigns (designed to raise awareness of sexual violence and support for survivors) and implemented bystander intervention training with their student societies. While anecdotal evidence suggests that these kinds of interventions are increasingly common, in the absence of reliable, collation of such interventions, it is unclear how widespread they are, to what extent they are institutional responses or student-led initiatives, what techniques are used, or what impacts they have.

In addition, student activists have been challenging GBV in their universities and beyond. More recently, they do so in the wider context of a sharp increase in attention to issues of gendered abuse of power, since exposés of GBV by Harvey Weinstein and other men in the entertainment, political and other sectors and the subsequent development of the '#MeToo' and '#TimesUp' campaigns. As there is no reliable source of coordinated information about students' grassroots activism against GBV, the extent, nature and impact of such activism is unknown. However, some scholarship does explore students' activism. For example, Lewis et al. (2016) report the range of activities feminist students engage in to resist sexism and 'lad culture', including zines to challenge dominant ideas about sex and sexuality; drama performances;

feminist discussion groups; 'Slutwalks'; and advocating for sexual assault centres. This activism has extended to challenges to the curriculum, as some students call for teaching about trauma—such as sexual violence and racism—to be more sensitive to its effects on students. The debate that has emerged in response includes depictions of students as 'coddled' (Lukianoff and Haidt 2015), who are 'precious snowflakes', 'embedded in a culture of victimization' (Robbins 2016), unable to deal with the harsh realities of life. Lewis and Marine (2018, p. 133) note that '[t]he attention to a particular range of activism (calls for no-platforming, safe spaces and trigger warnings) focuses attention away from other forms of student activism against GBV (such as awareness-raising campaigns, demands for support services, fund-raising for services) and simultaneously trivialises students' demands'. Such responses undermine campaigns against GBV and highlight the resistance activists face, discussed in the following section.

Resistance to Resistance

Work to resist GBV in universities has been met with resistance from a number of forces and invokes a variety of connected arguments. The first set of arguments utilise a post-feminist, neoliberal perspective that minimises GBV as a social problem and includes feminists who denounce constructions of women as victims. The second set of arguments is framed within neoliberal discourses of individual freedom and expression, including sexual expressions. We can think of these sets of arguments as 'resistance to resistance' or 'defensive resistance'. Each is discussed in turn below.

The first set of arguments, using a post-feminist neoliberal perspective, includes a number of different claims. A common and enduring claim is that the focus on women as victims of men's violence is misguided because men are also, or equally, victims of violence. In recent decades, there has been a turn towards gender symmetry in research on intimate partner violence, informed initially by the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus 1979) to measure the prevalence of intimate partner violence in a manner that quantifies acts unconnected to their contexts,

motivations and impact. As a result, a punch, for example, that results in fear (common for women victims) and a punch that results in laughter (common for male victims) are measured as equivalent (see Hester 2009; Barter 2009, for gendered responses). This approach has been robustly criticised (Dobash et al. 1992) for its exclusion of broader analyses of gendered power imbalances in society which results in misrepresentation of the gendered nature of this form of violence. Where closer analysis of data is undertaken, including attention to context, motivations and consequences, gender asymmetry becomes very apparent. For example, Walby and Towers' (2017) analysis of Crime Survey of England and Wales data (a victimisation survey which produces the most reliable national prevalence data[4]) reveals that '82% of domestic violent crimes are against women' (p. 18), 87% of domestic violent 'high frequency' (more than 10 crimes in a year) crimes are committed against women, and 91% of domestic violent crimes resulting in injury are against women. Despite the significant methodological flaws on which claims of gender symmetry are based, they are particularly attractive to men's rights and anti-feminist groups. They also hold some appeal to policy makers because of their apparently 'equitable' gender-neutral approach (Donaldson et al. 2018).

An alternative framing of defensive resistance is that attention to GBV is unnecessary because we have, to a large extent, achieved gender equality. This is a form of post-feminist discourse that recognises the importance of feminism in the past but considers that equality has been achieved in the present and so feminism and its campaigns are redundant. This framing is bolstered by the claim that the 'real' problems lie elsewhere around the globe where women experience 'real' oppression and exploitation, or that we have gone beyond equality and women are now 'on top' (Moore 2017). Within post-feminist discourses that posit that the battle for gender equality has been won in the West, any remaining misogyny or violence against women and girls is constructed as a remnant of the past or the pathological behaviour of individuals that is unconnected to broader sociocultural norms. At the same time, GBV within ethnicised communities in the West and in other parts of the world is constructed as rooted in 'their' culture (Volpp 2000).

The suggestion that men are now the victims of women's progress is what Lessard (2011) describes as an 'inversion' (p. 182). In her examination of the media 'backlash' in response to exposés of sexual harassment in universities in the 1990s, she derides notions that 'feminists brandishing newly "feminized" legal weapons threaten our basic institutions' (p. 164). She sees such notions as part of 'the rhetorical signature of conservative backlash discourses, namely the application of concepts and images of powerlessness and discrimination to describe the situation of relatively powerful persons, social groups, and institutions' (p. 182) while victims and their advocates are 'portrayed as powerful forces able to capture and corrupt not only university policy discourses but also legal discourses' (p. 188). Concerns expressed in the media that the drive for equality, and, in particular, the campaign against GBV, has gone too far reflect their growing visibility more than their achievements to date (Saul and Taylor 2017; Foroohah 2017). They also, perhaps, reflect, a sense amongst some men, heightened by the 'construction of white middle class young women as ideal neoliberal educational subjects' (Phipps 2018, p. 47) and the inversions that Lessard (2011) refers to, that their power and privilege are being challenged. This is not simply a gendered backlash against women's progress; as Phipps (2018) notes, consideration of the classed relations in these struggles reveals the complexity in the changing dynamics of power, resistance and social change.

It is not only those seeking to retain masculine privilege who claim campaigns against GBV in universities are unnecessary. Scholarship and media commentary from women, some of whom align themselves with feminism, also criticises the growing momentum or direction of work against GBV. For example, Mott (2017, n.p.) argues that in the drive to tackle GBV on campus under Obama's Presidency, which she sees as serving 'larger political demands', university staff were 'indoctrinated as 'responsible employees' and trained to see criminality in the most ambiguous situations'. Her concern is that, in attempts to hold institutions accountable, students did not receive the 'sensitivity and fairness' they deserved. For others, the concerns are about the focus on women as victims that underplays women's agency and clouds sexual relations in anxiety, or 'paranoia' (Kipnis 2017).

The concepts of victim, agency and choice have long been discussed in feminist debate in response partly to the neoliberal construction of the subject unencumbered by broader power relations (see, e.g., Lamb 1999; Schneider 1993). In this neoliberal perspective, reminders of women's victimhood are rejected because they disrupt this construction of the agentic woman. For example, Germaine Greer's recent comments on 'women who spread their legs' builds on the binary notion that women who act with agency (by 'accepting' the sexual advances of powerful men to influence their careers) cannot also be victims (Edwards and Nagouse 2018). These discourses manifest in women's lives and conceptualisations of themselves; scholars such as Scharff (2012) and Baker (2008) note young women's reluctance to identify with victimhood, even while they describe their own or other women's victimisation. In the reluctance to acknowledge victimisation, a distinction is often made between the experience and the subsequent identity; 'I'm not a victim' has become a common and popular refrain in response to harmful experiences. Reluctance to identify with the 'victim' position is heightened by flourishing neoliberal 'responsibilisation' rhetoric that depicts individuals as all-powerful agents creating their own circumstances; people are victims because of their limited capacity to avoid or overcome adversity. In a world in which 'empowerment' can be bought as a pair of trainers or a session at the gym, the idea that we can avoid victimisation if we simply make the right choices flourishes.

Feminist scholars have also made more nuanced analyses of the interplay between agency, choice, victimisation, oppression and power, which recognise the complex reality of gendered power dynamics. For these scholars, agency and victimisation are not an oppositional binary but coexist (see, e.g., Lewis et al. 2000; Mirza 2018). Agency does not preclude victimisation, nor does victimisation preclude agency. Drawing on Simone de Beauvoir's concept of 'situation', Vera-Gray (2016, n.p.) argues 'all agency is situated'. Feminist approaches to these debates conceptualise agency as expressed within the limitations of wider structural, economic, political and social contexts; no choices are entirely 'free'.

The second set of arguments comprising 'defensive resistance' stems from concern that anti-GBV campaigns shroud sexual relations in danger and risk. Laura Kipnis, whose work focuses on love, pornography

and ecstasy, bemoans the introduction of more restrictive staff conduct policies to prevent staff sexually harassing students, which, she claims, infantilise students and depict professors as powerful predators; 'sexual paranoia reigns; students are trauma cases waiting to happen' (2015, p. 15). Similarly, Merkin (2018, n.p.) worries that the public conversation about sexual behaviour and consent prompted by #MeToo amounts to 'the re-moralization of sex, not via the Judeo-Christian ethos but via a legalistic, corporate consensus'. She muses that 'we seem to be returning to a victimology paradigm for young women, in particular, in which they are perceived to be – and perceive themselves to be – as frail as Victorian housewives'. There is no doubt that ideas about coercion and victimisation in sexual relationships sit uncomfortably with a focus on sexual pleasures and freedoms. However, that discomfort points to the reliance on binaries rather than acknowledging that students may seek sexual pleasures *and* protection from sexual harms.

A further form of resistance to anti-GBV campaigns in universities manifests in claims that contemporary students' attempts to rid the campus of misogyny, racism and other forms of oppression threaten freedom of speech and reveal students as precious snowflakes who cannot handle attitudes and behaviours they find offensive. Accusations that students are closing down freedom of speech have come in relation to the practice of 'no-platforming' external speakers. No-platforming was originally used by left-leaning groups to restrict far-right organisations' access to public platforms and thereby to close opportunities for them to express hatred of Black and minority ethnic people, amongst others. More recently, speakers involved in gender politics (e.g. Germaine Greer in relation to her comments about trans people) as well as anti-Islamic and 'extremist' Islamic speakers have been 'no-platformed' by Students Unions seeking to protect their students from 'hate speech'. While we applaud the desire to rid campuses of hate, we are also mindful of 'feminism's long and proud history of saying the unsayable – usually "offensive" things for which women were expected to carry the blame and the shame, such as men's violence, menstruation and childbirth, women's anger, and their sexual desires' (Lewis et al. 2016, pp. 58–59). Balancing the important principle of freedom of speech with the equally important work of feminism (and

other progressive forces) to expose and articulate harms, as well as with the feminist desire to protect women from further harms, is undoubtedly challenging. However, the claim that hitherto marginalised groups are compromising the principle of freedom of speech fails to take into account the power dynamics between the groups that are speaking, being spoken of or being ignored. It reflects another 'inversion' (Lessard 2011, p. 182), suggesting that marginalised groups are wielding extensive, impactful power on campuses and beyond. For centuries, universities have been the preserve of elite white men. The marginalised groups that have only recently been allowed access to universities are now expressing their desire to adapt campuses and curricula to better reflect the diversity of the human race; adjustments are required to make universities fully accessible to these groups.

Moreover, freedom of speech has been both defended and challenged by established powers, such as the UK government. On the one hand, the UK Universities Minister has called on institutions 'to recognise the importance of freedom of speech and the role it plays in ensuring open debate… to ensure students are exposed to a wide range of issues and ideas in a safe environment without fear of censorship, rebuke or reprisal' (Gov.uk 2017). On the other, government counter-terrorism legislation requiring universities to anticipate whether views expressed at events with external speakers will constitute criminal offences (such as encouragement of terrorism and proscribed organizations) has been criticised for its 'chilling effect on intellectual debate and inquiry at universities' (Grove 2015). Freedom of speech has become a banner under which both powerful and marginalised groups claim the right to speak.

Accusations about freedom of speech are part of wider challenges to contemporary universities. We have seen persistent claims by right-wing groups and certain media outlets (Turner 2017; Buffet 2017) about universities' 'left wing bias' and marginalisation of views and scholars from other positions on the political spectrum. In a broader political climate where neoliberal views dominate, universities play a vital role in providing spaces for expressions of critical thinking that challenges established dogma.

Conclusion

We have analysed how, in a context of increasing recognition of and resistance to GBV in university communities, there has also been a proliferation of resistance to these changes. These different forms of resistance to anti-GBV campaigns are often couched in terms of equality, based on neoliberal and post-feminist assumptions that equality is largely achieved and that power relations are not compromising the academy. This anti-feminist resistance has received insufficient attention in the broader project to challenge GBV. The need to harness men as potential and crucial allies in the anti-violence project for change has shaped some of this neglect. In some respects, the failure to anticipate the inevitability of such resistance leads to compromises and negotiations in the hope of minimising such resistance. In the case of prevention education initiatives, this can take the form of a reluctance to foreground a gendered feminist analysis of the problem, in the hope of keeping men 'on board'. In US-based programmes, this has entailed the shift from a 'gender-based' to a 'power-based' conceptualisation of violence as the programme has been adopted and rolled out by students resistant to the idea that violence results from gendered structural inequalities (Katz et al. 2011). However, the persistence of patriarchy and misogyny requires us to pay close attention to the contours of this resistance, not least in order to mount an effective response to it.

We see attempts to tackle GBV and the cultures that support it as a clear challenge to these discourses of defensive resistance; by pointing to the continued existence of inequalities, they demonstrate that victimisation is not a result of individual idiosyncrasies but reflects and upholds gendered inequalities in society, and hence requires concerted efforts towards change. Moreover, we see the resistance to campaigns about GBV as a clear indication that unequal power relations continue to mar the academic landscape, creating 'chilly climates' for those groups who have only recently been allowed access. Demands made by students and staff for better prevention of GBV are part of attempts to re-imagine and recreate the university environment. They are part of a newly restarted as-yet unfinished conversation about sex, sexuality, gender and power which will continue to play out as long as gendered power relations continue.

Notes

1. We use the term backlash with caution, for the reasons detailed in Chunn et al. (2011).
2. Bystander interventions are based on recognition of the connection between acts of GBV and problematic gender norms. They seek to change dominant cultural norms that underpin GBV by equipping people—'bystanders'—with the skills and confidence to recognise gendered, violence-tolerant norms and situations where acts of GBV may take place and to intervene effectively and safely. For further discussion, see Fenton et al. (2016).
3. Arguably, attention to sexual violence to the exclusion of other kinds of GBV appeals to actors across the political spectrum, from feminists and Leftists who explain it in terms of patriarchal and structural power and oppression, to the Christian Right, who see it as evidence of a moral decline associated with sexual liberalisation. Moreover, it is a 'sledgehammer' event (Stanko 1985) that is more widely recognised as harmful, especially if perpetrated by strangers in public places, in comparison with the private, hidden nature of intimate partner violence. As sexual violence perpetrators have traditionally been depicted as predatory men who attack strangers, it can also be seen as the preserve of a few exceptional 'monsters', so wider gender relations are not implicated. Consideration of lad culture provides a counterpoint to this tendency by focusing on social norms rather than individual acts, but the focus remains on sexual harassment and violence rather than other forms of GBV.
4. However, Walby et al. (2015) highlight a significant flaw in its methodology—the 'capping' of high frequency victimisation, which undercounts intimate partner victimisation.

References

Ahmed, S. (2016, August 27). *Resignation is a feminist issue*. Feminist Killjoys blog. https://feministkilljoys.com/2016/08/27/resignation-is-a-feminist-issue/. Last accessed July 2018.

Anitha, S., & Lewis, R. (Eds.). (2018). *Gender-based violence in university communities: Policies, prevention and educational initiatives*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Anitha, S., Marine, S., & Lewis, R. (forthcoming). *Feminist responses to sexual harassment in academia: Voice, solidarity and resistance in diverse contexts*.

Australian Human Rights Commission. (2017). *Change the course: National report on sexual assault and sexual harassment at Australian universities*. Sydney, NSW: Australian Human Rights Commission. https://www.humanrights.gov.au/sites/default/files/document/publication/AHRC_2017_ChangeTheCourse_UniversityReport.pdf. Last accessed July 2018.

Baker, J. (2008). The ideology of choice. Overstating progress and hiding injustice in the lives of young women: Findings from a study in North Queensland, Australia. *Women's Studies International Forum, 31,* 53–64.

Barter, C. (2009). In the name of love: Partner abuse and violence in teenage relationships. *The British Journal of Social Work, 39*(2), 211–233.

Batty, D., Weale, S., & Bannock, C. (2017, March 5). Sexual harassment at 'epidemic' levels in UK universities. *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/education/2017/mar/05/students-staff-uk-universities-sexual-harassment-epidemic. Last accessed July 2018.

Brooks, O. (2011). 'Guys! Stop doing it!' Young women's adoption and rejection of safety advice when socializing in bars, pubs and clubs. *British Journal of Criminology, 51,* 635–651.

Buffet, T. (2017, June). *'The great blight of our age': Left-wing bias at university*. Centre for Policy Studies. https://www.cps.org.uk/blog/q/date/2017/06/20/the-great-blight-of-our-age-left-wing-bias-at-university/. Last accessed July 2018.

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R. Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct*. Rockville, MD: Association of American Universities. https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/%40%20Files/Climate%20Survey/AAU_Campus_Climate_Survey_12_14_15.pdf. Last accessed July 2018.

Chowdhury, S. R., & Deep, A. (2017, November 4). Universities respond to Raya Sarkar's list of alleged sexual predators: Mostly silence, some denials. *Scroll.in*. https://scroll.in/article/856589/universities-respond-to-raya-sarkars-list-of-alleged-sexual-predators-mostly-silence-some-denials. Last accessed July 2018.

Chunn, D. E., Boyd, S. B., & Lessard, H. (2011). Feminism, law and social change: An overview. In D. E. Chunn, S. Boyd, & H. Lessard (Eds.), *Reaction and resistance: Feminism, law, and social change* (pp. 1–28). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

DeKeseredy, W., & Schwartz, M. (2011). Theoretical and definitional issues in violence against women. In C. M. Renzetti, J. L. Edleson, & R. K. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on violence against women* (pp. 3–22). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems, 39*(1), 71–91.

Donaldson, A., McCarry, M., & McCullough, A. (2018). Preventing gender based violence in UK universities: The policy context. In S. Anitha & R. Lewis (Eds.), *Gender-based violence in university communities: Policies, prevention and educational initiatives in Britain*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Edwards, K., & Nagouse, E. (2018, June 7). Germaine Greer: From feminist firebrand to professional troll. *The Wire.* https://thewire.in/women/germaine-greer-feminist-firebrand-professional-troll. Last accessed July 2018.

Feltes, T., Balloni, A., Czapska, J., Bodelon, E., & Stenning, P. (2012). *Gender-based violence, stalking and fear of crime*. Final Report to European Commission, Directorate General Justice, Freedom and Security (Project JLS/2007/ISEC/415). https://vmits0151.vm.ruhr-uni-bochum.de/gender-crime.eu/pdf/gendercrime_final_report_smaller_version.pdf. Last accessed July 2018.

Fenton, R. A., Mott, H. L., McCartan, K., & Rumney, P. N. S. (2014). *The intervention initiative toolkit and website*. University of Exeter. https://socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/research/interventioninitiative/toolkit/. Last accessed July 2018.

Fenton, R. A., Mott, H. L., McCartan, K., & Rumney, P. N. S. (2016). *A review of evidence for bystander intervention to prevent SDV in universities* (No. 2016011). London, UK: Public Health England. https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/sexual-and-domestic-violence-prevention-in-universities-evidence-review. Last accessed July 2018.

Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., & Cullen, F. T. (2010). *Unsafe in the ivory tower: The sexual victimisation of college women*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Foroohah, R. (2017, September 22). Campus wars: Has liberalism gone too far? From trigger warnings to public shaming, has the left lost sight of reason—And itself? *The Financial Times*. https://www.ft.com/content/902581a0-99ff-11e7-b83c-9588e51488a0. Last accessed July 2018.

Gov.uk. (2017, October 19). *Jo Johnson calls for free speech to be protected on campus*. https://www.gov.uk/government/news/jo-johnson-calls-for-free-speech-to-be-protected-on-campus/. Last accessed July 2018.

Grove, J. (2015, July 2). Sir Ken Macdonald: 'Obnoxious' anti-radicalisation measures attack campus free speech. *Times Higher Education*. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/news/ken-macdonald-obnoxious-anti-radicalisation-measures-attack-free-speech. Last accessed July 2018.

Hester, M. (2009). *Who does what to whom? Gender and domestic violence perpetrators*. Bristol, UK: University of Bristol [in association with] Northern Rock Foundation.

Hutchinson, E. (2018). Tackling gender based violence in university communities: A practitioner perspective. In S. Anitha & R. Lewis (Eds.), *Gender-based violence in university communities: Policies, prevention and educational initiatives*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Jackson, C., & Sundaram, V. (2015). *Is 'lad culture' a problem in higher education? Exploring the perspectives of staff working in UK universities*. Society for Research into Higher Education. https://www.srhe.ac.uk/downloads/JacksonSundaramLadCulture.pdf. Last accessed July 2018.

Jackson, C., Dempster, S., & Pollard, L. (2015). 'They just don't seem to really care, they just think it's cool to sit there and talk': Laddism in university teaching-learning contexts. *Educational Review, 67*(3), 300–314.

Jane, E. A. (2017). *Misogyny online: A short (and brutish) history*. London, UK: Sage.

Jordan, A., Anitha, S., Jameson, J., & Davy, Z. (2018). Understanding student responses to gender based violence on campus: Negotiation, reinscription and resistance. In S. Anitha & R. Lewis (Eds.), *Gender-based violence in university communities: Policies, prevention and educational initiatives.* Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Katz, J., Heisterkamp, H. A., & Fleming, W. M. (2011). The social justice roots of the mentors in violence prevention model and its application in a high school setting. *Violence Against Women, 17*(6), 684–702.

Kipnis, L. (2015, February 27). Sexual paranoia strikes academe. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 61*(25), 1–23.

Kipnis, L. (2017). *Unwanted advances: Sexual paranoia comes to campus*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Lamb, S. (Ed.). (1999). *New versions of victims: Feminists struggle with the concept*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Lessard, H. (2011). Backlash in the academy: The evolution of campus sexual harassment regimes. In D. E. Chunn, S. Boyd, & H. Lessard (Eds.), *Reaction and resistance: Feminism, law, and social change* (pp. 164–195). Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Lewis, R., & Anitha, S. (2018). Conclusion. In S. Anitha & R. Lewis (Eds.), *Gender-based violence in university communities: Policies, prevention and educational initiatives.* Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Lewis, R., & Marine, S. (2018). Student feminist activism to challenge gender based violence. In S. Anitha & R. Lewis (Eds.), *Gender-based violence in university communities: Policies, prevention and educational initiatives.* Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Lewis, R., Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., & Cavanagh, K. (2000). Protection, prevention, rehabilitation or justice? Women using the law to challenge domestic violence. *International Review of Victimology, 7*(1–3), 179–205.

Lewis, R., Marine, S., & Kenney, K. (2016). "I get together with my friends and try to change it": Young feminist students resist 'laddism', 'rape culture' and 'everyday sexism'. *Special Issue of Journal of Gender Studies, 27*(1), 56–72 (Laddism, rape culture and everyday sexism: Researching new mediations and contexts of gender and sexual violence).

Lukianoff, G., & Haidt, J. (2015). The coddling of the American mind. *The Atlantic.* https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/.

Merkin, D. (2018, January 5). Publicly, we say #MeToo. Privately, we have misgivings. *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/05/opinion/golden-globes-metoo.html?_r=0. Last accessed July 2018.

Mirza, N. (2018). Reframing agency in abusive contexts: Beyond 'free choice' and 'open resistance'. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence, 2*(1), 41–56.

Moore, C. (2017, November 3). This scandal shows that women are now on top. I pray they share power with men, not crush us. *The Telegraph.* https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2017/11/03/scandal-shows-women-now-top-pray-share-power-men-not-crush-us/. Last accessed July 2018.

Mott, M. (2017, October 5). DeVos' rule changes on handling sexual assault will benefit everyone. *Times Higher Education.* https://www.timeshighereducation.com/opinion/devos-rule-changes-handling-sexual-assault-will-benefit-everyone. Last accessed July 2018.

National Union of Students [NUS]. (2011). *Hidden Marks: A study of women students experiences of harassment, stalking, violence and sexual assault* (2nd ed.). London, UK: National Union of Students.

National Union of Students [NUS]. (2018). *Power in the Academy: Staff sexual misconduct in UK higher education.* London, UK: National Union of Students.

Pells, R. (2017, January 18). Sussex University failed duty of care to student assault victim, inquiry finds. *The Independent.* https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/sussex-university-student-assault-allison-smith-senior-lecturer-dr-lee-salter-beat-punch-stamp-a7533751.html. Last accessed July 2018.

Phipps, A. (2018). 'Lad culture' and sexual violence against students. In S. Anitha & R. Lewis (Eds.), *Gender-based violence in university communities: Policies, prevention and educational initiatives.* Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Phipps, A., & Young, I. (2013). *That's what she said: Women students' experiences of 'lad culture' in higher education* (Project Report). London, UK: National Union of Students.

Robbins, S. P. (2016). From the editor—Sticks and stones: Trigger warnings, microaggressions, and political correctness. *Journal of Social Work Education, 52*(1), 1–5.

Saul, S., & Taylor, K. (2017, September 22). Betsy DeVos reverses Obama-era policy on campus sexual assault investigations. *The New York Times.* https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/22/us/devos-colleges-sex-assault.htm.Last. Last accessed July 2018.

Scharff, C. (2012). *Repudiating feminism: Young women in a neoliberal world.* London, UK: Routledge.

Schneider, E. M. (1993). Feminism and the false dichotomy of victimization and agency. *New York Law School Law Review, 38,* 387–399.

Stanko, E. (1985). *Intimate intrusions: Women's experiences of men's violence.* London, UK: Unwin Hyman.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intra family conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41*(1), 75–88.

Towl, G. (2016). Tackling sexual violence at UK universities: A case study. *Contemporary Social Science, 11*(4), 432–437.

Turner, C. (2017, March 2). Eight in ten British university lecturers are 'Left-wing', survey finds. *The Telegraph.* https://www.telegraph.co.uk/education/2017/03/02/eight-ten-british-university-lecturers-left-wing-survey-finds/. Last accessed July 2018.

Universities UK [UUK]. (2016). *Changing the culture: Report of the Universities UK Taskforce examining violence against women, harassment and hate crime affecting university students.* http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2016/changing-the-culture.pdf. Last accessed July 2018.

Universities UK [UUK]. (2017). *Changing the culture: One year on. An assessment of strategies to tackle sexual misconduct, hate crime and harassment affecting university students.* https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2018/changing-the-culture-one-year-on.pdf#search=gender%20based%20violence. Last accessed July 2018.

Vera-Gray, F. (2016, May 20). *Situating agency.* Trouble & Strife. http://www.troubleandstrife.org/2016/05/situating-agency/. Last accessed July 2018.

Volpp, L. (2000). Blaming culture for bad behavior. *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities, 12*(89), 89–116.

Walby, S., & Towers, J. (2017). Untangling the concept of coercive control: Theorizing domestic violent crime. *Criminology & Criminal Justice, 18*(1), 7–28.

Walby, S., Towers, J., & Francis, B. (2015). Is violent crime increasing or decreasing? A new methodology to measure repeat attacks making visible the significance of gender and domestic relations. *British Journal of Criminology, 56*(6), 1203–1234.

6

Building Connections Across Difference: Faculty Mentoring as Institutional Change

Heather Laube

Governments, professional organizations, and institutions of higher education around the world have acknowledged inequities in academia (and other professions) and expressed concern about the lack of diversity of both students and faculty. Some assume the significant underrepresentation of women and members of other historically marginalized groups as faculty and researchers relates to personal choice, fundamental lack of ability, or perhaps individual discrimination. They subsequently suggest small changes and systems of individual support. Feminist scholars, however, contend that underrepresentation is a consequence of gendered (and raced and classed) institutions and cultures. They argue for structural change and institutional transformation. As a feminist sociologist, I take the latter approach. This chapter considers the double-bind of *feminist outsiders-within academia*, contends that we must expand the margins to shift the center (Collins 1994), and suggests that

H. Laube (✉)
Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminal Justice,
University of Michigan-Flint, Flint, MI, USA
e-mail: hlaube@umflint.edu

the creation of institutional structures that establish connections across difference can support the success of individual women and contribute to the transformation of the academy.

In interviews with international scholars working on gender equity projects, I explore how the gendered structure of academia creates opportunities for disruption while constraining transformation. I identify three positionalities based on these narratives: the *supportive outsider-within academia*, the *feminist outsider*, and the *feminist outsider-within academia*. The narratives of *feminist outsiders-within* expose a struggle to balance feminist ideals and professional expectations and are particularly useful for illustrating the gendered structure of academia. These tensions reveal a double-bind in which feminist academics "will face the same unwanted outcome regardless of which approach is taken" (Jenkins 2014, p. 267). *Supportive outsiders-within* and *feminist outsiders* experience less tension, but, taken alongside those of the *feminist outsiders-within*, their narratives suggest that expanding diverse networks to engage more people in the work of transforming the academy may be a fruitful endeavor. In practice, institutional change requires a multi-pronged approach that supports the success of individual women *and* a transformation of the gendered institutional structures. I suggest that mindfully constructed formal faculty-mentoring programs can connect faculty across differences and build strong networks and communities that demand institutional change.

Feminism in the Gendered Academy

As a gendered (and raced and classed) institution, academia is built on a set of gendered organizational logics, the taken-for-granted and often presumed-to-be gender-neutral policies and practices of organizations that create and reproduce hierarchies of power and meaning (Acker 1990, 2006; Britton 2000). Gendered ideologies, policies and procedures, cultures, interactions, and identities structure academia as well as individual organizations like universities and research institutes. Disciplines dominated by men and men's knowledge tend to be more highly regarded and better paid; professional positions are likely

to reflect an assumption that the worker has a wife at home; and evaluation processes are constructed to value the instrumental work that men are more likely to do, rather than the nurturing work women are expected to do (Acker 1990; Bird 2011). Mainstream scientific principles, and assumptions about the production and dissemination of knowledge, reflect the ideal of a disconnected and disembodied scientist and presume pure objectivity (Haraway 1988). Because these academic and work structures are organized to reflect masculine ideals, and thus reward those who practice and embody them, men are more likely to occupy positions of power, and gendered structures are replicated because they seem normal and neutral (Britton 2000).

Gender schemas (Bem 1981), implicit or unconscious assumptions about gender differences, affect our expectations and evaluations of women and men. When individuals' implicit biases combine with gendered organizational logics, women and others from marginalized groups are often made to feel unwelcome. Identifying and analyzing gendered structures and interactions is the work of feminist scholars. While feminist scholars are not necessarily women, academic institutions that are not welcoming to women are likely to have fewer feminist scholars (Jenkins 2014, p. 270). Feminist academics reshape the boundaries of "legitimate" knowledge (David 2014; Laube 2010; Underhill-Sem 2017) and challenge gendered workplace norms (Hart 2005; Parsons and Priola 2013), even in the face of a chilly climate (Britton 2017; Sandler and Hall 1986). They do this work as outsiders-within their disciplines and institutions, striving to maintain their commitment to feminist principles while conforming to mainstream expectations enough to achieve professional success.

Collins' (1986) concept of "Outsiders Within" describes how gender and race intersect to situate women of color as outsiders even after they have gained access to mainstream institutions. Women (including women of color) in academia belong, are smart and competent, and should be listened to, yet are "presumed incompetent" or are under suspicion when they claim their presence is legitimate (Gutierrez y Muhs et al. 2012; Ahmed 2009). Integrating feminist identity (Sang 2018) into this intersectional analysis of the gendered character of academia contributes to our understanding of feminist scholars' experiences in

the academy and reveals how structures must change to welcome and support diverse people and knowledge.

Women who claim and are able to retain a feminist identity, as they gain legitimacy within a discipline, may maintain the "creative tension of outsider within status by encouraging and institutionalizing outsider within ways of seeing" (Collins 1986, p. S29). We engage with feminist theories that argue for a "reordering and restructuring of individual and social life," and consequently become open to political critique (Elshtain 1981, p. 204). We are presumed to be political and dismissed as "not real scholars" before our work and contributions are appropriately evaluated. As outsiders-within, we expose the tensions between the norms of mainstream academia and feminist scholarship and practice. Our presence disrupts the day-to-day routines of the university and assumptions embedded within practices of knowledge production and dissemination.

The Double-Bind

By definition, scholars who employ feminist theory as a frame embrace the political, positioning themselves as outsiders-within. Feminist scholars confront a double-bind as we attempt to practice feminist ideals, achieve professional respect, and attain legitimate positions in academia (Ahmed 2017). If we consistently question, critique, and push the boundaries, we may not be evaluated as legitimate scholars or be welcome to stay and continue our work. Conversely, if we conform to mainstream academic ideals, we may not produce feminist knowledge that informs feminist change. Jenkins (2014) identifies three key tensions that contribute to this double-bind. First, mainstream academia assumes research can be, and is, objective and impartial, while feminist scholars argue that this presumption is faulty and knowledge reflects a scholar's situated position in the social world (Haraway 1988). The second tension highlights the ways disciplines place feminist scholarship and practice on the fringes of the main disciplinary discourses, marginalizing and dismissing it as not really *of* the discipline. Marginalization negatively impacts the careers of feminist scholars and

discourages the production of new feminist knowledge. Finally, a discipline's canonical works, which often must be referenced for research to be taken seriously, may be explicitly or implicitly hostile to feminist perspectives (Katuna 2015). Feminist scholars, kept at the margins and thus out of the canon, may find ourselves repeatedly responding to basic arguments and personal attacks instead of moving knowledge forward.

Understanding the double-bind and recognizing positionalities on the margins can lead to productive responses that support individuals and alter the very structures that produce this double-bind. The double-bind cannot be resolved by individuals choosing one option over another (Jenkins 2014); it must be resolved by a collectivity working toward structural change.

Methods

I use interviews with seven women to develop three positionalities of women who engage in gender change work in academia. Each is connected to academia and has a formal position as a gender change agent in her institution or in broader collaborative projects. All are white women from various European countries. Most are feminist and gender scholars, and this perspective informs their analysis and practice. While this is a small sample, and not diverse, the positionalities that emerge from the narratives encompass scholars in many identity categories. Further research should apply these positionalities to the experiences of a wide range of marginalized people inside academia.

During in-depth interviews, I ask participants to describe their feminist identities, their work to improve gender equity and diversity, and how their professional and social locations shape their experiences. Interviews are conducted in English, take place through Skype, average about 80 minutes, and are transcribed verbatim. I use pseudonyms to protect the women's identities. Initial participants were identified through networks I developed while on a Fulbright Award in Austria in 2015. I used snowball sampling to identify additional interviewees.

Conceptualization

Three positionalities emerged from these interviews: *the supportive outsider-within academia*, the *feminist outsider*, and the *feminist outsider-within academia* (Laube 2017). The *supportive outsider-within* is situated inside a university or research institute and working to make change, but is not a feminist scholar. The *feminist outsider-within* is situated inside a university or research institute, identifies as feminist, works for gender change, and must traverse the boundary between political actor and scholar-scientist. The *feminist outsider* is feminist, a gender scholar, and a gender change agent who enters academia to do that work but does not have an official position inside a university or research institute. These positionalities are a product of how these scholars identify the root of the problem of inequality in academia and how that conceptualization and analysis informs their gender change work. *Supportive outsiders-within* do not identify as feminist scholars and do not come to their work as gender change agents with a deep understanding of the organization as a gendered structure. Consequently, their solutions are often small-scale and focus on encouraging women and helping them succeed in the structure as it exists. Conversely, *feminist outsiders* and *feminist outsiders-within* identify as feminist scholars and embark on their work with an assumption that organizations are gendered, and structural transformation is necessary to create a more diverse and inclusive academy and society.

Findings

These positionalities generate possibilities for action, inspire assumptions and reactions from others, and shape professional status. Each positionality shapes the degree to which women experience the conflict between feminist commitments and the norms of mainstream academia. *Feminist outsiders* and *supportive outsiders-within* experience this tension to a lesser degree than *feminist outsiders-within*. While she may be viewed as political because of her feminist commitments and their integration into her work, the *feminist outsider* is not dependent on the institution she critiques and is thus less subject to the tensions experienced by *feminist*

outsiders-within. *Supportive outsiders-within* and *feminist outsiders-within* have professional credentials and positions that demand acknowledgment of their legitimate claim to their positions inside the academy, but they experience the double-bind differently. *Supportive outsiders-within* experience tensions because they are women (often in masculine fields) doing gender change work inside academia. These tensions, however, are relatively inconsequential if their scholarly work is not relegated to the margins of their disciplines and they are not advocating for institutional transformation. *Feminist outsiders-within* confront more significant structural challenges because of their particular positionality.

Feminist outsiders-within experience the double-bind most acutely as they critique the institutions on which they depend for their livelihood. Their feminist identities and practice garner suspicion about their motives, scholarly objectivity, and by what means they achieved their professional status (Laube 2017). Feminist methodologies acknowledge that knowledge is situated and partial, while mainstream academic norms insist scholars can be, and are, disconnected and impartial. This tension creates a double-bind for feminist academics. What makes *feminist outsiders-within* experts, their feminist scholarship, is also what makes them and political motives, suspicious. At the same time, their status as *feminist outsiders-within* informs their critique and nuanced analysis of the gendered structure and is what sustains the potential for institutionalized change. In my analysis, I focus on *feminist outsiders-within* because we apply our expertise as we scrutinize our own experiences; our positionality clearly exposes the double-bind, and remedies are often both individual and institutional. I juxtapose this positionality with *supportive outsiders-within* and *feminist outsiders* to emphasize the importance of networks in making significant change.

Feminist Outsiders-Within, Managing the Double-Bind

The tension between feminist methodologies and mainstream academic norms is visible in the ways disciplines marginalize feminist research, encourage skepticism of feminist scholars' motives, and pigeonhole

feminists as scholars who are only interested in a narrow and peripheral area of research (Jenkins 2014). Helen, a feminist social scientist inside academia, clearly articulates the tension between claiming a feminist identity and resisting mainstream scholars' tendency to marginalize feminist scholars.

> There are issues around identifying yourself as feminist, I think. … But I am a feminist. … I just don't feel necessarily comfortable with the label because of the connotations associated with it. But I do think of myself as a feminist and I live as best as I can holding to feminist principles in my life. But I find it a problematic term when you're trying to, I don't know, build yourself in your career where I don't want to be pigeon-holed.

Kimberly, a feminist social scientist at a research institute, experiences similar frustration. As a feminist outsider-within, she feels branded as the "gender person."

> Sometimes I feel that nobody's really interested in my opinion as a scientific person who reads and writes, and whatever. It's just like, 'Okay we have *Kimberly* sitting here so we have to think about what we say'…Nobody talks with me about the content of anything, but they always think 'Oh yeah, she's sitting there so maybe there is some gender in a project.'

This positionality keeps her in the margins and can mean she is not taken seriously as a social scientist. However, her feminist scholarship and commitments oblige her to persist. If not for her presence, gender might not be included at all.

Sandra is less concerned with being categorized as the "gender person," because her feminist scholarship has earned her a level of respect as a researcher in the field. As a feminist outsider-within, tension emerges when her scholarly expertise intersects with her feminist commitments to inform her practice inside her own institution. She indicates she feels compelled to work for gender equity in her own institution in part due to the legitimacy she has gained doing this work in other institutions, but she has to navigate the double-bind between the demands of feminist scholarship and norms of mainstream academia.

> I am very aware of what I do as a researcher. I somehow developed this understanding of how I should act as a member of the institution in a political sense – to somehow initiate change within the institution with this focus on gender equality. I think I never would have done that if I worked in another field. I think I gained a lot of expertise during the last 15 years – of how research works and how our research can be identified and made visible. How to argue that this is a problem … At this point it was somehow clear that I also have to do that at my institution.

Sandra's expertise gives her not only confidence and legitimacy, but also a sense of how to navigate the politics of her institution. When the director of the institute calls her a "problem," her legitimacy as a scholar is called into question. Even respected experts like Sandra are "somehow a constant problem whenever [they] say something." It is just this position, however, that preserves the tension that compels *feminist outsiders-within* to demand change and contribute to scholarly ways of knowing that support demands and broaden our knowledge. When feminist gender scholars are pigeonholed and marginalized, their work is delegitimized and progress toward their own professional goals is impeded. Bringing more of these scholars from the margins to the center contributes to institutional change because their expertise provides them a means with which to analyze their experiences and observations and to transform structures to eliminate these challenges.

Feminist outsiders-within, who are often acutely aware of the inequities embedded in institutional structures, may not always feel able and empowered to act. The tensions they confront as they navigate the double-bind may necessitate external encouragement and support to engage in change work within their institutions. Outside demands, directives, or incentives provide a frame for equity work, so it is not interpreted as only in their interest, but as something required by the government, funding organizations, or other external entities. Even Sandra, who has spent many years developing and using her expertise to support change in other organizations and has published extensively on this topic, notes that it is important that her push for gender equity inside her institution not be seen as her individual hobby. She reflects, "I never would have started trying to change something [in my institute] without this

incentive or push from outside. This argument—it's not *me* that would like to have [gender equity], it's the Ministry. *They* are asking for that."

Expand the Margins to Shift the Center

Because of their analysis of structural inequalities, commitment to making change, and personal challenges inside academia, *feminist outsiders-within* connect with other gender change agents for support and collaboration. One goal of feminist scholarship and gender equity work is to increase diversity in the academy with the intent to shift the margins to the center. Although not enough to incite significant change, the presence of women and other marginalized people, even if not feminist, is potentially disruptive. Engaging more people provides opportunities, expands networks, and builds knowledge and understanding that can lead to change. Sarah, a *feminist outsider-within*, explains the ways her feminist commitments and expertise provide opportunities to work with scholars in a wide range of disciplines and to help them see the ways the institutional structure perpetuates inequalities. Her commitment to effecting change in academia has shown her the importance of connecting with people across disciplinary and positional boundaries. She sees feminist epistemology as having the ability to reveal intersecting inequalities and exposing how they are embedded in institutional structures and affect people in all positions.

> It's about trying to kind of deal with power inequality in whatever form it presents itself… I think it's all linked although it's not necessarily obvious. I think it has been helpful to be on committees and get to know people and network in that way. It's a good networking thing because you know otherwise you might just – If you're not involved in what the university is doing you might just be sitting in your office writing papers or delivering teaching to students. But then there's this whole thing happening – there's this whole structure that – and there's loads of people in the university that are really interesting to talk to.

Building diverse networks, identifying and engaging *supportive outsiders-within*, and connecting with *feminist outsiders* increase potential

disruption and the possibility of institutional transformation. Clara, *supportive outsider-within*, is reluctant to label herself feminist, yet participation in gender equity work, at the request of her superior, has made her embrace this work.

> At the beginning it was an obligation. You have to complete this and you have to complete that and you have to do that. But with time…after completing some interviews or some contacts with the people here in the Institute, when you realize what their situation is, you think that you can help in a way or at least to listen to them… I'm trying to be really helpful toward my colleagues. And to also somehow to encourage, yes, to encourage them because I've [been successful].

Supportive outsiders-within like Clara may only come to gender equity work in response to encouragement or obligations imposed from the outside. It is important for *feminist outsiders-within* to engage with people in this positionality, and for institutions to create opportunities for *supportive outsiders-within* to build networks. Such connections expand the potential for institutional change, even when such change is not the focus for the *supportive outsider-within*. Building collaborative relationships with *supportive outsiders-within* is useful as they encounter fewer tensions because they work squarely within the system to make change; are viewed as more impartial than someone who clearly identifies as feminist; and, as a result, are perceived as less disruptive. Small changes to institutional policies and practice may support cultural change that makes these environments more inviting to women. At the very least, increasing the number of women in masculine fields disrupts the assumption that women cannot and should not do this work. While not transformational, such incremental change matters, and expanding networks can support it.

Expanding links and networks outside the formal boundaries of universities and research institutes also promotes change by inviting targeted expertise and legitimacy, and by extending networks for those who have few like-minded colleagues on the inside. While she still confronts some of the tensions of the double-bind, as an outside expert the *feminist outsider* may have some legitimacy. Susan notes that *feminist*

outsiders have an opportunity to provide a different perspective and that the results of research may be less suspect when presented by external experts rather than colleagues (even those who are experts). She suggests that people inside institutions feel freer to share their experiences with *feminist outsiders*, "because we [are] the representatives for these results and not their colleagues." While she clearly cares about improving the situation for women, as an outsider and someone who has been hired with the clear purpose of assessing the status and making recommendations, she inspires less skepticism than the *feminist outsider-within* who is seen as a "problem."

Mentoring as a Strategy for Institution Change

While these positionalities are constructed from narratives of white women in several European countries, they expose challenges faced by marginalized faculty more broadly. Close examination of *feminist outsiders-within* illuminates the double-bind faced by feminist women who endeavor to have successful academic careers, while concurrently working to change academia. Clearly, significant change requires a critical mass, and we must employ a variety of tactics to engage the greatest number of people in this work. Careful reflection of the gendered character of academic institutions, and the gender schemas under which people within them operate, can inform the development of programs and interventions that support individual women's success and stimulate institutional transformation (Morrissey and Schmidt 2008). One useful strategy is to create structures that encourage connections across difference. Building networks invites more diverse people and perspectives into the conversation, increases understanding, and provides more lenses to draw upon to develop solutions.

Formal faculty-mentoring programs are one familiar approach universities and research institutes utilize to support marginalized faculty. Such programs frequently focus on helping individuals navigate the system as it exists, and may re-inscribe inequality as they employ dominant discourses to identify and solve problems (Allan 2015). Rather than insisting institutions address the root causes of inequalities within them,

these models may frame gender equity as a problem of women's deficiency when the obstacle is the privilege embedded in the structure of the institution.

Reflecting the assumption that institutions have fundamentally neutral structures, many faculty-mentoring programs have been, and continue to be, structured on a hierarchal model in which a single senior colleague, with presumably vast knowledge, bestows their knowledge on a junior colleague and guides them along the path toward professional success. In this model, meaningful mentoring is likely to be elusive for, or even exclude, many marginalized faculty for whom senior colleagues with similar experiences and concerns are rare. Because the senior mentor has succeeded in the academy as it exists, such a model often has the effect of replicating structures that create challenges in the first place.

While hierarchical mentoring may have its place, it is fraught with issues and should not be the only, or even primary, model employed by organizations. This does not, however, mean mentoring is ineffective or that it should be cast aside in favor of other faculty support. Robust and mindfully constructed faculty mentoring programs have the potential to improve recruitment and retention of women and other minorities. Not only can mentoring support individual faculty, innovative mentoring programs can also bring people together to demand change and can help ensure *outsiders-within* remain inside. Transformational faculty-mentoring program must, at their core, acknowledge the fundamentally gendered (and raced and classed) structure of academia. The goal is not to more evenly distribute the resource of power, or to simply increase numbers of diverse faculty, but to address the root cause, the inequalities built into the structure, and make change by drawing on more, and more diverse, knowledge.

Recent scholarship encourages this shift from one-on-one hierarchical mentoring to needs-based models that encompass an array of mentoring relationships (de Janasz and Sullivan 2004; Sorcinelli et al. 2016; NCFDD, n.d.). This shift requires faculty to expand their networks and, consequently, to think about how diverse people, in multiple social locations, have a collection of valuable skills and knowledge. Mentoring networks cross borders of discipline, institution, and identity. They increase connections and exposure to first-hand tales of

challenges which inspire a greater appreciation of the positionalities diverse colleagues occupy. Networks also provide safe spaces for marginalized faculty to come together to share stories and strategize for change (De Welde and Stepnick 2015). *Feminist outsiders-within*, for example, appreciate that the tensions they experience are not unique and share strategies for managing the double-bind. Through relationship-building across difference, inclusive mentoring networks invite more people to embrace the positionality of *supportive outsider-within* and build support for change. *Feminist outsiders* become valuable links for insiders because they have a distinct perspective and set of experiences and concerns.

Network-based mentoring includes a variety of mentoring models that are non-hierarchical and mutually beneficial. Such models not only support individual faculty in pursuit of their goals, but also encourage them to think differently about how knowledge is produced, who is present in various spaces, and what they value. Below I describe several models and point out the ways they may contribute to institutional change.

Reverse mentoring pairs junior and senior colleagues, but the junior colleague is identified as the person with specific skills, knowledge, or experience to offer their more senior colleague (De Vries 2011). As the mentor, the junior person introduces their more senior colleague to new ways of thinking about things like work–life balance and alternative perspectives on policies and practices, and offers insight into the desires and realities of people in the early stages of their careers. An additional benefit is that this structure encourages junior and senior colleagues to seek each other out and develop relationships. Beyond individual benefits, those with more seniority are likely to have more power and influence, a deeper understanding of the structure, and broader networks. If senior leaders begin to think about equity issues from new perspectives and alter the way they view women's leadership potential, for example, they may be encouraged to initiate institutional change, including cultural transformation.

Peer (or near-peer) mentoring involves two or more people of similar status and may occur in a small group or a larger network. Such a model combines both formal and informal characteristics (Thomas et al. 2015; Henderson et al. 2010; O'Meara and Stromquist 2015; NEA 2009). Connecting similarly situated colleagues can prevent isolation

and burnout by building community. Developing and strengthening peer relationships facilitates information-sharing, supports collaborative problem-solving, and eases the discussion of matters of work and personal life because the power inequalities are reduced. Additionally, historically marginalized faculty are likely to have more similar peers than senior colleagues. Building a mentoring network of peers shifts the focus from the stress of finding a senior mentor to identifying specific needs and how to meet them.

One form of *peer mentoring* occurs in formally organized *mentoring circles* that provide an opportunity for a group of faculty to come together to identify common needs and discuss strategies for change (Thomas et al. 2015). These loosely structured groups are led by a facilitator who may solicit current issues and help to guide the group-led discussion. As individuals share specific challenges and needs, the group is introduced to others' experiences. They work to understand unfamiliar concerns and are encouraged to question their assumptions about their colleagues and the institution. In addition to the individual support faculty give and receive, this model supports institutional transformation. Through discussion, members work together to develop ideas and policies they may then propose to those in positions to make change (Bussey-Jones et al. 2006; Darwin and Palmer 2009). Such action has the potential to change institutional culture rather than to encourage faculty to adapt to policies as they exist (as may happen in hierarchical one-to-one mentoring).

To create effective and robust mentoring programs, institutions must support the process through mentor training and development (NCFDD, n.d.; Ramani et al. 2006). Mentors must be intensely aware of the particular challenges and concerns of faculty from historically marginalized and underrepresented groups in order to build strong relationships, ask powerful questions, and demand institutional change (De Welde and Stepnick 2015; Gutierrez y Muhs et al. 2012). Training mentors and bringing them into networks where they develop relationships with diverse faculty has the potential to impel cultural change by making gendered structures and implicit biases more visible and, thus, able to be addressed. Participation in formal mentoring programs must be officially recognized and supported by administrators and reward structures (Johnson 2007).

Conclusion

Gender inequity and lack of diversity in academia is not a result of women's inadequacies or failings but, rather, a consequence of the gendered structure of the institution. Jenkins (2014) notes that "an institution that systematically excludes women is, by definition, an institution that operates in ways that are contrary to feminist principles" (p. 270). *Feminist outsiders-within* are, thus, well positioned to serve as examples of this marginalization and to provide an analysis and set of solutions to the problem (Boisvert 2010). Women who are *feminist outsiders-within* are often on the margins of academic disciplines, of the academy itself, and of perceptions and assumptions of science and knowledge production. They challenge pre-conceived ideas, create new knowledge, and endeavor to shift boundaries between margin and center to build a more inclusive and equitable academy and world. Simply inviting more diverse people in does not guarantee increased equality, but if diverse people are not present, change will not happen. Diverse people committed to change must be successful in the structure as it currently exists (in order to stay and continue to make change), but individual success must not come at the expense of the reproduction of gendered power structures. Institutional change must occur simultaneously. Expanding networks across difference fosters support for individuals and improves the likelihood that structural change will result from widely supported demands. Formal faculty mentoring programs that emphasize community building across difference can contribute to individual success and institutional transformation.

References

Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society, 4*(2), 139–158.

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes: Gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society, 20*(4), 441–464.

Ahmed, S. (2009). Embodying diversity: Problems and paradoxes for black feminists. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 12*(1), 41–52.

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Allan, E. J. (2015). Multiple perspectives for creating change in the academy. In K. De Welde & A. Stepnick (Eds.), *Disrupting the culture of silence: Confronting gender inequality and making change in higher education* (pp. 293–302). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354–364.

Bird, S. R. (2011). Unsettling universities' incongruous, gendered bureaucratic structures: A case-study approach. *Gender, Work & Organization, 18*(2), 202–230.

Boisvert, J. A. (2010). Feminist mentorship in the academy: Revolutionary feminism in action. In E. C. Mayock & D. Radulescu (Eds.), *Feminist activism in academia: Essays on personal, political and professional change* (pp. 78–97). Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Co.

Britton, D. M. (2000). The epistemology of the gendered organization. *Gender & Society, 14*(3), 418–434.

Britton, D. M. (2017). Beyond the chilly climate: The salience of gender in women's academic careers. *Gender & Society, 31*(1), 5–27.

Bussey-Jones, J., Bernstein, L., Higgins, S., Malebranche, D., Paranjape, A., Genao, I., et al. (2006). Repaving the road to academic success: The IMeRGE approach to peer mentoring. *Academic Medicine, 81*(7), 674–679.

Collins, P. H. (1986). Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of black feminist thought. *Social Problems, 33*(6), 14–S32.

Collins, P. H. (1994). Shifting the center: Race, class, and feminist theorizing about motherhood. In E. N. Glenn, G. Chang, & L. Forcey (Eds.), *Mothering: Ideology, experience and agency* (pp. 45–65). New York, NY: Routledge.

Darwin, A., & Palmer, E. (2009). Mentoring circles in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development, 28*(2), 125–136.

David, M. E. (2014). *Feminism, gender and universities: Politics, passion and pedagogies*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.

de Janasz, S. C., & Sullivan, S. E. (2004). Multiple mentoring in academe: Developing the professional network. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 64*(2), 263–283.

De Vries, J. (2011). *Mentoring for change.* Paper prepared for Universities Australia Executive Women (UAEW). http://hr.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0005/581297/MentoringForChange-LHMartinInstitute.pdf. Last accessed June 2018.

De Welde, K., & Stepnick, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Disrupting the culture of silence: Confronting gender inequality and making change in higher education.* Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Elshtain, J. B. (1981). *Public man, private woman: Women in social and political thought.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gutierrez y Muhs, G., Niemann, Y. F., Gonzalez, C. G., & Harris, A. P. (Eds.). (2012). *Presumed incompetent: The intersections of race and class for women in academia.* Logan: Utah State University Press.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspectives. *Feminist Studies, 14*(3), 575–599.

Hart, J. (2005). Activism among feminist academics: Professionalized activism and activist professionals. *Advancing Women in Leadership Online Journal, 18*(Spring). http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/social_justice1/Hart.html. Last accessed May 2018.

Henderson, T. L., Hunter, A. G., & Hildreth, G. J. (2010). Outsiders within the academy: Strategies for resistance and mentoring African American women. *Michigan Family Review, 14*(1), 27–41.

Jenkins, K. (2014). 'That's not philosophy': Feminism, academia and the double bind. *Journal of Gender Studies, 23*(3), 262–274.

Johnson, B. W. (2007). *On being a mentor: A guide for higher education faculty.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Katuna, B. (2015). Perpetuating inequality through the canons of disciplinary knowledge. In K. De Welde & A. Stepnick (Eds.), *Disrupting the culture of silence: Confronting gender inequality and making change in higher education* (pp. 163–172). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Laube, H. (2010). 'It's part of my being': Demand making and discursive protest by feminist sociologists inside academia. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change, 30,* 3–41.

Laube, H. (2017). Präsenz, disruption, transformation: Feministinnen als insider und outsider im vergeschlechtlichten system der wissenschaft (Presence, disruption, and transformation: Feminists as insiders and outsiders in the gendered academy). In J. Dahmen & A. Thaler (Eds.), *Soziale geschlechtergerechtigkeit in wissenschaft und forschung* (*Social gender justice in science and research*) (pp. 73–94). Opladen, GB: Verlag Barbara Budrich.

Morrissey, Cl. S. & Schmidt, M. L. (2008). Fixing the system, not the women: An innovative approach to faculty advancement. *Journal of Women's Health, 17*(8), 1399–1408.

NCFDD [National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity]. (n.d.). *On-demand access to the mentoring, tools, and support you need to be successful in the academy*. https://www.facultydiversity.org/. Last accessed June 2018.

NEA. (2009, April). *Mutual mentoring*. Higher Education Advocate. http://www.nea.org/home/33677.htm. Last accessed June 2018.

O'Meara, K. A., & Stromquist, N. P. (2015). Faculty peer networks: Role and relevance in advancing agency and gender equity. *Gender and Education, 27*(3), 338–358.

Parsons, E., & Priola, V. (2013). Agents for change and changed agents: The micro-politics of change and feminism in the academy. *Gender, Work, and Organization, 20*(5), 580–598.

Ramani, S., Gruppen, L., & Kachur, E. K. (2006). Twelve tips for developing effective mentors. *Medical Teacher, 28*(5), 404–408.

Sandler, B. R. & Hall, R. M. (1986). *The campus climate revisited: Chilly for women faculty, administrators, and graduate students.* http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED282462. Last accessed May 2018.

Sang, K. J. C. (2018). Gender, ethnicity and feminism: An intersectional analysis of the lived experiences feminist academic women in UK higher education. *Journal of Gender Studies, 27*(2), 192–206.

Sorcinelli, M., Jung Yun, D., & Baldi, B. (2016). *Mutual mentoring guide*. The Institute for Teaching Excellence & Faculty Development, The University of Massachusetts. https://www.umass.edu/tefd/. Last accessed June 2018.

Thomas, N., Bystydzienski, J., & Desai, A. (2015). Changing institutional culture through peer mentoring of women STEM faculty. *Innovation in Higher Education, 40,* 143–157.

Underhill-Sem, Y. T. R.-R.-O.-T. (2017). Academic work as radical practice: Getting in, creating a space, not giving up. *Geographical Research, 55*(3), 332–337.

7

First Nations' Women in the Academy: Disrupting and Displacing the White Male Gaze

Sandy O'Sullivan

Across colonised countries, the academy has been an instrument of the state and has collaborated in the project of colonial suppression of First Nations'[1] Communities and Peoples. This inculcation, while compounded for First Nations' women engaged in education and research, is being challenged by these same academics as we create a space that disrupts the dominant scrutiny and expectation; our[2] women are leading the change. This chapter explores projects and activities of academic engagement that promote inclusion by engaging the power of disruption and displacement. Iterations include Bronwyn Carlson's Forum for Indigenous Research Excellence that has shaped strength around diversity and centralised the First Nations' experience, and the assessment processes within the Australian Research Council's Discovery Indigenous program that has prioritised Indigenous women researchers. The chapter aims to provide a roadmap of current practice, contributions, and speculates on potential strategies across research, teaching

S. O'Sullivan (✉)
University of the Sunshine Coast, Maroochydore, QLD, Australia
e-mail: sosulli1@usc.edu.au

and engagement in the academy that transform how and why First Nations' women are achieving through disruption and the displacement of power in the academy (Craven and Mooney 2013).

While the dominant male gaze in the academy has its own deeply problematic history and ecology (Winchester and Browning 2015; Monroe et al. 2008; Bagilhole 2002; Robinson 2017), for women who embody a disruption to the colonial interface in which the academy has grown and thrived, our challenge has been to confound its centrality and protest its stability (Pascoe 2018). Where destabilising has occurred in Australia, it is often through the actions of First Nations' scholars who have challenge from their outsider status, and who claim the right to centre the discussion around the needs of community, the desires of the forced collective of First Nations' Peoples, and who interrogate from a position that uniquely represents groups of people who have been studied upon (Fredericks 2010, 2013; Behrendt et al. 2012). The academy is challenged through the assertion of multiple scholars that it must change and bend (Robinson 2017; Winchester and Browning 2015) to make it equally representative across gender. These same tools cannot easily be reapplied for First Nations' women, and in order to understand how and why our tools may be different, we need to understand why feminism and the women's rights movement have frequently sidestepped key issues for First Nations' women. We also need to understand that First Nations' women are creating academic worlds and spheres of influence that enrich and enhance the academy while resisting dominant colonial conformations.

Feminism, Equality and the Inclusion/Exclusion Zone

Over three decades ago, Dr. Jackie Huggins [Bidjara and Birri-Gubba Juru], current Co-Chair of the National Congress of Australia's First Peoples, asked us to consider that when First Nations' women were supporting Indigenous men alongside our women in their aspiration for power and equal rights, they were not occupying the same position as white women supporting white patriarchy (Huggins 1987). This lesson, told consistently by senior First Nations' academic women

(Moreton-Robinson 2000; Fredericks 2010), has been repeated so consistently that it seems to have little traction or discussion in the broader academic community. The idea that if you support all women, marginalised women will be brought along, has been roundly challenged by women of colour writing in both the colonial and race and whiteness studies fields (Painter 2011; Kovach 2009; Moreton-Robinson 2000). The failure to translate the importance that we must bring our brothers along with us in order to challenge the colonial constructs of the academy and beyond has roots in the women's movement that frequently failed to adequately lift up the perspectives and voices of First Nations' women and women of colour by ignoring the specificity of their cultural and social experiences (Crenshaw 2018; Suzack et al. 2010; Block 2012). This is not to suggest that feminisms across women of colour or Indigenous women are not substantial, nuanced and diverse, but rather that externally imposed ideas of feminism and equality cannot tidily apply to First Nations' Peoples or women of colour in the same way as they do for women who experience a power relationship otherwise aligned to the dominant, colonial culture (Moreton-Robinson 2015; Bielefeld 2016).

The complexity that Huggins proposed and that Moreton-Robinson extensively built on requires us to consider the tensions that exist in feminism and its relationship to the dominant order, and how removed the experience of Black/Blak/Indigenous women is from these discussions. In a text titled *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Foucault and Feminism* the complex, 'tensions' between Foucault and Feminism are considered by a range of white feminists exploring multiple facets of feminism and power, and the ways in which Foucault fails to adequately explore these complexities. While the text is tuned to complexities of feminism, with one contributor taking on the universality of women, feminism and gender politics (Ramazanoglu 1993, p. 100), each chapter comfortably fails to further position the complex relationship that feminism has as a lens on cultural interaction. If Foucault has a women problem, does he also have a First Nations' women or women of colour problem? The difficulty is that without First Nations' women or women of colour voices present, we become another element to consider; there is no capacity for specific or in-depth discussion, and no referent beyond the dyadic dynamic of gender.

We see a similar problem in the social action of Guerrilla Girls, a late twentieth-century anonymous political action group that challenged the dominance of men across the arts. Their brief was to challenge the status quo that privileged men as arts practitioners, they latterly considered race, and only after substantial criticism. Their anonymity has meant no transparency over representation of women of colour in their group (Chave 2011). In spite of a focus that aims to rebalance equal representation in the arts, their own lack of transparency is compounded by claims from original members that there were very few women of colour, and that one of the two leaders of the group—a white woman, Jerilea Zempel—had appropriated the name of an artist of colour, Frida Kahlo as her anonymous moniker (Richards 2008).

While diverse exclusions are likely unintentional, it is the ease by which diverse voices are ignored, erased or conflated that is of concern to many Indigenous women in the academy. Unintentional exclusion and simplified inclusion become the problematic that many of our colleagues in the academy address through the lens of critical race theory, and in the lived experience of engaging as a First Nations' woman in the academy.

In *Talkin' Up to the White Woman*, Aileen Moreton-Robinson [Goenpul woman from Minjerribah], Distinguished Professor at Queensland University of Technology, describes the position of white women in the colonial project, as having access to unequal power based on colonisation and dispossession (2000, p. 14). She provides a compelling argument that it was the actions of women in these power positions persistently and selectively offering to educate and lift up Indigenous women only in ways that they deemed appropriate, and using their own lens of expectations (2000, p. 16). She claims feminist actions around equality with white men and antidiscrimination solely focused on gender and failed to consider or incorporate the concerns of First Nations' women or other marginalised groups.

In her later text, *White Possessive: Property, Power and Indigenous Sovereignty,* she explores this thesis more fully as she formulates a framework that argues that Indigenous Peoples become the possession of the coloniser in a journey from claiming ownership of our land, to claiming ownership over our bodies. While she acknowledges all

women throughout history as subject to possession, she articulates
key differences for colonised bodies, in part around how frequently
claims of changes to these rights are only true for women with oth-
erwise equal power to men, for example, rights to vote, a right
to own land, and that these rights were frequently not extended or
extended later to First Nations' women (2015, p. 133). She provides
a pivotal example of the way in which white women are believed
over Indigenous women, and makes a compelling demonstration
by articulating the events that led to The Intervention, an act that
removed agency from our communities and that erased the work
that Aboriginal woman had done for decades before. In her 2006
appearance across the national media, Crown Prosecutor, Dr. Nanette
Rogers, a white woman reported on Indigenous communities' fail-
ure to 'take responsibility for their actions' in relation to the sexual
abuse of children. Moreton-Robinson reminds her readers that Rogers
and the media failed to report that for decades before, Aboriginal
women had appeared in multiple public forums to talk about these
issues and to call for support and empowerment of the community to
act (Moreton-Robinson 2015). The resulting media storm led to the
Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER), popularly known
as The Intervention, a government action that would yet again recast
Aboriginal people as requiring guidance and protection by white peo-
ple, and Aboriginal women of being incapable of protecting children
(Moreton-Robinson 2015; Nakata 2018).

Both texts by Moreton-Robinson cast doubt over the advocacy that
mainstream applications of feminism, women's rights and processes
that empower and enable women who inhabit the mainstream, have for
Indigenous women. Where mainstream women's voices have silenced
or drowned out Indigenous women's voices through a compromised,
selective listening that Moreton-Robinson wrote about in relation to the
NTER, there has been a resulting mistrust in that relationship. If there
remain inherent risks in continuing to participate in these conversations
where unequal power can result in further damage to our communities,
it may be through the agency of strong First Nations' academic lead-
ers like Moreton-Robinson that our community can demand that our
voices are not ignored or erased.

First Nations' Women in the Academy

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples have come late to the academy (Behrendt et al. 2012), with many of us engaged in higher education only in the last few decades, and our numbers remaining substantially lower than the general population (UA 2017; Asmar and Page 2009). Our late inclusion coincides with substantial, disconnected changes to the academy across Australia and internationally that range from a lack of job security to expectations of longer work hours and more stressful work. It also comes at a time when there are heightened expectations that First Nations' Peoples provide support and input into the process of embedding Indigenous Knowledges and Perspectives across the academy (UA 2017). This added pressure creates a layer of expectation that we both inform the academy of appropriate epistemologies, at the same time as gate-keeping against abuse and misinformation (Fredericks 2010), putting us between a rock and a hard place: the academy and the reasonable expectations of our Community.

So, who are we, as academic First Nations' women? What fields of study do we inhabit, and what are our expectations and the expectations of our communities? Some of these answers were found in the Review of Higher Education Access and Outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People completed in 2012 (Behrendt et al. 2012). It provided a snapshot of both our student expectations and our academic workforce, and it spoke to concerns around equity and parity for women against their mainstream. It also reviewed the strength of directing research and teaching concentrations, focused academic inquiry, and networks, one of which—the National Indigenous Knowledge Research Network (NIRKN)—was run by Aileen Moreton-Robinson. It discussed the need for leadership in the form of executive and senior management positions held by First Nations' Peoples, and connection and responsibilities back to Community. It also spoke to the importance of the development of a workforce that adequately meets the needs of First Australians. In doing so, it began to raise questions around how the workforce was developing and some of these would be addressed by the

Australian Research Council this year, as they began an extensive review of how they support First Nations' academics, with specific notes on what this means for women (ARC 2018).

In August 2018, after extensive consultation with targeted senior researchers[3] from across the country, the Australian Research Council issued an *Evaluation of ARC support for Indigenous researchers and Indigenous research: ARC Response*. The evaluation made a series of key recommendations to encourage a greater amount of applications to National Competitive Grant Programs (NCGP) by Indigenous applicants. The recommendations addressed key concerns that Indigenous applications are substantially lower for NCGPs, than from our non-Indigenous counterparts. The evaluation had found that, '… the Aboriginal workforce has a distinct gender profile with 60 to 66 per cent being female and 34-40 per cent being male. By way of contrast, the non-Indigenous academic workforce has been as high as 65 per cent male and 35 per cent female' (ARC 2018).

In an already reduced number of Indigenous applicants, the number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women was substantially lower. This was addressed across the recommendations to both monitor and ensure gender equity on committees and in decision-making processes, and in ensuring that, 'a greater focus is required by the ARC on capacity building amongst doctoral, postdoctoral and early-career researcher, predominantly female Indigenous academics' (ARC 2018).

The same evaluation also details a crucial detail challenge to Indigenous success across academic employment. While there are no specific statistics on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women in the academy, the number of all Indigenous academics at both Level A, the entry level lecturing role, and Level E, the most senior professorial position, is lower per capita in 2018 than that was in 2001. This means that in a generation the amount of Aboriginal academics entering the workforce and those reaching the highest level within the academy has remained static. At a time when the academy is doing less to progress and assure the futures of all workers, we may find Indigenous participants are less likely to remain and persist (Trudgett 2014), and this presents a key risk addressed by this report and other initiatives, including the Universities Australia Indigenous Strategy (2017) signed onto by all Australian universities.

What these reports share, apart from the call for parity in representation, is the importance of leadership and networks in effecting positive change (Behrendt et al. 2012). In this next section, the work and leadership of two senior female academics are featured to show how they have leveraged their positions to support others and to engage across the sector and across disciplines. Both come from different disciplines and have different approaches, differing amounts of time in the academy, but they both share a relationship to a broad cohort of researchers, students, communities and communities of practice, and play a direct role in supporting networks. In this way, they form a challenge to the disorder, dispossession and disenfranchisement that accompanies the colonial project, and in that way, they also challenge many of the tenets of the academy.

Professor Bronwyn Carlson

Professor Bronwyn Carlson is an Aboriginal woman, who was born on, and lives on Dharawal Country. In 2011 while at Wollongong University, she established the Forum for Indigenous Excellence (FIRE), which brought Indigenous and non-Indigenous voices together to discuss topics across the range of disciplines that coalesced in the space of Indigenous agency. As with many of these activities, it was largely funded from individual researcher grants, with some small institutional funding, but what separated it from other institutions was that at a time when the Australian university sector was becoming increasingly resistant to sharing resources across the sector and focused on internal development, Carlson pushed to fund international and national engagement in the forum.

Her work extended discussions beyond her discipline of social science, and into health, the arts, gender and sexuality, and history. FIRE was the originator of the first-ever international symposium on Queer First Nations' performance (O'Sullivan 2015). She funded scholars to visit and present, including scholars from SUNY Albany, Northern Arizona University, Oregon State University, University of Saskatchewan and independent and affiliated scholars from New Zealand. She also funded numerous junior and mid-career scholars from across Australia, and she encouraged them to publish and think about a wide range of topics.

Carlson's FIRE was the first academic network to host an Indigenous May Day Health event, running a symposium and partnering with online health journal, Croakey, to use Twitter to bring people from around Australia in on the discussion of Indigenous health.

When Carlson—who had written a complex and politically difficult book called *The Politics of Identity: Who Counts as Aboriginal Today*— moved to Macquarie University, she brought both the network and the sensibility of encouraging academic voices that were often not supported or heard in the academy. In 2018 for the NAIDOC event,[4] she not only participated in the *Because of Her We Can* event that celebrated the contribution of Indigenous women, but she agreed to be interviewed for a satirical news programme that required her to answer racist and insensitive questions complete with her eye-rolling and correcting the racist 'interviewer' (Ballard 2018). What Carlson shares with many of her Indigenous counterparts is that her sphere of influence crosses out of her discipline field, extending to the support of junior colleagues and research students, and creating a space where her network is enhanced because she has persisted in ignoring the university inward-facing and discipline-led focus.

Professor Bronwyn Fredericks

Professor Bronwyn Fredericks, a Murri Elder from South East Queensland, is Pro Vice-Chancellor in Indigenous Engagement at the University of Queensland, and a leader in First Nations' inclusion in the academy. As an academic who has written extensively on the management of own identity and culture within the academy, and the necessity of maintaining control over that navigation (Fredericks 2008, 2010, 2013), Fredericks argues for the need to participate across the disciplines in order to challenge preconceptions outside of the ghettoised areas of concentration in which we have been forced. She resists these ideas and encourages others to do so.

In her previous role as Pro Vice-Chancellor for Central Queensland University and in her current position at UQ, she fosters substantial support across the range of disciplines, with a special focus on health

and academic writing. She co-convened the The Tiddas Writin' Up Workshop with Professor Nereda White that was aimed at encouraging Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander academic women to write and publish (Fredericks et al. 2014).

Fredericks has also been a staunch advocate of social media as a way to seed information back to the community and to ensure that the community/university divide is bridged through information being available and input being sought (Carlson 2018). She has frequently raised the unique problems of Indigenous women in our engagement in the academy, and the competing demands of family, community and representative agency (Bingham et al. 2014).

Listening

It is ironic that First Nations' academics are finally gaining some influence in the academy at a time that it is increasingly competitive and anti-networking (Pechenkina 2017). These networks also challenge the emerging ideas of academic networks as concentrations to strengthen government or industry claims, rather than exploring difficult or unpopular areas. It is more likely that pathologised views of First Nations' people will gain traction—and funding—than topics and ideas that expand our capacity and views that are measurable through impact to and for our communities (ARC 2018). For First Nations' women in the academy, we have created frameworks that support the capacity of students and colleagues, and the agency and aspirations of our communities. Carlson, Fredericks, Moreton-Robinson and Huggins, and many others, are contributing to this work. It remains to be seen if the academy can find a way to support this cross-institutional approach, whether through the extension of NIRAKN, through an appreciation that our networks and collaborations make our worlds— and our research and teaching—better, or through a realisation by the sector and the community at large that Indigenous women's standpoints will help to build not only a more equitable future, but also a more interesting one.

Notes

1. Indigenous, First Nations'—and in the context of Australia—Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander are terms that are used interchangeably throughout this chapter to adequately reflect the various ways in which First Nations' Peoples identify themselves. These terms are always capitalised out of both respect, and because they operate as a short form for a proper noun. Named individual nation-status or localised collective terms are also used where appropriate, following the person's name.
2. As a Wiradjuri woman, I assert the cultural responsibility to use 'our' and 'we' as a means of ascribing connection to the peoples and communities that I am speaking to, and from, and as a strategy to avoid a removed reporting *on* of our communities.
3. In full disclosure, the writer was a participant in this group consultation.
4. NAIDOC Week celebrates the history, culture and achievements of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. NAIDOC Week is celebrated by all Australians and is a great opportunity to learn more about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

References

Australian Research Council (ARC). (2018, June). *Evaluation of ARC support for Indigenous researchers and Indigenous research: ARC response (June 2018)*. https://www.arc.gov.au/policies-strategies/policy/aboriginal-and-torres-strait-is-lander-researchers/evaluation-arc-support-indigenous-researchers-and-indige-nous-research-arc-response-june-2018. Last accessed September 2018.

Asmar, C., & Page, S. (2009). Sources of satisfaction and stress among Indigenous academic teachers: Findings from a national Australian study. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 29*(3), 387–401.

Bagilhole, B. (2002). Challenging equal opportunities: Changing and adapting male hegemony in academia. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 23*(1), 19–33.

Ballard, T. (2018, July 12). *Tonightly investigatesly: NAIDOC week—Tonightly with Tom Ballard [Video]*. https://youtu.be/RE6rA7KNFtc. Last accessed September 2018.

Behrendt, L., Larkin, S., Griew, R., & Kelly, P. (2012). *Review of Higher Education access and outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.* Final report. Canberra, ACT: DIISRTE.

Bielefeld, S. (2016). Income management and Indigenous women: A new chapter of patriarchal colonial governance. *The University of New South Wales Law Journal, 39*(2), 843–878.

Bingham, J. L., Adolpho, Q. B., Jackson, A. P., & Alexitch, L. R. (2014). Indigenous women college students' perspectives on college, work, and family. *Journal of College Student Development, 55*(6), 615–632.

Block, T. (2012). Indigenous women and feminism: Politics, activism, culture. *BC Studies, 174,* 146–147.

Carlson, B. (2018, September 19). *12 deadly Indigenous Australian social media users to follow.* The Conversation. https://theconversation.com/12-deadly-indigenous-australian-social-media-users-to-follow-66479. Last accessed September 2018.

Chave, A. C. (2011). 'The Guerrilla Girls' reckoning. *Art Journal, 70*(2), 102–111.

Craven, R., & Mooney, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Seeding success in Indigenous Australian higher education.* Bingley, UK: Emerald.

Crenshaw, K. (2018). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory, and antiracist politics [1989]. In K. Bartlett & R. Kennedy (Eds.), *Feminist legal theory* (pp. 57–80). New York: Routledge.

Fredericks, B. (2008). Researching with Aboriginal women as an Aboriginal woman researcher. *Australian Feminist Studies, 23*(55), 113–129.

Fredericks, B. (2010). Reempowering ourselves: Australian Aboriginal women. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 35*(3), 546–550.

Fredericks, B. (2013). 'We don't leave our identities at the city limits': Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people living in urban localities. *Australian Aboriginal Studies, 2013*(1), 4–16.

Fredericks, B., Mills, K., & White, N. (2014). 'I now know I can do this now': Indigenous women and writing in the Australian higher education sector. *TEXT: Journal of Writing and Writing Courses, 18*(1). http://www.textjournal.com.au/april14/fredericks_et_al.htm. Last accessed September 2018.

Huggins, J. (1987). Black women and women's liberation. *Hecate, 13*(1), 1–7.

Kovach, M. (2009). *Indigenous methodologies: Characteristics, conversations, and contexts.* Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Monroe, K., Ozyurt, S., Wrigley, T., & Alexander, A. (2008). Gender equality in academia: Bad news from the trenches, and some possible solutions. *Perspectives on politics, 6*(2), 215–233.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2000). *Talkin' up to the white woman: Indigenous women and feminism*. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2015). *The white possessive: Property, power, and indigenous sovereignty*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Nakata, S. (2018). The infantilisation of indigenous Australians: A problem for democracy. *Griffith Review, 60,* 104–116.

O'Sullivan, S. (2015). Queering ideas of Indigeneity: Response in repose: Challenging, engaging and ignoring centralising ontologies, responsibilities, deflections and erasures. *Journal of Global Indigeneity, 1*(1), 1–5.

Painter, N. I. (2011). *The history of white people*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Pascoe, B. (2018). The imperial mind: How Europeans stole the world. *Griffith Review, 60,* 234–243.

Pechenkina, E. (2017). 'It becomes almost an act of defiance': Indigenous Australian transformational resistance as a driver of academic achievement. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 20*(4), 463–477.

Ramazanoglu, C. (1993). *Up against Foucault: Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and feminism*. London and New York: Routledge.

Richards, J. (2008, May 17). *Oral history interview with Guerrilla Girls 'Zora Neale Hurston' and 'Agnes Martin'*. Oral Histories, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. https://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-guerrilla-girls-zora-neale-hurston-and-agnes-martin-15840. Last accessed September 2018.

Robinson, B. (2017). Universities Australia. *Impact, 2017*(10), 32–33.

Suzack, C., Huhndorf, S. M., Perreault, J., & Barman, J. (Eds.). (2010). *Indigenous women and feminism: Politics, activism, culture*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Trudgett, M. (2014). Supervision provided to Indigenous Australian doctoral students: A black and white issue. *Higher Education Research & Development, 33*(5), 1035–1048.

Universities Australia (UA). (2017). *Indigenous strategy 2017–2020*. Canberra, ACT: Universities Australia.

Winchester, H. P., & Browning, L. (2015). Gender equality in academia: A critical reflection. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management, 37*(3), 269–281.

8

(Hyper)Visible 'Women'/Invisible (Dalit) Women: Challenging the Elusive Sexism in Indian Universities

Anagha Tambe

India is at present witnessing rapid growth in what is one of the largest higher education systems in the world (UGC 2017). Though India has a relatively low rate of enrolment in higher education on the global map, the last two decades have witnessed a rapid increase in the 'Gross Enrolment Ratio' (GER) from 8% in 2001 to 24% in 2015. This growth has occurred concurrently with massive privatization of higher education institutions driven by neoliberalism. According to a report by the Planning Commission (2012), currently 66% of students in general education and more than 75% in professional education are enrolled in private, self-financing institutions. Remarkably, this period has also seen an unprecedented entry of new groups into higher education who have been hitherto socially and educationally disadvantaged. The GER amongst women of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes[1] has been increasing, although their numbers are still negligible. The presence of women in general in tertiary institutions in India is almost equal

A. Tambe (✉)
KSP Women's Studies Centre, Savitribai Phule Pune University,
Pune, India

to men. The University Grants Commission (UGC), the central regulatory body of higher education in India,[2] has promoted a focus on equity and inclusion along with expansion and excellence in higher education (UGC 2011). This period due to its rapid changes is therefore seen as the 'silent revolution' in higher education, with fundamental policy reforms and bills, and recommendations by several commissions, committees and studies, seeking to remodel the field in terms of funding support, governance, quality assurance, relationship with industry, and international collaboration (John 2012). This volatile period has also witnessed a rise of students' movements that support the democratization of education and challenge the restriction of academic freedom and institutional discrimination (Arunima 2017). Student protests against the 'institutional murder' of Rohith Vemula[3] on caste grounds were significant in stirring the political environment in India. Women students waged a nation-wide campaign against not just sexual harassment but patriarchal paternalism of institutions enforcing '*laxmanrekha*'—the mythical boundary for protecting women that is also seen as restricting their mobility. Students' assertion of the right to dissent and protest as citizens, and institutional repression of this assertion has also caught national attention. Thus, public university has become a space that through dissent drives the national politics against jingoism.

This chapter considers gender in the context of the dramatic transformations of the higher education in India. Education of women has been prominent in public debates and part of the discourse of building modern India, though it lost its centrality with the emerging 'consensus' about the value of educating women from dominant classes to shape their respectable domestic womanhood. Education is one of the few fields that support the steady improvement in women's participation taking them 'towards equality', and women have now almost equal presence in the universities as they form 46% of total enrolment (UGC 2017). The affirmative action in terms of reserved seats in educational institutions does not involve 'women' as a group. Yet gender has been mainstreamed in the educational system with a range of policies and programmes facilitating 'gender inclusion' in universities. These include: support to female students through scholarships or accommodation at hostels; schemes to establish WSCs; interdisciplinary

faculty development programme in women's studies; capacity building programmes for women managers in higher education; recognition of gender as a separate criterion along with social diversity in the national system of accreditation, and assessment focusing on gender audit; separate regulations for safety and the prevention of sexual harassment of women; and special schemes like 'Gender Champions' for promoting gender equality amongst young men and women.

This chapter seeks to problematize this visibility of women in Indian universities linked with a peculiar kind of institutional sexism. Black feminists have examined and challenged the hegemony of masculine whiteness by pointing out the hypervisibility of black women, and their stereotyped and sexualized visibility for controlling and rendering them invisible (hooks 1992). Drawing from this idea of simultaneous invisibility and hypervisibility, or visibility marking the perceived difference of black women, this chapter interrogates from the Dalit feminist perspective the compositional inclusion and visibility of women as a homogenous and domesticated category in the normative university. It seeks to expose the myth of gender inclusion, and the 'hidden' sexism and misogyny pervading Indian universities from the perspective of intersectionality.

Paradox of Gender Inclusive University—1: Women's Equalizing Presence Entangled in Discrimination

The landscape of Indian university system is transforming into being increasingly inhabited by socially diverse groups. The gender gaps in higher education are narrowing, and the share of women in higher education is almost equal to men's, as noted above (UGC 2017). While GER for men has increased from 11% in 1983 to 14% in 2004–2005, GER for women has shown a tremendous increase from 4% in 1983 to 11% in 2004–2005 (UGC 2011). However, there is wide state-wise and district-wise variation requiring focused intervention. Additionally, women's increased enrolment is not translated into their proportional

presence across diverse disciplines, and women are crowded into non-professional, non-market, low-status subjects, and their subject choices are constrained (Chanana 2007). Even though women's participation in professional education has also increased from 8.6% of total students in 1950 to 29.5% in 2011, this has been mainly in the subject of education or teacher training (52%) which has a relative low status and is perceived as a 'feminine' subject. In the high-status subjects like engineering and technology, agriculture, veterinary science and law, as few as around 20% of enrolments are by women students. The obvious exception is medicine which has 45% female enrolment (UGC 2017). Thus, while the gender inequalities in enrolment seem to have reduced, gender divisions have persisted through sub-fields and specializations leading to horizontal gender segregation, especially with increasing knowledge specialization. The entrance examination has been one of the mechanisms that have significantly impacted women's access to top colleges and subject choices, and consequently to employability, as they are relegated to the lower rank levels in the engineering entrance examination in Kerala (Rajasenan 2014). There is thus over-exclusion of women and the 'lower castes' from the best performing levels in engineering, which gets generally unnoticed when all ranks are viewed together. In the same way, more equalizing enrolment of women in pure sciences, often in aided or public institutions, is linked oddly with men's exit from pure sciences to professional, market-oriented privatized education (Chanana 2007). The uneven inclusion of women across disciplines with women constituting only 23% in management and 27% in physical education in the university is also observed in a campus climate study in India (Kamat et al. 2018). Thus, along with the glass ceiling of tapering participation of women at research degrees as compared to undergraduate colleges, it is the horizontal segregation that has ensured that breaching in the male bastions of professional education would be difficult for women.

In addition, women's equalizing access in sciences as students at the entry level conceals their exclusion at the level of practice and recognition. Only 37.5% of PhDs are allocated to women in sciences, and only 15% of scientists in government institutions are women. Even though there are more women students in life sciences, more men receive awards for their work output (Chanana 2003). Women are also severely

underrepresented in terms of publications in high-impact journals, in representation in prestigious groups, opportunities for research funding, acceptance of project findings in research journals, etc. (Bal 2004). It is the gendered exclusion from inhabiting teams of scientists with overlapping interests and individual specialized skills, and spaces involving peer review that work against women in science. Even the narratives of women in science bring out the experiences of diminishing self-worth as they enter science as young researchers or professionals, and 'the sense of being in an abject state which is so visceral that it almost seems like a physical diminishing of the self' (Chadha and Achutan 2017). It is the Brahmanical or casteist, patriarchal culture in the academic networks and spaces, pedagogic and mentoring practices, resource and knowledge production disguised under the trope of meritocracy and objectivity that leads to women's absence, invisibilization and discrimination. Sur (2012) constructs the gendered histories of science enterprise in the early twentieth-century India through micro-histories of scientists to argue that the entry of women scientists in advanced science even if unobtrusive has not been uncontested.

Against the narrowing gender gaps amongst students, women are underrepresented as staff, as teaching faculty or administrative staff, and more significantly in senior and leadership positions. In a state university in western India, women make up only 39% of faculty, and these women come disproportionately (78%) from 'upper castes'. Further within the institutional hierarchy, women constitute 42% of assistant professors, 41% of associate professors and only 33% of professors. Moreover, almost all women professors (93%) come from privileged castes. Even in the university administration, women are over-represented in clerical and assistant level staff (62%) but underrepresented as menial staff (23%) as well as top managerial staff (22%) (Kamat et al. 2018). Women achieve managerial positions less through open selection, but more through nomination. 47% of men and only 26.2% of women who occupy leadership positions are recruited through open selection (Chanana 2003). Thus, the glass ceiling pervades academia, as women are rejected, and they themselves refuse the leadership positions seeing it as gender inappropriate. This is because of the broad sociocultural patriarchal factors that assign women to home labour, making their

work participation difficult, and hence typically women are found to have more frequent job changes, start at lower-grade positions such as assistant or guest teachers or demonstrators and experience career interruptions. But it is also the institutional procedures, networks, opportunities and culture in academia that work against women with norms of sexual propriety and gendered division of labour that contribute to the 'leaky pipelines' (Chanana 2003).

Thus, the visibility of unmarked women in the university is marred with their structural marginalization. The documents conceptualizing or evaluating policies for higher education exclude reference to gender unless these concern women-specific issues such as retention of women in science, capacity building for women managers or safety on campus (Chanana 2003). This creates a fragmented approach to supporting women in tertiary education and positions gender as irrelevant or a non-concern for higher education. Nor do the policy documents treat gender along with other social inequalities and thus ignore intersectionality, creating the myth of gender inclusion.

Paradox of Gender Inclusive University—2: Gender Inclusion Juxtaposed to Caste Exclusion

The euphoria about equalizing access of women is challenged more significantly by intersectional analysis which disaggregates data about women in terms of social differences amongst women. Though gender gaps are narrowing in urban areas with 25% GER for men and 23% for women, the GER for women in rural areas is as low as 6%, even though it has almost tripled in the last two decades. The caste differentials show a similar pattern. So, amongst urban 'upper castes' or castes other than SCs, STs and OBCs, the GER of women (31.3%) is equal to that of men (31.7%). The gender gaps amongst SCs, STs and OBCs persist, but these are also narrowing, specifically in urban areas, so, for example amongst urban SCs, male GER is 16% while female GER is 13%. However, it is the caste disparities that are still wider and more so amongst women. There is 13% GER amongst urban SC

women, and 15% amongst urban OBC women as compared to 31% amongst urban 'upper caste' women (John 2012). Similarly, in terms of religion, Muslims overall and Muslim women in particular even in urban areas have quite low GER, with rural Muslim women having the lowest GER amongst all social groups (4% in 2004–2005). Thus, gender gaps have persisted obstinately in rural areas and in lower socio-economic groups, even if they have been narrowing in the last decade. However, it is the socio-economic disparities amongst women, in terms of caste, religion, income and urbanity which are wide and narrowing at much slower pace. Therefore, gender does not work alone outside of the interlocking effects of other structures of social exclusion in higher education (John 2012).

Recent studies have revealed that the new factors such as parental education and language of school are emerging as key dimensions of disadvantage in higher education. An under-representation of first-generation learner students and those educated in Indian languages is noted and affect gendered experiences in campus in complex ways. The social disadvantages work in a cumulative way, and thus, if one is from 'lower caste', it is more likely that she/he will also be rural, from a lower-income group, first-generation learner student and with regional medium schooling. However, in a state university with 'general education' it is mainly the male students who come from socially disadvantaged groups including rural, 'lower caste', lower income, ENFL (English Not First Language) and have non-graduate parents, and women at university generally come from relatively advantaged social backgrounds (Kamat et al. 2018). These contrasting gender profiles on campus are unsettling the traditional gender hierarchies and relations that have profound implications for the university and beyond. Thus, women who are socially and economically disadvantaged across multiple axes are mostly absent in tertiary education, and those coming from either of the socially disadvantaged groups can enter university only if they are socially advantaged or upwardly mobile in other terms. The narratives of those few women in the university from multiple disadvantaged backgrounds reveal that it is largely through their strong 'personal' assets in terms of support and

mentorship from family and teachers that they realize their educational rights and potential in the face of considerable obstacles (Rege 2012).

This paradox of inclusion of women imbued with social exclusion is interestingly and complexly linked with another paradox pertaining to gender differentials in the goals and outcomes of higher education. The period in which gender gaps in higher education have narrowed is ironically also the period in which gender gaps in employment or paid work have continued to increase (John 2013). Work participation rates (WPRs) for women were 28.7% in 2004–2005 as against 54.7% for men, and while men's WPR has remained almost the same in 2011–2012, it has decreased for women by up to 21.9%. And according to NSSO, 2009–2010, the unemployment rate of urban female graduates at 12.7% is significantly higher than that of urban male graduates (4.3%) in the country (John 2013). More interestingly, while women are largely excluded from higher education in rural areas in comparison with urban areas, the WPR shows exactly the opposite trend. The WPR for women is relatively higher in rural areas (24.8% in 2011–2012) than in urban areas (14.7% in 2011–2012). Thus, it is largely the social groups in which women's GER in higher education is high, i.e. in urban areas, 'upper castes', middle classes are rather those where women's WPR are low. Women's education and employment are thus inversely correlated with each other. The assumption that education makes women more productive, increasing their earning potential, incentivizing them to join the workforce, is disrupted by this data. It also highlights how family income earned by their husbands discourages women, along with cultural factors like norms restricting women's mobility, and structural factors like lack of appropriate job opportunities (Chatterjee et al. 2013). The contradictions of caste which associate paid labour with stigma and vulnerability, rather than as value and autonomy, lead women to withdraw from the public domain of paid work and seek protection in marriage to avoid sexual and caste stigmatization (John 2013), thus undermining women's education as the index of development and their empowerment.

Paradox of Gender Inclusive University—3: Women's Studies Expanding on Margins

The new millennium has also witnessed a peculiar expansion of Women's Studies Centres (WSCs) emerged with the UGC support in the Indian university system. WSCs have a dual and disparate influence on radical feminist politics as they interrogate the triumphal account of development and modernity but at the exclusion of questions of social inequalities (Rege 2011). This rapid increase of WSCs from 4 centres across India in 1986 to around 170 WSCs in 2017 has meant that these UGC-supported WSCs have become an important site for women's studies. However, these centres have continued to exist over three decades under the conditions of real marginality and uncertainty, with the pervading experience of ridicule, refusal and reluctance within the university system. Despite institutionalization within university as the formal structure with the master's teaching programme and separate teaching staff, these centres have lacked both resources and infrastructure as well as legitimacy required to stay afloat. The recent jeopardizing of continued support by the UGC due to its replacement has meant a real setback to WSCs.

Further, the institutional expansion has become somewhat disjunct from women's studies as an intellectual-political project that has certain weight and stability in the academic life (Nair 2008). The extension of community work and networking programmes along with teaching and research has moved along parallel paths, and this has meant that the critical gains from the intellectual-political project of women's studies have come to be diffused and de-radicalized in their circulation within academia. The project of making education useful and practically relevant to 'employability' has meant that the women's studies programmes often stabilize gender without challenging its patriarchal construction, and without implementing its critical and radical potential. This has reproduced gender as a 'frozen', and at best, as a descriptive category.

Paradox of Gender Inclusive University—4: Everyday Institutional Discrimination and Protectionism in the 'Safe' University

Women's experiences of the learning environment at university are mediated through caste, class and other structural inequalities. Even with affirmative action for 'lower castes', the gatekeeping in Indian universities is invested in 'concealing the social selection under guise of technical selection and legitimating reproduction of social hierarchies by transmuting them into academic hierarchies' (Deshpande 2013). Universities have remained largely inaccessible in terms of enrolment, physical and symbolic infrastructure, curricula and pedagogies, attitudes, interactions and practices amongst peers, and between teacher and students seeking to produce the normative world violently. The social prejudice and discrimination, specifically in terms of caste, is deeply entrenched in the university system. Those blocked by caste and community are eager to embrace the academic environment to pursue life of mind and not just to credentialize them for employment. Yet the hostile climate of the university scars their lived experiences and academic progress, and the affective economy of the university prioritizes the dominant aesthetic and taste, and devalues them, distances and alienates them from the university (Thirumal and Christy 2018). Students from socially marginalized groups have shown strong will and endurance to pursue education despite deep educational hurdles and marked university as the space that broadens their horizons (Kamat et al. 2018). This mismatch between desire and actualization has rendered university as one intimate and embattled space for students resulting in country-wide movement against discrimination on campus.

Even the queers are included in the university, at best by their nominal inclusion as mere additional third category, or at worst, by making them completely invisible and not recognizing their status at all. They are motivated to seek higher education because of their strong need for independence being often deprived of family support. It is spaces like sports or theatres outside classrooms which have been enabling for queer women, and teachers are also found to be bolstering their

self-esteem. However, universities have continued to be gender segregated and 'gender appropriate' and become a perilous space for queer women (Nevatia et al. 2012).

The question of gender discrimination on campus is invoked overwhelmingly through the prism of safety and prevention of sexual harassment of women. The complaints and experiences of sexual harassment on campus seem low for women, because communication and interaction between men and women is limited due to formal and informal norms of gender segregation on campuses. The cross-gender interactions are troublingly low with 27% of students reporting rare interactions in a state university (Kamat et al. 2018). It is interesting to note that more men than women reported having experienced any kind of discrimination on campus, and at the same time, even civic engagement in terms of public participation is overall low, but lower amongst women and socio-economically privileged groups. This link between inter-group interactions, experience of discrimination and civic agency is complicated, specifically for women on campus (Kamat et al. 2018), as discussed below. The question of gender discrimination is articulated by the policy makers in terms of women's vulnerability and measures for their safety, such as setting up institutional mechanisms for complaint redressal (UGC 2017). Nonetheless, women students themselves resist this discourse of safety and instead assert their right to pursue education freely, fearlessly, and with dignity and equality. Two recent protests of female students against 'sexual harassment' on campuses include: '*pinjratod*' (*Break the Cage*) against hostel curfews and more, and the 'List of Sexual Harassment Accused' in academia (*LoSHA*) following #MeToo.

Pinjra Tod: Breaking the Bastion of Protectionism

Pinjra Tod started in 2015, initially at Delhi University colleges, and then spread across the nation to challenge the patriarchal protectionism that promotes precautionary policies for women that put the onus of safety on women themselves and thereby imprison them. This nation-wide campaign against hostel curfews and over-involvement

of authorities in women's lives attacked the cultural legitimacy of protectionism invoked through the notion of *laxmanrekha*—a mythical boundary to control the so-called 'insatiability' of young women. It resisted the dominant culture of violence which seemed to focus women's safety and oppose sexual violence against them, but in fact denied women personhood by glorifying them only as the 'mothers' or 'daughters' of the nation, as the symbols of honour constraining them in the norms of purity and chastity.[4]

On the one hand, *Pinjra Tod* opposes the stringent hostel regulations relating to entry and exit timings in the name of women's safety. It points out the institutional culture in modern universities that seeks to discipline and supervise women by infantilizing them. For instance, female students in Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak, protested against the restrictions on attending a theatre festival on campus due to hostel curfews. Or in Aligarh Muslim University, UP, they opposed the prohibition on joining the protest against an armed attack of Hindutva organization on students in a college event. Or in Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, female students resisted the stigmatizing and moral policing of consenting sexual relations amongst adults as 'women mingling with men' which reproduced the culture of victim blaming. *Pinjra Tod* thus challenges the logic of security through surveillance that denies women agency, and cultural and political participation in the universities.

Additionally, it highlights how sexual violence against women is legitimized through 'traditional' culture. In Delhi and other parts of north India, it protested the sexual harassment of women on Holi, a popular festival of playing colours, when men sought to force themselves on women to 'play' colour with them. While popular customary Holi wish, 'Bura Na Mano Holi Hai' (*Don't make a fuss, it's Holi*), justifies forcible play of colour, *Pinjra Tod* protested with a slogan 'We will make a fuss, Holi is not festival but culture of violence'. It also opposed the police's dismissal of women's complaints against harassment by men as 'normal' for Holi, and the police targeting only working-class men like balloon sellers as pervert and aberrant. *Pinjra Tod* rather indicates how the modern institutional culture draws from this dominant patriarchal Brahmanical culture of violence. They also fought against a

popular mock ritual performed in one of the prestigious colleges, Hindu College in Delhi, 'Virgin – tree worship' on Valentine's day when men conducted this worship with prayer and oath as per Brahmanical ritual, to lose their 'single' 'virgin' status. The popularly known 'V-tree puja' involves 'worshipping' the fetishized body of a female Bollywood actor chosen by men as the sex goddess. An opposition to this event for sexualizing women was countered by the pretences of sex positivism erasing silence about sexual desire, and that of gender equality asking women to fetishisize the body of a male actor. *Pinjra Tod* highlighted how this ritual conducted for several decades came up as part of a strong resentment against admission of women to these elite institutions.

Pinjra Tod has been remarkable in its commitment to intersectional analysis and politics. It attacked the dominant anti-minority, Brahmanical, patriarchal culture creating an atmosphere of fear and intimidation not just for women but also for Dalit Bahujan, Adivasi,[5] Muslim and queer students, and marked its solidarities with students fighting the structural hegemony, and also the larger democratic struggles, such as those against the state impunity to sexual violence or violation of rights by the state. It supported students' protests across India against privatization of public universities, calling for inclusive education, and also against the expulsion and discrimination of queer students on campuses. Interestingly, they also supported Hadiya[6] who was infantilized by instrumentalizing the college and hostel to deny her freedom to choose her religion and partner with someone from another religious community. They challenged violence against young women and men in the name of honour by remembering *Anarkali,* the cultural symbol of violently crushed transgressive love, or by dialoguing with *Dhanak*, an organization supporting inter-caste, inter-religious marriages on the occasion of Valentine's day to re-imagine love.

Significantly, *Pinjra Tod* claims the legacy of Savitribai Phule, the first woman teacher of modern India and her associate Fatima Sheikh, who struggled in the nineteenth century to educate women from 'lower' castes who were hitherto denied education. Savitribai and Fatimabee also articulated a radical vision of education as 'the third eye' which enables one to see what the regular vision didn't allow—the invisible power relations embedded in knowledge. It is significant to note that both

these women coming from 'lower caste' and Muslim locations have been part of the anti-caste Satyashodhak movement, marking their difference from the educated modern 'gentlewomen' of that period. Thus, though *Pinjra Tod* supported different complaints of sexual harassment by women urging administration to take action, and campaigned for empowering the internal complaints committees to work efficiently; it is the institutional protectionism on the one hand and everyday 'normalized' culture of violence on the other that has been the target of their resistance.

LOSHA: Breaking the Silence on Everyday Sexual Infringement

Another recent attempt to make sexual harassment in academia 'speakable', following the *#MeToo* campaign, was the *Facebook List*, a crowd-sourced list of the names and cases of teachers accused of sexual harassment. The *Facebook List* was compiled by Raya Sarkar, a law graduate from India, presently studying in the USA. *The Facebook List* garnered public attention first because it named well-known liberal male academics, mainly from social sciences and humanities in India. It became controversial also because some of the prominent feminist academics/activists opposed *the list* asking the complainants to follow 'due process' of institutional mechanism for complaint. Whether *the List* can be seen as the struggle of young women, and/or a social media campaign to break silence about everyday sexual harassment, this became an issue of feminist debate that highlighted the fissures in the feminist publics in terms of generation, caste and so on. The appeal of such a *List* for the young women in universities and colleges is visceral through online support and discussion around it, and public programmes on campuses.

While *#MeToo* and consequent *#HimToo* were significant in breaking the silence by coming out with confidence and displacing shame onto the perpetrator, the potential of this *List* seemed to lie in speaking out on those routine and normalized, but often hidden experiences of sexual harassment. The experiences of feminists in academia working with

the internal complaints committees established to address the issue of sexual harassment of women bring out the limitations of framing sexual harassment in terms of the predatory accused and the vulnerable complainant (Power and Relationships in Academia 2017). The lived experiences of sexual harassment elude the legal/procedural frame being embedded, on the one hand, in the complex breaching of heterosexual intimacies and affinities of varied kind, formed not just amongst peers, but also amongst relations of authority like teacher-student. On the other hand, it is located in complex and obscure forms of gender discrimination, in both formal and informal spaces, and matters that work through contradictory processes of favouritism and repulsion, attraction and disgust, rewards/concessions and denial, etc. Thus, the legal limits of talking about sexual harassment are countered by making intelligible the sexual harassment located in the in-between space of experience and complaint (Sen 2017). It is the sexual infringement or transgression in the transformed and democratized interpersonal interactions in classroom and campus, where power also coexists with intimacy that makes the certainty of complaint dubious, and *The List* seems to acknowledge this. *The List* highlights the need of platforms for conversations about ordinary sexual violations (Sen 2017), and an ethics of care to address the problematic everyday social relations in deeply gendered academic spaces, along with the struggles to make institutional channels accountable to it.

The List also illuminates the intersection of sexual harassment with the caste-based harassment making it more indiscernible in the known language. The caste discrimination on Indian campuses seems to be visible only through suicides of Dalit students in the face of structural violence that marks them as incapable materially, culturally and intellectually, as they pursue their educational aspirations. According to Bargi (2017), death becomes the evidence of caste-based violence, otherwise rendered invisible. For the Brahmanical unmarked bodies in academia claiming to be casteless, the silent and insidious humiliation of living breathing Dalit in the classroom, canteen and campus remains absent, being too real to be sealed off from one's self, to be written over. Even through the academic space working as the fortress, with a regiment of

gatekeepers, personal favourites and sovereigns, the Dalit Bahujan and Adivasi students are marked twice, first as different bodies, and later as those with undue privilege due to the affirmative action that supports them. Further in the homosocial academic space, bodies of the Dalit Bahujan Adivasi women are excluded being marked as monstrous, ugly, and strong and resistant women are greater outcaste, desexualized, found queer. What is needed then is the giving up of the claim of castles, anonymous identity and seeing the everyday normal regular humiliation rendered invisible (Bargi 2017).

Thus, women are seeking radical equality beyond mere presence of unmarked women on campus, recognizing that they are allowed into the university only reluctantly, and still considered outsiders and intruders, and that their travails of education are shaped by the institutional sexism intersected with caste and other social inequalities that makes invisible and normalizes the barriers to women's progression within the academy.

Whatever Happened to the Dalit Women: Dalit Women Speaking Differently in Academia

The myth of women's empowerment linked to their increasing participation in education is marked by popular developmentalist slogans such as 'the progress comes, when a girl is educated', and created by deploying the iconic image of ideal womanhood located in new liberal appropriately Indian domesticity (Lukose 2009). This hypervisibility of unmarked women in higher education who do not seem to pose any threat to the normative society overshadows the women from socially disadvantaged groups—Dalit, Adivasi, Bahujan, Muslim, rural and queer women—who struggle to access the academy. It is therefore imperative to focus how the gendered experiences of university of nearly absent and invisible Dalit women are different from those of the unmarked women. I will conclude this discussion by looking at the life of Sadhana, a young Dalit woman teacher in a public university in India to unearth her standpoint of the university.[7]

Education as Tritiya Ratna[8]: Dalit Women Struggling for Education to Re-imagine It

Sadhana comes from a migrant SC family, and her mother serves as a janitor at the university where Sadhana has studied and is presently teaching. While narrating her educational journey, Sadhana refers to the affirmative action briefly, but it's her 'personal' capital gained through the support from family and friends, and continuous motivation and hand-holding from a teacher that she recognizes as facilitating her journey to university, both as student and teacher. Her mother has shown an intense urge to give her daughter the highest education, and what supported her is the recognition that marriage and lesser education has trapped her other daughters into difficult marriages; her observations of girls at the university hostel during her janitorial work that girls gain confidence and independence with education; and the advice, guidance and encouragement given to her by university students visiting their home for food service. Sadhana's mother insisted that 'girls study long, and even after marriage and after having children, to do their PhDs'. She desired that 'her daughter be photographed with her degree certificate'. Sadhana sees her educational journey being possible also because of her own courage, aggression and confidence developed having lost her father at a young age and staying alone with her single mother. She also attributes her success to her sense of dignity, for not getting caught up in romantic relations, or being well mannered. And it is her perseverance to pursue education, which has helped her navigate her life in college and thereafter. This coping of Sadhana with structural deprivation but with interpersonal resources marks the state failure in addressing the intricate and elusive forms of exclusion.

Sadhana also mentions that the appreciation of her struggle by people around her receded when she moved up to teaching faculty, and further with her inter-caste marriage. She speaks of education as a goal in itself that has enabled her to understand the politics of and navigate the self and the world around. Sadhana talks of her experiences of discrimination in terms of pressures and anxieties, deprivation and humiliation, and highlights the informal institutional culture regulating her

appearance, behaviour and lifestyle, friendship and intimacies, inter-actions in mixed groups, sharing of aspirations and goals, academic processes and habits of mind, staying in campus staff quarters, etc. It must be noted that the gender constitution of her discrimination has remained obscure and intangible and is remembered rather as caste and class discrimination, and her sense of gender discrimination is thus mediated through caste, class and language disadvantage.

Conclusion

This chapter exposes how the contemporary Indian higher education presents a complex mosaic of exclusion, where the exclusion of Dalit Bahujan Adivasi rural and Muslim women gets buried under the narra-tive of gender inclusivity. This paradox of gender inclusive Indian uni-versity masks that women in the university are segregated both vertically and horizontally. They are crowded largely in the 'feminine' niches in academia; they can hardly make it to the campus unless the 'glass escala-tor' of some social privilege pushes their upward mobility; they are made 'respectably' safe only by curtailing their mobility; and their education is not resonated in the post-university employment and autonomy. This has meant that the visibility of women in the university is embedded in the trope of domesticated respectable femininity rendering the gendered exclusion, mediated through caste, community and class, invisible. While the state policies and institutional mechanisms have failed to recognize and address these subtle and obscure forms of gender inclusion, the stu-dents' protests erupting across India have shown immense capacity to identify and challenge this politics of hypervisibility/invisibility, as in the campaigns of *Pinjra Tod* and *LoSHA*. Students are not just asserting their more substantive access to education in everyday terms, but rather claim-ing as political subjects their right to determine what education ought to be. How do these move towards re-imagining the increasingly fraught public university in India is the question that needs to be pursued further.

Notes

1. Scheduled castes or SC and schedules tribes or ST are the constitutionally recognized terms in India for 'lower castes' considered 'untouchable' earlier and for indigenous tribes, respectively.

2. The higher educational system in India is in flux with the recent developments towards scraping down of UGC and the end of 'five-year plans' of the Indian state. This has seen public debate over the grave uncertainties for academic institutions.

3. The suicide of a Dalit research student Rohith Vemula protesting against casteism of elite university in January 2016 has galvanized nation-wide students protests against the institutional failure in social justice and demanded Rohith Act, a legislation to address the exclusionary and discriminatory university space.

4. This section draws from the discussion on *Pinjra Tod* in public media and mainly on the Facebook page of *Pinjra Tod* (https://www.facebook.com/pinjratod/).

5. Commonly, the term Dalit refers to 'lower' ex-untouchable castes, Bahujan to other educationally and socially disadvantaged castes/classes, and Adivasi refers to indigenous tribes. These terms are often used together within the resistant politics to refer to a loose group of socially disadvantaged groups.

6. This is a controversial case from 2016 of a medical student from Kerala, India, whose decision to convert and marry was thwarted by the state and her family in the name of 'love jihad'.

7. Following section draws from an intense and long oral history interview of Sadhana in Pune on 10 August 2018.

8. Tritiya Ratna or third eye is the term used by the nineteenth-century social revolutionary, Jotiba Phule to refer to education and pursuit of knowledge. While claiming the right to education to women and 'lower castes' who were hitherto denied education, he underlines the subversive potential of education to see and challenge the hidden caste and gender hegemony.

References

Arunima, G. (2017). Thought, policies and politics: How may we imagine the public university in India? *Kronos, 43*(1), 165–184.

Bal, V. (2004). Women scientists in India: Nowhere near the Glass Ceiling. *Economic and Political Weekly, 39*(2), 3647–3652.

Bargi, D. (2017, December 14). On misreading the Dalit critique of university spaces. *EPW Engage, 52*(50). https://www.epw.in/engage/article/misreading-dalit-critique-university-space. Last accessed September 2018.

Chadha, G., & Achuthan, A. (2017). Feminist science studies: Intersectional narratives of persons in gender-marginal locations. *Science, Economic and Political Weekly, 52*(17), 33–36.

Chanana, K. (2003). Visibility, gender and the careers of women faculty in an Indian university. *McGill Journal of Education, 38*(3), 381–389.

Chanana, K. (2007). Globalisation, higher education and gender: Changing subject choices of Indian women students. *Economic and Political Weekly, 42*(7), 590–598.

Chatterjee, E., Desai, S., & Vanneman, R. (2013). *Rising education, declining female employment: An Indian paradox.* http://paa2013.princeton.edu/papers/131962. Last accessed September 2018.

Deshpande, S., & Zacharias, U. (Eds.). (2013). *Beyond inclusion? The practice of equal access in Indian Higher Education.* New Delhi, India: Routledge.

Higher Education in India: Twelfth Five Year Plan. (2012–2017) and beyond. *FICCI Higher Education Summit 2012.* https://learnos.files.wordpress.com/2012/11/ey-ficc_higher_education_report_nov12.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

hooks, bell. (1992). *Looks: Race and representation.* Boston, MA: South End Press.

John, M. (2012). Gender in Higher Education in the time of reforms. *Contemporary Education Dialogue, 9*(2), 197–221.

John, M. (2013). The problem of women's labour: Some autobiographical perspectives. *Indian Journal of Gender Studies, 20*(2), 177–212.

Kamat, S., Tambe, A., Dyahadroy, S., Hurtado, S., & Zuniga, X. (2018). *Inclusive universities: Linking diversity, equity and excellence for the 21st century: A research report.* Amherst: KSP Women's Studies Centre, University of Massachusetts.

Lukose, R. (2009). *Liberalization's children: Gender, youth and consumer citizenship in globalizing India.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Nair, J. (2008). The troubled relationship of feminism and history. *Economic and Political Weekly, 43*(43), 57–65.

Nevatia, S., Raj, Mahajan, S., Shah, C., & Lesbians and Bisectuals in Action (LABIA). (2012). Bound by norms and out of bounds: Experiences of PAGFB (Persons Assigned Gender Female at Birth) within the formal education system. *Contemporary Education Dialogue, 9*(2), 173–196.

Power and Relationship in Academia. (2017, October 24). *EPW Engage, 52*(50). https://www.epw.in/engage/special-features/power-relationships-academia. Last accessed September 2018.

Rajasenan, D. (2014). Gender bias and caste exclusion in engineering admission: Inferences from the engineering entrance examination in Kerala. *Higher Education for the Future, 1*(1), 11–28.

Rege, S. (2011). Women's studies since the 1990s: Mapping new conjunctures, challenges and strategies. In R. Kumkum (Ed.), *Insights and interventions: Essays in honour of Uma Chakravarti* (pp. 39–74). New Delhi, India: Primus Books.

Rege, S. (2012). *Champions of Higher Education: A study of first generation Lerner girls in Maharashtra* (Unpublished report). Savitribai Phule Pune University, Pune, India.

Sen, R. (2017, December 14). Sexual harassment and the limits of speech. *EPW Engage, 52*(50). https://www.epw.in/engage/article/sexual-harassment-limits-speech. Last accessed September 2018.

Sur, A. (2012). *Dispersed radiance: Caste, gender and modern science in India*. New Delhi, India: Navyana Publishers.

Thirumal, P., & Christy, C. (2018, February 2). Why Indian universities are places where Savarnas get affection and Dalit-Bahujans experience distance. *EPW Engage, 53*(5). https://www.epw.in/engage/article/why-indian-universities-are-places-where-savarnas-get-affection-and-dalit-bahujans. Last accessed September 2018.

University Grants Commission (UGC). (2011). *Inclusive and qualitative expansion of Higher Education in India*. New Delhi, India: University Grants Commission.

University Grants Commission (UGC). (2017). *Annual report 2016–17*. New Delhi, India: University Grants Commission.

Part II

An Examination of Feminist and Critical Pedagogies That Resist the Reproduction of Masculine Knowledge Systems

9

n.paradoxa's
MOOC (Mass Open Online Course): A Case Study in Feminist Online Pedagogies

Katy Deepwell

Feminism in Art Education

Feminists working in the arts have invested heavily in both education and publishing since the late 1960s, using both these means to communicate their ideas to different audiences and produce a sustained critique of traditionally masculine forms of knowledge and knowledge production. Various feminist pedagogies (particularly in the arts), developed out of consciousness-raising among and between women, and, with a strong content-based focus in art-making, have advocated that students/readers bring or consider their own life experience and knowledge(s) into learning within classroom or workshop settings (Chicago 1975; Sandell 1979; Kiefer-Boyd 2007). This strong self-reflexive process supported through a 'consciousness-raising' pedagogy and developing

K. Deepwell (✉)
KT Press, Middlesex University, London, UK
e-mail: katy@ktpress.co.uk

153

knowledge about feminism through women's struggles past and present is not the same as today's instrumentalist and neoliberal learning models of 'student-centred' learning (Dalton 2001).

Over the last 50 years in the discipline of fine art, which incorporates art theory, history and practice, different models for feminist teaching have developed in many short courses (organised by art organisations, museums and colleges), summer schools or within specific modules or course options within undergraduate and postgraduate degrees. From the early 1970s, feminist lecturers have set up and co-ordinated short courses focusing on women artists and feminist art history, often as extramural or electives within degrees, in many countries around the world (n.paradoxa 2010; Loeb 1979). Today, as part of the overall switch from women's studies to gender theory in the 1990s, courses on 'Art and Gender' have emerged, questioning how gender forms part of the overall analysis of objects/subjects in art and in the divisions of art and craft, or between media. However, dedicated degrees on feminism in the visual arts have been few and far between, and mainly at MFA level (Pollock 2010), a fact demonstrating the marginalised position of feminism in the curriculum and feminism's existence largely as an 'option' or a 'specialism' in formal or mainstream undergraduate curricula. 'Women and art' courses in art history, which were the foundation of a women's studies approach to feminist art history, have been widely replaced by 'the option' to do gender in courses on 'gender, representation and sexuality'. These wide-ranging courses touch on everything from queer theories on sexuality, psychoanalytic theory, studies of masculinity, and only sometimes on feminist and gender theory as one among many 'schools' of interpretation. Moreover, courses in women's studies that do still exist rarely focus on visual culture, other than in film and literature.

Most often, feminist art history appears as a single token lecture on a fine art course focused on contemporary art. The subsumption of feminism into queer theory (Hemmings 2016; Weed and Schor 1997) places a strong focus on feminism as a perspective to be taken on questions of representation and identity, dropping any emphasis on women's cultural production as an issue in what is studied and even rendering this anachronistic as something worth studying. This means that most students not only lack familiarity with the history of sex/gender debates

and their import on questions of representation in the visual arts but are not encouraged to study women artists. While most feminists who teach in art departments, like myself, might include significantly more women artists in relation to men in our examples as a way of exposing students to 'role models' and to highlight key feminist issues and ideas; the reduction of art theory/history to one lecture a week and the lack of seminar level 'options' means that there is limited opportunity to expose and explore feminist art theory within the standard curriculum. This is a structural problem of how fine art itself is positioned in higher education curricular where art theory/art history is already marginalised to 20% of the curriculum against studio practice at 80%. Unless a student encounters a lecturer in fine art interested in feminism or has a prior political interest in feminist art/artists, feminist art in theory and practice are rarely examined within the mainstream/'malestream' curriculum.

For me, developing this MOOC was a means to intervene and 'resist' in this landscape as well as a return to self- and community-based education as an arena for feminism. n.paradoxa's MOOC seeks to create an interactive, intersubjective learning experience that focuses on feminist theory in relation to contemporary art, which is increasingly global, transnational and transgenerational as a field.

The MOOC in the Online Landscape

Although MOOCs have increased in visibility in the educational landscape since 2008, as a different (neither new nor alternative) model for online learning (Yuan and Powell 2013), academics have begun to experiment with them in order to provide different styles or forms of learning. For me, a MOOC presents an opportunity to create a pedagogy that sits in between the conventions of the lecture/seminar/tutorial of University teaching and those of the journal article/textbook/book of academic publishing. Many MOOCs reproduce a well-established 'training model' already embedded in textbooks by offering courses based on an 'introduction to topic', 'explanation of key points' and 'exercises' for self-development. In this respect, some MOOCs offer no less rigidity or formula for learning than existing print-based course materials, only the

online format is different. MOOCs educational claims often rest on providing 'interactive learning', in which someone can engage in their own time and from their own computer because they can select what to 'click'. This does not mean the programme offered is not conventional, proscriptive or benchmarked in terms of learning outcomes. Although premised on a questionable critique of lectures as 'passive learning' versus 'active engagement' models (Bligh 1971), the ability to watch and respond is limited in a quiz or forum, and the lecture format is actually reproduced via a 'talking head' video or information presented in bite-size paragraphs. In contrast to this, there are other types of MOOC which offer the capacity for detailed reading and time-absorbing thinking with community discussion, creating a conversation between established theory and ideas in relation to one's own and others' lived experience.

In the online world, MOOCs sit alongside many other commercial and non-commercial websites, government services, social media, online gaming and pornography, as well as websites for artists, arts organisations, galleries and museums. In addition, the plethora of online educational opportunities embraces a wide range of information-loaded digital experiences. For instance, in the arts, many websites offer different kinds of profiling and information projects, some of which mirror old card index systems, trade catalogues and dictionaries in their database formats. Artists, museums, arts organisations and galleries also profile artwork and artists online and discuss their work or 'reputation' in blogs or articles. Within this context, educational projects online for and about women artists have implied that 'more profiles' of women artists on information pages and in databases provide an antidote to the lack of knowledge presented about women in the mainstream curricular. However, this information-based approach fails to promote any critique, self-reflexivity, or questioning of what constitutes valid or valuable knowledge and ways of knowing, and often simply substitutes a male artist for a female artist using standard artistic biography to explain their works of art. Feminists since the 1970s have been openly critical of this 'add-women-and-stir' model of education, because the frameworks in which their work is presented are never questioned (Parker and Pollock 1981; Chadwick 2007). This issue became critical in building this MOOC because it was possible to assume that this

informational approach represents (via Wikipedia) the dominant way of knowing about artists already online. The issue was not to reproduce content from the many websites that exist already offering overviews of woman artists' works but to question the frameworks through which we understand their work. Building a humanities MOOC using feminist frameworks and ideas can therefore offer an alternative to this dominant model of 'knowledge as information' by questioning art historical ideas and their investments in values surrounding 'greatness', 'success' and 'femininity'. By selecting and organising material that prompts reflection, discussion and interrogation of ideas n.paradoxa's MOOC sought to establish a critique of traditional habits and structures of learning.

The xMOOC and cMOOC

The differences in how MOOCs operate is considered by Parme Giuntini (2017) who distinguishes between xMOOCs and cMOOCs to demonstrate how the latter can correspond to the feminist principles for Distributed Open Collaborative Courses (DOCCs) advocated by FemTechNet. Since the 2010s, xMOOCs, as Parme Giuntini identifies, are now offered by major programme providers like Coursera, Udacity, edX, and FutureLearn in the following way: they are initiated by an 'expert' from a single institution, they are offered in timed blocks with 'a specific beginning and ending date, lectures, videos, tests, reading and writing assignments, and opportunities for collaboration on projects or activities' (e.g. Comer and White 2016). The xMOOC 'incentivises' participation by offering achievements in the form of badges and certificates and posting to forums, as a form of peer-to-peer support. Completion in online training courses is 'encouraged' by building visual graphics which map or monitor the time, effort and progress through the course to support and encourage students to complete the training. In an xMOOC, students are required to sign in at set times to experience live feedback sessions—or webinars—delivered over a weekly schedule with fixed timeframes. Regular emails are sent announcing new content and detailing the next step/s in the course direction to encourage participation and return on a week-to-week basis. All of this is to encourage cohesion as a group

meeting at specific times (regardless of global time differences of participants) and to reproduce classroom experiences online in live webinars with a teacher. Content is also drip-fed to students, ensuring progress from one step to another or a week-to-week experience is maintained. Questionnaires at the end of each unit are used to test whether knowledge has been absorbed or 'understood'—students can redo these (unlike real-world tests) if they fail, but cannot progress in the course until a reasonable pass has been achieved. In addition, certificates of completion are used as the 'carrot' both to encourage engagement or completion—but also to obtain payment. Within an xMOOC module or course, payment marks the distinction between learning for one's self (within an open access model) and learning for an award/reward (in paid educational achievement and certified training). Sometimes, payment marks access to materials beyond the life cycle in which the course was run.

While there is a widespread belief that MOOCs attract large numbers of people (in their 1000s), many students sign into a MOOC only once or twice and never complete a course: the average completion rate in terms of assignments, participation in forums and quizzes can be as low as 6–8% of those who sign up (Ho et al. 2015). Completion is higher (45–59%) where the course is a required unit of assessment within a degree or training programme or offers a verifiable certification as an outcome (Ho et al. 2015; Jordan 2015). Interestingly, the most enquiring and avid audiences for MOOCs are other educational developers and teachers who join into watch what other people are doing, research the field, and consider their own next pedagogical steps. It should be noted this completion rate is the very opposite of what teachers expect when they embark upon teaching a class. Class participation and engagement for 'all' are the number one priority for most lecturers and a 94%+ completion marked by students taking exams is a core expectation of 'success' in many 'real world' universities.

The alternative, a cMOOC, offers a different rationale and approach. cMOOCs are connectivist as they aim to build a community of learners over time and focus on 'knowledge creation and generation rather than knowledge duplication' (Giuntini et al. 2017). They are 'self-paced', encourage 'collaboration, commentary and reflection', and emphasise 'decentralized and collective networking' (Giuntini et al. 2017). While I employ the descriptor 'MOOC', n.paradoxa's MOOC is in fact a cMOOC and

is much closer to the DOCC, a Distributed Open Collaborative Course, which FemTechNet identify as 'a feminist retooling of the popular genre of networked learning called MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses)'.

FemTechNet's principles for DOCC's on their website, advocate experimenting with online pedagogies in the following ways. The course:

– 'Recognizes and engages expertise DISTRIBUTED throughout a network;
– Affirms that there are many ways and methods of LEARNING;
– Embodies COLLABORATIVE peer-to-peer communication modes and learning activities;
– Respects DIVERSITY, SPECIFICITY, and DIFFERENCES among people and in bandwidth across networks;
– Encourages the collaborative creation of an HISTORICAL archive' (FemTechNet.org 2018).

I discovered this useful definition only after I had started exploring connectivist models for MOOCs. This definition encompasses the many attempts since the mid-1990s to use the Internet for educational campaigns that support social justice and citizenship rights, and the numerous webpages prepared by academics in disciplines of history, philosophy and literature particularly to share the foundations of feminist thought. When universities went globally online in the mid-1990s, sharing curricula was considered important in marketing a course as 'original', promoting examples of good or innovative practice, and, because these html pages existed they could be seen as useful starting and reference points for students, bridging that gap between compulsory schooling and independent learning at University. Yet, during the commodification of education and the business models adopted by neoliberal institutions, the majority of this curriculum-sharing and exchange of knowledge online has ceased. Degree courses are now marketable 'products' for sale online, duly represented by advertising copy, which promises to lead to an achievable outcome such as a professional role and a job. Precise information on a course is offered in a mission statement and what is offered is not available until after 'purchase', once entry requirements have been met and fees have been paid. xMOOCs follow this instrumental model for service industries.

The concept of online resources as a public good, as having educational potential for citizenship, or through public participation in the free exchange of knowledge via the Internet is now propagated and supported through entirely different sources (largely in the public library or charity sector). This is an enlightened view of humanity and a welcome development away from the net's original purpose as an unbreakable communication-command-control system for the military and its most populist uses of computer components, pornography and commerce. Public science projects, for example, initiated through MOOCs where participants learn about the science and record their own observations or experience as data within a larger scientific project offer a wholly different model of the public-citizen-amateur-scientist to date. Perhaps there is space here for envisaging feminist MOOCs differently as participatory spaces for public conversations?

n.paradoxa as a cMOOC

n.paradoxa's MOOC is an attempt at a feminist intervention that aims to offer an accessible platform for feminist knowledge production and learning and a space for sharing ideas; it is not driven by profit or auditable measures or certification by a University. In fact, like most of my writing and my role as editor of the journal, *n.paradoxa*, it is designed in a spirit of connectivity. My concern in starting this MOOC was to support the potentially under-resourced student, interested person or potential student; to help her/him to learn to navigate the Internet and to find resources which will lead to broad/ening models of knowledge when so little feminist critique and collaboration is taught and encouraged in the formal curriculum. Feminism has a long and complex history of both self-help and self-education by bringing together women in circles and reading groups. Perhaps, this could be replicated online in other humanities subjects and internationally.

There are many other cultural, social and political reasons for embarking on this kind of project online. This project was produced outside an existing university structure of credits or grades (even though I am a Professor at a university) and it did not utilise the technical platforms of the larger production companies such as Coursera

and FutureLearn. It was an extension of KT press' mission which is to publish works which educate the public in the work of women artists. Rather than produce a textbook, I opted for the MOOC as an alternative with the broader aim of seeing if it would generate a larger readership for feminist ideas. This course is positioned against the grain of most generalised 'lowest common denominator' training online. It is not a survey course, it does not seek to reproduce a dictionary or catalogue about women artists, nor does it rehearse well-known information about a few key women artists. It is an attempt to communicate a specialisation—feminist art criticism/feminist art theory—in a connectivist MOOC. n.paradoxa's MOOC is built on WordPress as a website, requiring users to create a login, present their identity to other users in an account page, and view and interact with the content by sharing ideas on forums. This form invites participants to work within their own time restraints and availability, allowing them to work at their own pace. This mass open online course is independently published and was initially sponsored by a start-up of £5000 from Innovate UK, the UK Government's Innovation Agency to my publishing company, KT press. This grant paid for the technical assistance, it did not pay for my accumulated cultural capital in writing the course or my voluntary labour in designing it. I aimed to produce a low-maintenance, low-budget production on an independent website—which would be a resource used for a long time and contained the potential to grow largely through audience interactions. In its first year, 800 people joined.

The n.paradoxa MOOC is presented as a course of 10 lessons, each with a different subject. Each lesson is interlinked extensively with other resources on the web, including those provided by the international feminist art journal's website, n.paradoxa, at http://www.ktpress.co.uk. Each lesson has 3–4 pages which move from 'common-sense' understanding to more 'theoretical' questions and broader issues, through a wide range of sources and links, with the idea that the more you pursue the course, the more you can learn. As the author/teacher, my task was to find a way of explaining complex ideas and concepts to an unknown but highly varied potential audience. I envisaged (when I began) that joining the course invariably implied some interest in feminism and contemporary art as an area of study from the reader/student. The lessons offer a narrative which

develops an explanation between texts, images and other resources, and the teaching is in this narrative, as well as through the selection of the material. This course offers links to websites and embedded videos, but it presents no images by women artists and employs 'fair use' quotation of short quotes and links to content hosted on other sites. I did not make any videos, nor negotiate complex copyright for visual materials or photos. I was trying to avoid the MOOC requiring 'ownership' or licensing of other people's material because the 'teaching' is in the narrative as a careful sequencing of resources already published online. (It is worth noting that online materials do change and updating is an issue with so many online links in one site.) As a lecturer, this narration and 'fair use' is common to what we do in education and I was translating this into the MOOC as the basis for feminist discussion within a broad/er community.

The text of each lesson offers a complete narrative to read without pursuing any links, it prompts questions and encourages responses from individual readers and discussion forums from these points are attached to each lesson. There are also spaces for feedback and questions. Writing the course, I considered fast vs. slow uses of the Internet, questioning our familiarity with it as the quick reference sources for facts or definitions. I try to show the limitations of the net for feminist debates in contemporary art—not in terms of visibility of artworks (as here it has been a boon) but a lack of online critical discourse in print (particularly for those outside Universities' provision of electronic resources). Learning about feminism and contemporary art is not a technical or factually based project; it is a journey of understanding and requires familiarity with key concepts and ideas. In the humanities, the model is that students should learn critical skills such as 'discernment', through becoming familiar with categories, ideas and frameworks of knowledge. In art history, 'compare and contrast' is still a dominant pedagogical model where two images are presented on the screen to prompt visual comparisons and demonstrate 'styles' in art and types of art. I employ this in some lessons but more often I emphasise not similarities but points of difference, both in quotations as points of view and by presenting different kinds of talks in public galleries, already available in videos online. Many of the feminist videos I selected have

very low audiences as videos (often less than 250 recorded viewings) but these recordings were a way to locate different ideas and introduce many voices into the MOOC. I chose to compile this course without reference to either Wikipedia or Ted Talks, precisely because there are many underused, freely available and interesting resources online, including scanned archival materials which provide more reliable and more engaging material. These citation practices supplement the main arguments, they do not replace them.

I had another aim in pointing to so many different resources within the n.paradoxa MOOC by using links. A singular narrative implies a single perspective, and I wanted to emphasise the existence of multiple perspectives within feminism and different viewpoints. This sign-posting process is not the same as writing a dictionary entry or writing a Wikipedia page (both of which I have done!). Indeed, it does not attempt to be 'comprehensive' or 'authoritative' but aims to be expansive and deliberately full of contrasts and juxtapositions. I did not attempt to present 'neutrality'—by moderating between two sides in an argument— and presenting a view of a discipline or orthodoxy in the manner of a survey. I instead offered an overview of different issues and questions to initiate a dialogue, in the manner of 'here are some issues and points of view… do you have questions? How do you feel about this?'.

Here are some examples from the MOOC: 'feminism is not about equality but fighting discrimination'—'feminist art theory is not about images of women in the male gaze, but about women as cultural producers'. I emphasised the necessity of negotiating these viewpoints for each reader, prompting them to form their own views in relation to this material. Throughout, I chose to focus on international presentations of resources with the aim of moving beyond art history's typically national frameworks. In one case study, however, I present an intergenerational difference in Denmark, by presenting two groups of women artists from the 1970s and the 1990s and pointing to what is and is not available online about them. This example demonstrates how feminism occurs offline but is translated in limited ways in an online space. The project 'curates' sources and focuses on 'explaining' ways of seeing the world to encourage online navigation that is different in quality or type than that served by

Google. I also selected material that presents transnational/international perspectives on feminisms (in the plural) and on feminist art practices (that are also multiple in content/form/politics). This exercise, in some small part, addresses Jacqui Alexander and Chandra Mohanty's (Alexander and Mohanty 2012) call for 'a radical transnational feminist project' that 'involves looking at the way curricula and pedagogies mark and become sites for the mobilization of knowledge about the transnational'.

The key question that Alexander and Mohanty (2012) raise is how to embody a vision with different kind of educational goals and a syllabus which does not reinforce 'normative' cartographic rules in the spatialisation of knowledge. They call for forms of pedagogy which do not lead to the dismissal of Third World/developing countries as peripheral or marginal. Western art history is dominated by a spatialisation of knowledge between the West (a Euro-American model) and the rest 'Other/ed' cultures. Alexander and Mohanty (2012) review and critique the few courses that do exist in US Third-World feminism which present globalisation, diasporic and post-colonial discourses, even those using queer LGBT-based agendas, by arguing that the case studies offered in them frequently provide a stand-in for more developed transnational studies because the voices of Others are offered as discreet and separate through an 'add-and-stir' method (the same problem of women artists in the art-school curricula!). To counter this, they argue that feminist post-colonial studies should not be separated from a feminism defined only through a white Euro-American lens. They raise questions which apply to all feminist scholars about how to attend to the location from which we (as teachers and students) speak, as this contains the possibility of moving beyond limits of national/regional studies into transnational and comparative models.

n.paradoxa's MOOC was premised on international participation and aimed to explore how a transnational view would occur when participants online come from different parts of the world and ask questions, that emerge from their locations, about cross-border norms/exception/s. This approach can only be achieved by encouraging people to share popular mis/conceptions in relation to their perspectives, not as a correction but as a known starting point. Sharing definitions and differences also develops the potential for feminism to exist as a 'travelling' concept between women located in different parts of the world. (Obviously,

though this depends on their access to computers, time and language-acquisition—as this course is currently only presented in English.) Nevertheless, the course attracted women from South Africa, Brazil, Russia, and different parts of Europe as well as UK and USA.

The forums within the MOOC were designed to become a repository of collected contributions and conversations. Each forum begins with a first posting of my own perspective/s and those of early test contributors to suggest how content could be engaged with by all readers/contributors. The most popular section, so far, is the invitation to write about a 'memorable book' on feminism and contemporary art that participants have read before engaging in the course. I tried to find more accessible methods of participation and sharing opinions in deliberate contrast to didactic pedagogies that focus on presenting 'facts'. Another invitation for conversation I offer is 'describe a feminist organisation you would like to be part of'. These questions stimulate participation and sharing, a collective generation of resources and ideas, and a space for participants to connect with each other. The only quiz on the site does not store the answers each participant selects, nor does it aggregate the responses as 'popular choice' graphics, its purpose is not a testing of correct answers, or learning achieved, but a self-examination of personal assumptions. It asks participants about their ideas about statistics on women artists. The 'result' page which follows, offers research on women artists and is designed to prompt the reader to examine their own assumptions further.

Developing n.paradoxa's MOOC has been an idealistic rather than a capitalistic project; an experiment in negotiating how to teach (or engage learning) about feminism and contemporary art at a time when no other online courses existed on this subject. n.paradoxa is a pedagogical intervention that both resists sexism and the imperative to transform knowledge into profit as part of a neoliberalist project in the academy. By offering an alternative curriculum which focuses on feminism and contemporary art and offers free online access to knowledge acquisition, generation, sharing and connectivity possibilities. Like many other MOOCs, it has attracted many educators to it but if this experimental course exists only to educate the educators, it is still successful.

Conclusion

The feminist project, broadly speaking, identifies and critiques patriarchal structures that position women and women's knowing and communicating as subordinate to men's, while providing alternative forms of being and working. It encourages a critical view of systems and invites us to identify how structures privilege and marginalise certain people, beliefs and ways of living/doing. Therefore, from a feminist perspective, I consequently devised this cMOOC as an intervention and resistance to the marginalisation of women and feminism in art curricular. Yet, my critical and feminist lens also identified that certain forms of knowledge and education packaged in traditional xMOOCs—the survey course, compare and contrast methods to identify style, 'add and stir' methods for teaching about women artists which leave the framework of art history intact—propagate hierarchies of power and knowledge and do not permit participatory, issue-based or situated ways of knowing. I therefore developed n.paradoxa, as a 'cMOOC/DOCC' to create open access connectivist, interactive, intersubjective learning experiences that focus on feminist theory in relation to contemporary art. In addition, by curating varied perspectives and creating a narrative which values global, transnational and transgenerational women's art within an online environment n.paradoxa's MOOC aimed to resist the neoliberalist agenda of contemporary academia. In this chapter, I detail how and why I developed n.paradoxa's MOOC by exploring the differences between xMOOCs and cMOOCs and in so doing, I invite a reconsideration of the way we conceptualise 'package' and 'manage' our courses and curricular at universities when they do not place women as cultural producers—as objects of study, or as the perspectives of teachers and students—at the centre of knowledge production.

References

Alexander, J. M., & Mohanty, C. (2012). Cartographies of knowledge and power: Transnational feminism as radical praxis. In M. Luxton & M. J. Mossman (Eds.), *Reconsidering knowledge: Feminism and the academy* (pp. 42–63). Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Bligh, D. (1971). *What's the use of lectures?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chadwick, W. (2007). *Women, art and society* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Thames and Hudson.

Chicago, J. (1975). *Through the flower: My struggle as a woman artist*. New York, NY: Doubleday.

Comer, D. K., & White, E. M. (2016). Adventuring into MOOC writing assessment: Challenges, results, and possibilities. *College Composition and Communication, 67*(3), 318–359.

Dalton, P. (2001). *The gendering of art education: Modernism, identity and critical feminisms*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

FemTechNet. (2018). https://femtechnet.org. Last Accessed August 2018.

Giuntini, P., Swartz, A., & Wentrack, K. (2017). Review of n.paradoxa's MOOC on contemporary art and feminism. *Art History Pedagogy & Practice, 2*(2), 1–21. https://academicworks.cuny.edu/ahpp/vol2/iss2/5/. Last accessed May 2018.

Hemmings, C. (2016). Is gender studies singular? Stories of queer/feminist difference and displacement' differences. *A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, 27*(2), 79–102.

Ho, A., Chuang, I., Reich, J., Coleman, C., Whitehill, J., Northcutt, C., et al. (2015). *HarvardX and MITx: Two years of open online courses Fall 2012–Summer 2014* (HarvardX Working Paper No. 10). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2586847. Last accessed May 2018.

Jordan, K. (2015). *MOOC completion rates: The data*. http://www.katyjordan.com/MOOCproject.html. Last accessed May 2018.

Keifer-Boyd, K. (2007). From content to form: Judy Chicago's pedagogy with reflections by Judy Chicago. *Studies in Art Education, 48*(2), 134–154.

Loeb, J. (Ed.). (1979). *Feminist collage: Educating women in the visual arts*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

n.paradoxa (2010, July). Feminist Pedagogies. *n.paradoxa: International Feminist Art Journal, 26*.

Parker, R., & Pollock, G. (1981). *Old mistresses: Women, art and ideology* (3rd ed.). London, UK: I.B. Tauris.

Pollock, G. (2010, July). Opened, closed and opening: Reflections on feminist pedagogy in a UK university. *n.paradoxa: International Feminist Art Journal, 26,* 20–28.

Sandell, R. (1979). Feminist art education: An analysis of the women's art movement as an educational force. *Studies in Art Education, 20*(2), 18–28.

Weed, E., & Schor, N. (Eds.). (1997). *Feminism meets queer theory.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Yuan, L., & Powell, S. (2013). *MOOCs and open education: Implications for higher education* (A White Paper). Centre for Educational Technology Interoperability Standards. https://publications.cetis.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/MOOCs-and-Open-Education.pdf. Last accessed May 2018.

10

Civic Engagement as Empowerment: Theater, Public Art, and Spoken Word as Roads to Activism

Kay Siebler

The day before the 2016 U.S. presidential election, I made a call to my feminist colleagues. "Let's meet on the green space in front of the library and take a Pantsuit Nation photo." We were all wearing pantsuits that day – baby-poop brown, double-knit polyester, tailored wool, culled from thrift stores and closet nooks. We were, feminist faculty and coven cohorts, exuberant and giddy in our assurances that Hillary Clinton was about to become the first woman president. We linked arms and created a righteous can-can line across the green. In every class I taught that sunny, chilled November day, I talked to my students about why I – and many women – were wearing pantsuits. My students and I had been talking politics all semester, part and parcel of every class I teach as a way of coaxing my students to political engagement. "Everyone is voting, right?" I chided. "You can't afford to sit out *any* election, but especially this one."

K. Siebler (✉)
Missouri Western State University, St. Joseph, MO, USA
e-mail: ksiebler@missouriwestern.edu

The centrality of civic engagement in my feminist teaching has become more prominent as I have been faced with increasingly greater numbers of students who seem ignorant or apathetic. The herstory of feminist pedagogy began in political action and civic engagement, the voices of women gathering and rising and moving into the academy in the form of teaching practices, curriculum development, and educational policies of inclusiveness and equity (Siebler 2004). In the 1970s, in the USA, feminist academics began bringing feminist principles into their classrooms, into their ways of teaching. These feminist teachers used the principles of Freire (*Pedagogy of the Oppressed* 1970) and his theories on education toward social consciousness as a foundation. But then they added more. Feminist educators complicated Freire's socioeconomic focus through examination of various systems of power and oppression: sex, gender, sexuality, ability, race, ethnicity, and spirituality. Freire (1970) wrote that education needed to create empowered students who felt agency is working against systems of oppression. Feminist teachers wrote about applying the second wave mantra "The Personal is Political" to education so students could connect classroom curriculum with critical consciousness leading to social action (hooks 1994; Fine 1995; Kane 1997; Siebler 2004). From Freire to bell hooks (*Teaching to Transgress* 1994) through today, feminist teachers continue to emphasize their commitment to interrogating power, empowering students, and social action.

Many of my students boast that they are apolitical. "I don't pay attention to the news", students say; "I don't have time for politics"; "My vote doesn't matter anyway"; "I don't have *time* for the news." I work to make sure students understood their *obligation* to vote (regardless of whether the next election is local or national). I show my students the forced feeding clip from the 2004 film *Iron Jawed Angels*, a way of putting an exclamation point on the topic. I need my students to understand what others, especially women and Blacks, have gone through to ensure they had the right to vote and how that right is currently being curtailed through gerrymandering, voter ID laws, and denying felons' right to vote. I want them to know that because others *can't* vote, if they *can*, they are obligated.

The day after our colorful, pantsuit can-can, I dragged myself onto campus dejected and despairing. Many of my colleagues, male and female, were wearing black. We hugged and wept openly. My students were hesitant in class. One said, "I thought of you last night. How are you doing?" Many of my colleagues, my sisters-in-arms of the previous days' euphoric moment on the green, felt *angry*, with some of it directed at their students for not voting or being apathetic. I felt a kinder, empathetic association with my students. We had been talking all semester about the political process, their obligation to vote. Regardless of *how* they voted, I felt confident that they understood the importance of voting.

It doesn't matter what class I am teaching, from an *Intro to Gender Studies* course to a graduate course on *Theories and Practices of Teaching*, I arrive early to class and, as students trickle in, devote the first 10 minutes to current events. The only topics not allowed are celebrity or sports news: "I don't care about Lil Peep or the Superbowl. Speculation about Beyonce's baby bump is not *news*."

This daily practice of discussing complex social and political issues leads to a research assignment. But we don't stop there. Students are then charged with taking the issue they have researched into the community, whether through performance or political action, many times both of these. Feminist teachers need to teach civic engagement in both traditional contexts (fighting oppressive systems of institutional power) and in non-traditional contexts, including performance venues of students' choosing. With this twin approach to teaching civic engagement, students gain knowledge and practice in becoming active citizens. Political awareness, social activism, and interrogating complex systems of power are, after all, cornerstones of feminist teaching.

"What's in the news?" It's 8 a.m., not an easy class time for the typical college student who is over-programmed due to athletics, work, childcare, or extracurricular activities. Students look sleepy and disheveled, dozy Labradors being coaxed into play. "Come on," I prod, waiting for their brains to be jolted into action by their preferred, legal morning stimulant. "Who will impress me today?" Some avoid eye contact, but there is always someone who perks up and mumbles a news headline. "And what do you think about that?" I press, watching students shuffle in and slump

into sturdy chairs. I jostle their minds into action by asking, "What else do you know?" and "Who else has something to say about that?" If there are no volunteers, I call on students by name. Ambivalent shrugging or muttering, "I don't know" as a way to dodge engagement is not allowed.

Although many feminist teachers have emphasized political action as a goal in their classrooms, there was already a well-paved road of social engagement running through higher learning. One founding principle of US higher education is the objective of creating critically thinking, engaged citizens (Ehrlich 2000; Naples and Bojar 2002; Colby et al. 2007, 2010; Hartley 2009; Orr 2011). When the idea of the contemporary US university system was first articulated by Cardinal John Henry Newman (1852/1990), his argument pivoted on higher education as a way of strengthening the new US republic. Newman wrote that without people educated in a wide range of topics, the idea of democracy would fail. In order to be smart voters and engaged citizens, people had to be educated beyond just job training; a well-educated populous needed to understand the intricate systems of economies, sciences, politics, government, arts, and humanities (Newman 1852/1990, p. 2). Educational scholars continue to write about the centrality of activism and social transformation in education (Schutte 2017). The centrality of civic engagement is discussed at all levels of the educational system, but certainly in higher education. The American Colleges and Universities Civic Engagement Working Group (Musil 2011; Welch 2009; Jacoby 2009) focuses on education about communities and culture as well as public action (Musil 2011, pp. 59–60). Liberal Arts' engagement and action tenants merge with feminist pedagogy where commitment to student political and social empowerments is central.

"What have you done today?" I ask my students. "What *will* you do today?" I disclose to them my daily failings and successes, speaking out against racist comments, writing a letter to the editor, making a phone call to a senator. Every day I have something to report. Every day I ask them to report. We are cultural activists, working towards social justice in small, daily ways. "I don't care what it is. Just *do* something, deliberately and intentionally."

Feminist pedagogy was born of the multi-disciplinary Women's Studies (now often Gender Studies), foregrounding elements of community connection and activism (Orr 2011). Many educators and scholars have written about the connection of teaching civic engagement, campus activism, and lifelong political/social engagement (Hunter 1988; Chambers and Phelps 1993; Keeling 2004; Giroux 2002; Strachan et al. 2002; Biddix et al. 2009; Yerbury and Burridge 2013). Universities have a vested interest in encouraging campus activism because research has shown a correlation between campus involvement and low attrition rates (Astin 1993; Tinto 1993). That same campus activism also offers ways for underrepresented student populations to gain voice, confidence, and political agency through campus involvement that extends *beyond* their campus years (Bowman et al. 2015). Because of the added benefit to disempowered groups, feminist teachers have an additional incentive to focus on civic engagement through social activism.

> In passing, a colleague pulls me aside. "I have one of your former students in class this semester. He told me, 'In Prof. Siebler's writing class we talked about what was in the news. I miss that. It made me feel like I knew what was going on.'" She laughed, "I told him he didn't have to stop reading the news just because he wasn't required to!" This anecdote makes me sad in two ways: first that my former student did not continue to be engaged on his own; second that my colleague did not seize the opportunity to continue this work.

Feminist pedagogy includes the imperative of political/social action. I want to offer students a direct connection between community activism/service and political action within established systems of power (letter writing/lobbying political representatives). I want them to be comfortable acting in various arenas, particularly understanding and engaging with formal systems of political power. Sometimes I succeed. Sometimes not.

Corporatization of Education and Civic Disengagement

Understanding systems of political power are essential for my students because in the USA we are experiencing a cultural shift in education away from Liberal Arts and toward government-defined corporate education. These shifts are driven by political forces designed to create an undereducated voting populous of people whose primary role is consumption, not political engagement. Many students, parents, and politicians are eager to point out that anything that does not relate to the chosen career path is liberal indoctrination or a waste of money.

> I'm sitting knee-cap to knee-cap, eyeball to eyeball with one of my student advisees, talking about their educational trajectory, the classes they need to take, their program of study, ticking boxes and plotting timelines. The lanky young man in trainers and a sloppy sweatshirt, grimy sports cap covering bed head, sighs, "I don't get why I have to take two art courses. I'm going to be a computer programmer. That is such a waste of time." I pause. Exhale. Begin. Over and over, semester after semester, I explain to students the importance of the diversity of knowledge that general education courses offer. I attempt to convince them that critical thinking skills are important for everyone and that each class presents them with different ways to practice critical thinking and analysis, increasing a broader – as opposed to a narrower – view of the world. "Yet another day and I haven't used *algebra*," one student recently told me with an exasperated eye roll. Out clattered my Liberal Arts Soap Box, and I explained that algebra is a way to exercise logic, analysis, and critical thinking in a different context, not a set of job or life skills.

Within the past decade, I have gained an increased sense of urgency with my students' lack of knowledge regarding their role in civic engagement, an apathy that has real consequences. In the most recent US presidential election, the statistics regarding first-time millennial voters should be a call for action to anyone who teaches:

– 46% of Millennials voted on Election Day (low compared to other generation demographics) (File 2017).
– 35% of young voters reported using social media to learn about election and candidate news (Gottfried et al. 2016).
– Most young people engage in social media activism ("slacktivism") rather than grassroots and community activisms (Dookhoo 2015).

The emerging research on "clicking as activism" is not optimistic. Dookhoo (2015), surveying 300 young people, found their "slacktivism" does not translate into grassroots activism or community work. Dookhoo writes, "[A]lthough a Millennial may show support for a social-political issue online, this act is a one-time, isolated incident that may not necessarily affect that individual's future activity" (p. 48). The quick gratification of clicking as activism (signing a petition, forwarding a post, sending a mass e-mail to a senator) seems to have had a secondary effect as well: Young people don't seem to understand the institutional process of policy and politics.

My students are of the digital generation. They grew up with minicomputers in their hands, demanding immediacy and non-stop connection. Complex news stories are reduced to facebook memes, twitter posts, and one minute youtube. Feminist pedagogy offers an antidote to dig deeper, to slow down, to encourage resistance, to talk about the complexities of who is left out, whose voice is not being heard, how do we complicate these issues, where do we go for more information, and, ultimately, what can we *do* about any of it?

My commitment to feminist pedagogy does not allow me to become the geezer teacher, peering over her glasses, and tsk-tsking, "You young people …" with the exaggerated sigh of an exasperated crone. Instead, I need to roll up my sleeves and dig in. I am not a political science or economics professor, but I teach civic engagement. Requiring my students to choose a current event that interests them and dig deep, do the research, evaluate sources, and come up with a well-structured argument based on their opinion, asks them to move beyond initial, superficial opinions on complicated issues that they have gleaned from social media or news sound bytes. But the assignment doesn't stop there.

Students have to engage in action beyond the research, getting outside the rhetoric of the classroom in two ways: community education as well as political action.

> It is early November, 2016 and the news is dominated by the presidential election pitting a woman who has spent her life devoted to social justice activism (and, yes, a career politician) against a blow-hard, bloated, reality television star troll who boasts about his ostentatious riches. "I'm voting for Trump," a student proclaims. "He's a successful businessman. He can turn the economy around." I offer evidence to the contrary (seven declared bankruptcies, money from his rich father, Trump not paying contractors or taxes). I end with a mini-lecture on macro-economics vs. micro-economics. "The type of economic theories and practices it takes to understand a government are vastly different from those it takes to run a business," I opine. "But that is why you are in college: to *learn* about the complexities of these systems and how different they are. Stay tuned. That economics class you have to take for your general education requirements will help you understand that. And you'll be a smarter voter because of it. Do you think it is any coincidence that the most under-educated people are those who support Trump?"

Research to Performance

Informed voting is action. But there are many types of action. Performance as community engagement and social change are themes that run through much scholarship on feminist pedagogy (Bishop 2006; Springgay 2010). Bishop (2006) writes that socially engaged art creates activists through participation, collaboration, and community building (p. 12). In my classroom, these "art/performance as activism" projects include such events as spoken-word poetry nights regarding issues of social justice, documentary film screenings with discussion, flash mob-style performances of *Vagina Monologues*, and photo campaigns such as "This is what a Feminist Looks Like" or "I Identify as Queer Because …" For their campus or community action, students are asked to critically reflect on each phase of the process, through execution. They are also required to gather feedback from the audience who observed or experienced their action.

When asking students to first propose their activist project, I help them shape their objectives and how to deliver them effectively for their target audience. How will they notify their potential audience of the event? At the event, what information do they want to communicate? How will they move their audience to action? How will their event disrupt or confront systems of oppression? And, finally, how will they know whether their event/performance was successful? Student must move beyond simply executing a public action to thinking about who needs to hear their message and how will they know whether they achieved their goal in educating their audience.

Performance to Personal Correspondence

Moving their action from personal performance to lobbying is essential in helping students understand that simply engaging in personal actions for a chosen audience is not enough. They need to engage in both the personal/community level *and* with the formal institutions of politics and power that define the policies and laws. By connecting their issue to a formal structure of power, students begin to understand how systems of power (community, culture, religion, family, school, government) are related. This phase of the project mandates that students research what government entity has the power to make a structural/policy change regarding the issue (University Board of Trustees? City Council? State Senator? Congress?). For this, students need a lot of help. Many do not understand the difference between the jurisdiction of the local school board v. the city council v. the state legislature v. US Congress.

Regardless of which agency/individual the students define as the power broker, the student needs to research whether there is already an existing policy/bill/law in place or proposed that deals with their issue. They need to articulate what the existing policy/bill/law is and what *they* are proposing. Once the student has answered these basic questions, the students must articulate what will be persuasive to the audience. This means doing research about the power broker, perhaps even calling the office of the individual/group and asking about past voting records or public statements regarding their issue. In a *Pedagogy of Teaching Writing*

course, a group of students organized a "safe space" training for area middle and high school teachers. Their final political action was to write a letter to school board representatives advocating that LGBTQI friendly and gender-neutral language be adopted by the school district, including at least one gender-inclusive bathroom per school.

In drafting a letter to a public official or politician, I ask students to write a formal letter rather than an e-mail because research has indicated these personal letters, signed, addressed, and stamped, are often weighted more by public officials than e-mails (Schultz 2017). These letters are no more than front/back of one page of paper, single-spaced, with a clear argument, evidence/support, and proposed solution that is within the power of the person they are writing. Students have to research the snail mail address of their audience, buy a stamp, and address/stamp the envelope. After grading the letter, I seal the envelope and mail it. Without this essential knowledge and practice in community and political activisms, there is little hope that formal systems of power will change.

Anti-feminist Resistance

A colleague says to me, "Well, I *hope* that you also let *other* opinions be heard in your classroom." On their end-of-semester evaluation a student writes, "This class was all about racism and it was supposed to be about writing," Scrawled another, "All we did was talk about politics." But for every negative comment, there are five telling a different story. "I am more aware of what is going on in the world because of this class." I fidget and fixate on the negative comments, worried that I will get a terse warning from the chair or the dean about dialing back my feminist politics. Those reprimands never come.

I often face student resistance. Sometimes this comes only after the course is complete, in the comment sections on student evaluations. In class, a student may take an approach that is antithetical to my feminist beliefs, e.g., a student arguing that campus policies and protocols on sexual assault unfairly victimize males. I approach these projects the same as the rest: making sure the student does in-depth research with

credible sources, asking questions to focus the argument, and prodding the student to investigate how to best deliver the performance and the political engagement pieces.

When a student is fully committed to a stance that runs counter to feminist principles, I step back from my emotional response and look more objectively at the assignment criteria, whether the argument is effective for the intended audience, and whether the research is solid. Recently, a white male student argued that athletes "taking a knee" during the National Anthem was disrespectful of veterans/active duty military. As his peers reviewed his project, they engaged in a lively debate about how patriotism is defined in different ways, how the flag can represent one thing to some (a symbol of oppression and systemic racism) but something else to another (a symbol of military service and pride). Throughout these debates, students were passionate, but respectful. The only time I inserted my perspective was when the defending student said, "The football field is a place for entertainment, not politics." I pulled up the image of Tommie Smith and John Carlos raising a black power salute at the 1968 Olympics. I talked about the reason behind the medal stand salute and the fallout the athletes faced. I spoke to the strong tradition in the Black community of "rhetoric of the body" protest because *saying* something was often ineffective or lead to brutal lynchings. I pointed to Rosa Parks, the lunch counter sit-ins, the Black Panthers standing vigil in the streets of Oakland, California … all part of a rich, powerful tradition in the Black community of civil engagement and silent protest. My point was to show the student that Black activism has a long history of peaceful protest like "taking a knee" and that we—as whites—needed to recognize that history. In the end, the student did not change his argument, but he was able to see a perspective he hadn't considered.

When I do choose to insert my voice, tone, word choice, and body language are important. I am aware that as I age, becoming closer to the age of my traditional students' grandparents, they do not see me as antagonistic as some did when I was 15 years younger. This could be sexism ("She reminds me of my liberal aunt/crazy granny …"); it could also be that I have tempered my tone and approach. By being careful with tone, body language, and word choice, I can address resistant students without making them feel bullied.

Ultimately, I need to remember that I am the one with the most tangible power in the classroom. I am aware of these micro-systems of power; I am the one assigning grades. Many of my feminist colleagues shy away from making their opinions known to their students, sensitive to the power dynamic in the class where they—as the teachers—have more tangible power. This power dynamic causes them to be wary of expressing an opinion for fear that it will bear more weight.

> A young, un-tenured colleague, very involved in feminist action off campus, expresses her classroom trepidation. "I pretend to be neutral," she says in a tone that suggests mental hand-wringing. "And I fear that I give more space to the uninformed or conservative perspectives. I'm over-compensating."

Although I understand the teacher inclination to be coy with an opinion, a feminist teacher has the obligation to be overt with her own opinions instead of feigning neutrality. Students need to see their teacher as invested in ideas and see teachers as informed political and social activists. I do experience students who will quickly capitulate to my opinion once I express it. When I see this happening, I challenge them: "Don't change your opinion because of me. Defend your perspective. Make your argument! Try to persuade me." Because I challenge their opinions daily, when it comes to questioning their stance on assignments, students rarely see my line of questioning as hostile.

> The skills that I learned from your class, although it was very hard to get through, was probably the most helpful when it comes to furthering my education in college. … [Y]ou showed me that even though something isn't always right, as an intellectual, I can stand up for my opinions and state my facts. I've never had a teacher that graded me on talking in class, but doing so, I got the opportunity to voice my opinion. (Student in a *Writing and Research* course)

Many times I hear from students after they become teachers themselves. Recently, a Swedish foreign exchange student sent me an unexpected e-mail, four years after he was in my class:

> Now, being a teacher myself, I can appreciate how well you handled the fact that a mere mention of your personal views on, say, gender equality could spark about 4-5 anecdotes from the students of varying length and importance. I might have shared a few stories myself that perhaps weren't always that important to the situation but I think it was because of how inspirational and cool you made it feel to have a strong opinion. Thought provoking and very educating is how I remember Advanced Composition. The way you were able to mix a strong personality and sense of humor while maintaining a strong sense of discipline and professionalism has really inspired me in my teaching. I can't say I really master both those qualities yet, but I'm working on it!

Conclusion

At these particular social and political moments, I fear the USA is losing a Democracy to a Plutocracy or a Kleptocracy. As an educator, I have the power to make a difference in this trend. An important way to save the Republic is to make certain my students are not only critically thinking about complex issues, but that they feel empowered to engage in resistance and activism in various contexts. This approach is not about a feminist brainwashing of students. My commitment to my students, grounded in my feminist pedagogy, is to challenge them to think in complex ways about the world in which they live, to speak out and act out in various contexts, and to have practice in both performing in the community and engaging with their political representatives on issues that are important to them. If students have practice in engaging both in community and political actions within institutional power structures, they might replicate that engagement in various contexts throughout their lives. It will be the one thing that can create a better world.

References

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Biddix, J., Somers, P., & Polman, J. (2009). Protest reconsideration: Identifying democratic and civic engagement in learning outcomes. *Innovations in Higher Education, 34,* 133–147.

Bishop, C. (2006). *Participation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bowman, N. A., Park, J. J., & Denson, N. (2015). Student involvement in ethnic student organizations: Examining civic outcomes 6 years after graduation. *Research in Higher Education, 56,* 127–145.

Chambers, T., & Phelps, C. E. (1993). Student activism as a form of leadership and student development. *NASPA Journal, 3*(1), 19–29.

Colby, A., Beaumont, E., Ehrich, T., & Corngold, J. (2010). *Educating for democracy: Preparing undergraduates for responsible political engagement*. Jossey-Bass.

Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (2007). *Educating citizens: Preparing America's undergraduates for lives of moral and civic responsibility*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Dookhoo, S. (2015). *How Millennials engage in social media activism: A uses and gratifications approach*. Masters theses, University of Central Florida. https://stars.library.ucf.edu/etd/1364.

Ehrlich, T. (2000). *Civic responsibility and higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: Orynx Press.

File, T. (2017, May 10). *Voting in America*. United States Census Bureau. https://www.census.gov/newsroom/blogs/random-samplings/2017/05/voting_in_america.html. Last accessed June 2018.

Fine, G. A. (1995). Public narration and group culture: Discerning discourse in social movements. In J. Johnston & B. Klandermans (Eds.), *Social movements and culture* (pp. 127–143). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.

Giroux, H. A. (2002). Neoliberalism, corporate Culture, and the promise of higher education: The university as a democratic public sphere. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(4), 425–463.

Gottfried, J., Barthel, M., Shearer, E., & Mitchell, A. (2016, February 4). *The 2016 presidential campaign*. Pew Research Center. http://www.journalism.org/2016/02/04/the-2016-presidential-campaign-a-news-event-thats-hard-to-miss/. Last accessed June 2018.

Hartley, M. (2009). Reclaiming the democratic purposes of American higher education: Tracing the trajectory of the civic engagement movement. *Learning and Teaching, 2*(3), 11–30.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Educating as the practice of freedom.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Hunter, D. E. (1988). Student activism: Growth through rebellion. In K. M. Miser (Ed.), *Student affairs and campus dissent: Reflection of the past and challenge for the future* (pp. 23–40). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Jacoby, B. (2009). Civic engagement in today's higher education: An overview. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 5–30). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Kane, A. E. (1997). Theorizing meaning construction in social movements: Symbolic structures and interpretation during the Irish Land War, 1879–1882. *Sociological Theory, 15*(3), 249–276.

Keeling, R. P. (Ed.). (2004). *Learning reconsidered: A campus-wide focus on the student experience.* Washington, DC: The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, The American College Personnel Association.

Musil, C. M. (2011). Remapping education for social responsibility: Civic, local, and global diversity. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 49–68). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Naples, N. A., & Bohar, K. (Eds.). (2002). *Teaching feminist activism: Strategies from the field.* New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.

Newman, J. H. (1990). *Idea of a University.* University of Notre Dame Press (Original work published in 1852).

Orr, C. (2011). *Women's studies as civic engagement: Research and recommendations.* The Teagle Working Group on Women's Studies and Civic Engagement and the National Women's Studies Association. http://www.nwsa.org/Files/Resources/WomensStudiesasCivicEngagement2011Revised_Finalpdf-1.pdf. Last accessed June 2018.

Schultz, K. (2017, March 6). What calling Congress achieves. *The New Yorker.* https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/03/06/what-calling-congress-achieves. Last accessed June 2018.

Schutte, J. (2017). The future of student life: Participating. *On the Horizon, 25*(3), 177–180. https://ezproxy.missouriwestern.edu:6835/10.1108/OTH-05-2017-0025.

Siebler, K. (2004). *Composing feminisms.* New Jersey, NJ: Hampton Press.

Springgay, S. (2010). Knitting as an aesthetic of civic engagement: Re-conceptualizing feminist pedagogy through touch. *Feminist Teacher, 20*(2), 111–123.

Strachan, J., Hildreth, A., & Murray, L. (2002). *In search of effective civic education messages: A content analysis of high school government texts.* Conference Papers—American Political Science Association, 1–40.

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Welch, M. (2009). Moving from service-learning to civic engagement. In B. Jacoby (Ed.), *Civic engagement in higher education: Concepts and practices* (pp. 174–195). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Yerbury, H., & Burridge, N. (2013). The activist professional: Advocacy and scholarship. *Third Sector Review*, *19*(2 Special), 119–134.

Part III

Approaches to Research That Offer an Alternative to Androcentric Research Practices

11

Genders at Work: Gender as a Geography of Power in the Academy

Kate Carruthers Thomas

Starting Points

I have an unusual dual role within a large, urban, modern UK university. As a Senior Research Fellow, I work critically *on* gender, drawing on geographical, sociological and educational theories and methods. As the university's Project Manager for the Athena SWAN Charter, I work *in* gender, overseeing and innovating activities in relation to the HE sector's flagship accreditation system for advancing gender equality. As such, I am 'doing diversity work … the ordinary and painstaking work of working on institutions so they are more accommodating' (Ahmed 2017). Some colleagues express surprise at this juxtaposition and wonder how the two are compatible? Indeed, as Ahmed writes: 'working in-house too often ends up being a restoration project, polishing the furniture so it appears less damaged; a labour I have called … "institutional polishing"' (Ahmed 2018).

K. Carruthers Thomas (✉)
Birmingham City University, Birmingham, UK
e-mail: Kate.Thomas@bcu.ac.uk

My current research: *Gender(s) at Work*, investigates how gender operates as a geography of power in the contemporary academy, particularly in relation to notions of 'career'. This chapter first contextualises the research within the intertwining contexts of higher education (HE) and the Athena SWAN Charter. It then outlines how theories of 'the spatial' notably Massey's understanding of space as 'a simultaneity of stories-so-far and places as collections of those stories' (2005, p. 11) shape my key research questions and methodology. A series of selected 'stories-so-far' illustrate the complexity and dimensionality of lived, gendered experiences in the academy. Throughout and in conclusion, I reflect upon the alignments and tensions in my work and the opportunities these afford to resist sexism in the academy.

Context

The Project

Gender(s) at Work constitutes institutional research in that it is conducted within an educational organisation to inform decision-making, planning and effectiveness. Certainly, the project aims to increase corporate intelligence about gender equality and contribute to the university's Athena SWAN gender equality agenda. However, institutional research typically seeks a quick turnaround and clear simple answers and is not underpinned by theoretical perspectives (Brown and Jones 2015). *Gender(s) at Work* is distinctive in its duration (18 months); in being theoretically underpinned by theories and principles of feminist geography and, as evidenced by this chapter, reporting its findings beyond the university's walls. It is qualitative in character, collecting data via face-to-face individual interviews and a visual mapping task.

45 participants were recruited following an open call for staff participants of all genders, in academic and professional services roles at all levels of seniority across the university hierarchy. Of these, 31 (68%) participants were in academic/academic management roles; 14 (32%) in

professional services/professional services management roles. 27 (60%) of the participants were identified as female, 16 (35%) as male, 1 as gender non-binary and 1 as transgender. 36 (80%) of the participants were identified as White, 9 (19%) as Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME). 28 percentage of participants were aged 30–39 years, 28% 40–49 years, 26% 50–59 years, 13% 18–29 years and one 60–69 years.

Higher Education

Contemporary HE originates from 'a world without women' (Noble 1992); the enclosed masculine societies of the monasteries and early universities engaged in 'the kind of knowledge production which was to receive the highest social valuation' (Massey 1998, p. 161). Our universities continue to be specialised places of knowledge production, but they are now, most definitely, worlds *with* women; albeit underrepresented in particular disciplinary spaces and the higher echelons of management (ECU 2018; Jarboe 2016; Blackmore et al. 2015, inter alia). Massification, marketization, metrics and technological advances continually intensify pressure on academics to 'reproduce and enhance the value of their own labour power by keeping up with the literature, going to conferences, maintaining the performance of networking' (Massey 1998). However, staff in HE (as elsewhere) also continue to negotiate paid workload and 'career' within the constraints of social roles coded 'masculine' and 'feminine'. Daily experiences of working in HE play out in complex border territory between polarised structures of work and home.

Nevertheless, the prevailing academic culture relies on a model of carelessness: 'the idealized worker is one that is available 24/7 without ties or responsibilities that will hinder her or his productive capacities. She or he is unencumbered and on-call, even if not "at work"' (Lynch 2010, p. 57). Assumptions of carelessness also inform the generic, gender-neutral model of 'career' in terms of an occupation undertaken for a significant period of an individual's life, with opportunities for progress. This implies a set and bounded vertical trajectory with a finishing line,

or at least a desired end point. The notion of 'career' is frequently associated with linear metaphors (pipeline, ladder, trajectory), which aligned to 'male-defined constructions of work and career success … continue to dominate organisational research and practice' (Bilimoria et al. 2010, p. 727). However, Allen and Castleman (2001) argue the idea of career pipeline is a fallacy, because even with a critical mass of 'appropriate' women, the pipeline is leaky with significant dead ends.

Gender inequality in the academy is well documented within a vigorous, transnational body of literature (Acker 2006; Bagilhole 2002, 2007; Blackmore 2014; Morley 2013, 2014, 2016; Morley and David 2009; O'Connor 2014; White and O'Connor 2017, inter alia) and weighted towards disadvantages faced by female academics working within 'exclusionary structures and practices and seemingly entrenched gender power relations' (Burkinshaw and White 2017). An emerging strand of UK literature addresses intersections of gender and ethnicity as experienced by BAME female academics (Bhopal 2016; Tate and Bagguley 2017; Gabriel and Tate 2017). Female undergraduate participation in the global academy is at record levels (Morley 2013) yet women remain woefully under-represented in senior academic and leadership positions in the sector (Morley 2013; Jarboe 2016, inter alia). In the UK, the sector's average gender pay reflects the national average of 18.4% (Jones 2018).

In no small part due to the gendered order of caring (Lynch and Feely 2009), female academics tend to have atypical career patterns and diverse routes into the academy. They are also more likely to pick up teaching and pastoral duties and institutional housekeeping, e.g. committee work and administration (Coate et al. 2015), which disadvantage them in terms of time available for research. In the UK, evidence of differential selection, submission and status in relation to the Research Excellence Framework (REF) demonstrate that factors of disability, age, nationality and career stage intersect with gender to exacerbate disadvantage (Yarrow 2017; HEFCE 2015). Yet, research is the most valuable currency in HE's prestige economy (Coate et al. 2015; Morley 2014) and performance-centred culture.

The Athena SWAN Charter

The Athena SWAN Charter is a sector initiative first established in the UK in 2005 and coordinated by the centrally funded Equality Challenge Unit (ECU), as a mechanism to address gender inequality in the HE workplace. The Charter's six principles aim to 'encourage and recognise commitment to advancing the careers of women in science, technology, engineering, maths and medicine (STEMM) and their employment in higher education and research' (Advance HE 2018a). It specifically targets the phenomenon of the 'leaky' career pipeline, whereby across academia, even in subjects popular with women at undergraduate and postgraduate level, the percentage of females declines significantly along the career ladder from Ph.D. student to professor and from junior to senior management.

Athena SWAN provides a vehicle for individual universities and research centres to assess their policies and practices, plan actions to mitigate structural inequalities and advance career progression. Institutions progress through a system of Bronze, Silver and Gold institutional and departmental awards. The Charter preceded new UK equalities legislation in 2010 and has since become part of universities' wider strategies of and business case for, equality, diversity and inclusion. During this period, more complex equalities discourses challenging the gender binary and highlighting intersectionality have gained traction and in May 2015 Athena SWAN's UK framework 'was expanded to recognise gender equality more broadly … and work undertaken in arts, humanities, social sciences, business and law (AHSSBL), and in professional and support roles, and for trans staff and students' (Advance HE 2018a). The *Gender(s) at Work* participant sample reflects this expanded framework. Four new Charter principles were added, including a commitment to consider intersectionality. These changes have not been universally welcomed, with some claiming a broader gender equality remit blurs focus and creates tensions between addressing female disadvantage and providing equal opportunities for all (Carruthers Thomas 2018).

Athena SWAN Charter membership in the UK has grown from ten founding institutions in 2005 to 145 in 2018 (Advance HE 2018b). In 2015, the Charter was adopted by universities in the Republic of Ireland and a pilot launched in Australia by the Science in Australia Gender Equity (SAGE) Initiative in partnership with the Academy of Technology and Engineering (ATSE). The Australian pilot involved 40 universities and used the pre-May 2015 (STEMM only) framework. Meanwhile in 2018, advance HE, a new agency formed from the merger of ECU, the Higher Education Academy (HEA) and the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (LFHE) announced an independent review of the Charter to ensure 'it is fit for current and future needs of institutions, individuals and the sector as a whole' (Advance HE 2018c). The review prioritises sector concerns about workload, consistency in peer-review panels and the inclusion of non-STEMM disciplines in the framework. However, Athena SWAN's core focus, the leaky career pipeline and women's progression against conventional measures of academic 'success', is not under review.

Theory to Practice

Massey on Space

The ideas of radical geographer Doreen Massey (1944–2016) are central to *Gender(s) at Work*. Massey is a key figure in the diverse project of feminist geography, whose broad aim is 'to investigate, make visible and challenge the relationships between gender divisions and spatial divisions, to uncover their mutual constitution to problematise their apparent naturalness' (McDowell 1999, p. 12). Massey defines space 'as social relations shaped by power and inherently temporal … a confluence and product of histories, relationships … the sphere in which distinct trajectories coexist' (2005, p. 9). Massey brings space and power together through the heuristic device of 'activity space'—'the spatial network of links and

activities, of spatial connections and of locations, within which a particular agent operates… within each activity space is a geography of power' (Massey 2005, p. 55). Activity space operates on multiple scales. It frames 'the academy' as the product of social relations shaped by (geographies of) power socially coded masculine, i.e. academic and disciplinary discourses, tradition, patriarchy and government. Individual universities are activity spaces in their own right, positioned more or less powerfully within those wider networks and crosscut by their own geographies of power.

Spatial Storytelling

The methodological design of *Gender(s) at Work* reflects Massey's concept of space as plural, heterogeneous and fluid. It is also informed by the work of essayist and psychogeographer Rebecca Solnit (2001, 2006, 2010, 2013) who experiments with spatial storytelling in her reinterpretation of the atlas as a visual, textual and literary form created by multiple authors and artists 'a collection of versions of a place, a compendium of perspectives' (2010, p. vii). Solnit re-presents cities in a way which 'unsettles "the classic Western map" … disputes the internal coherence, the singular uniformity to which the classical map lays claim' (Massey 2005, p. 109).

I first experimented with spatial storytelling as part of my doctoral research, using mapping in its broadest sense—as process, product and powerful metaphorical tool to capture mature part-time undergraduates' sense of belonging in HE on campus maps (Carruthers Thomas, in press; Thomas 2016). I subsequently developed the practice of organisational cartographies, as a way of 'mapping the university as a space of multiple centres experienced in multiple ways, thus capturing a wider, more complex organisational territory' (Carruthers Thomas 2017). Spatial storytelling allows exploration of spaces between rhetoric and experience; it loosens the hold of the binary. As a research methodology, it is both instrumental and illustrative, engaging with the material and imaginary; the past, present and future.

In *Gender(s) at Work* spatial storytelling foregrounds relationships between space and power in considering lived experiences of work and career. Narrative enquiry and visual mapping tools are interwoven to elicit the multiple and the psychosocial: the mutual interaction of individuals of multiple gender identities with the gendered social environment of the university. Spatial storytelling challenges space and place as natural and coherent, disrupt prevailing narratives and uncover the peripheral, the hidden, the contradictory—the 'spaces between' of the university workplace, 'a highly specialised envelope of space-time, into which the intrusion of other activities and interests is unwanted and limited' (Massey 1998, p. 109).

In Practice: Narrative

Narrative enquiry begins with experiences as expressed in lived and told stories of individuals and relates to the singular and particular within a social context (Creswell 2007). In *Gender(s) at Work* this approach foregrounds the way(s) participants create meaning of their lived experiences of work and 'career' in HE. Each interviewee was first asked to provide a 'potted history' of their work and career. The interview then followed a common schedule of questions and prompts exploring interviewees' experiences of working at the university and in the HE sector generally. They were asked to reflect on their perceptions of the impact, or otherwise, of gender on those experiences. Interviewees are 'both living their stories in an ongoing experiential text and telling their stories in words as they reflect upon life and explain themselves to others' (Connelly and Clandinin 1990, p. 3). Narrative enquiry allows for complexities, inconsistencies and silences. 'An essential aspect of data is that … good narratives … reveal ambiguity rather than tidy it away' (Bathmaker 2010, p. 2). Narrative is also central to the role of the researcher whose privilege it is to elicit, listen to and restory individuals' stories so that 'the thing finally written on paper … the research paper or book, is a collaborative document; a mutually constructed story created out of the lives of both researcher and participant' (Connelly and Clandinin 1990, p. 12).

In Practice: Mapping

The visual mapping tool draws on participatory diagramming, a technique widely used in social geography and development studies which is 'wide open to context- and topic-specific innovations by researchers and participants alike' (Kesby 2000, p. 425). Mapping in its dominant form is problematic in that it gives authority to simplified, selective and bounded representations of space, and positions 'the observer, themselves unobserved, outside and above the object of the gaze' (Massey 2005, p. 107). However, in this mapping activity, the interviewee is both agentic and acknowledged as the map maker.

Each interviewee was given a pen and a mapping sheet containing three shapes: a triangle with a solid outline, a circle with a dotted outline and a rectangle shaded blue with a solid outline. They were asked to select the shape they felt best represented the university and to position themselves in relation to that shape. Interviewees were free to make any changes, add text, use more than one shape or create their own visual representation. The activity was therefore prescriptive in its use of familiar shapes, but flexible in the shapes' varied characteristics and in giving the interviewee the option to modify them or create alternatives.

Acts of distancing and disrupting reveal the 'spaces between' of the university workplace:

> Participant-generated visual materials are particularly helpful in exploring the taken-for-granted things in their research participants' lives … [it] involves the participants reflecting on their activities in a way that is not usually done; it gives them distance from what they are usually immersed in and allows them to articulate thoughts and feelings that usually remain implicit. (Rose 2014, p. 27)

Interviewees used the given shapes to represent their perceptions of the organisation, for example, hierarchical (the triangle), porous (the circle). Visually and through accompanying narratives they positioned themselves in relation to organisational power structures (geographies of power) and indicated affective, psychosocial dimensions of their

experiences. The activity often triggered fresh thoughts and discussions as well as sometimes leading interviewees to revisit and extend topics or themes already covered. The exercise also highlighted synergies and conflicts between the professional and personal, internal and external.

Stories-so-Far

The following section presents a small selection of stories-so-far, narrated by six participants, five female and one male. These explore ways of telling and reading the 'spatial' in stories of work and career, and how these contribute to understanding how gender operates as a geography of power in contemporary HE. The stories-so-far are interspersed with my own reflections on ways in which these provoke tensions and alignments within my professional role and the opportunities these afford to resist sexism in the academy. Pseudonyms are used, but job type, stated gender identity, ethnicity and age group are included.

Narrating Career

Interviewees' constructions of potted career histories at the start of each interview initiated a wider mapping of professional and personal identities.

> There's a lot of bits and pieces to my career. When I look back, there are themes, but it was very broken. I kept starting jobs and leaving jobs and then I started my PhD. I'm a Research Assistant and officially I'm employed to support other staff on their projects but there is a day a week that I can sort of carve out my own research. It's obviously much messier than that in practice. It's a constant process of trying to make sense of what's going on and what is this environment that I'm in and how can I make sure that I position myself to boost my profile? My profile is terrible in terms of publications. (Yvonne, Research Assistant, Female, White British, 40+ years)

Yvonne has a sense of where she 'should' be in the competitive, individualised environment of the academy but finds herself far behind the field. She embarked 'late' on an academic career and is notably short of its principal currency, publications. She chooses the circle and maps herself on the periphery.

> I've chosen the circle instead of the triangle because it seems less claustrophobic. This looks like you can go home to your life outside. I'm here, a little spot. I don't feel geographically in the centre in terms of the campus I'm on … and at the moment, I haven't established solid partnerships or relationships with people. (Yvonne)

Anne, in the same age group as Yvonne, occupies a significantly more senior role, but has diverted from a conventional academic trajectory in order to get a permanent contract:

> My career history? Research assistant, PhD, post doc, lecturer – then I was invited to apply for an academic-related role. As it was permanent, and having never at that point had a permanent job, thought, "What have I got to lose?" It gave me an opportunity to work cross-university and at a much more senior level. That's what gave me the experience to do the jobs I've done since. Then it's been quite a zigzag route to this point. (Anne, Senior Academic Manager, Female, White British, 40+ years)

Anne also chooses the circle but unlike Yvonne, places herself at the centre of it.

> I'm going to go for the circle, because the way I see academia is as a conglomerate: as a collegiate activity. I would place myself, I think, at the centre of that – not because I think I'm the centre of everything – but the way I interact with people is obviously from me outwards, whether that's students, or colleagues, or line managers, or people I line-manage. (Anne)

Anne is ambitious to progress further in senior management but frank about what that will involve:

I think it's just a question of finding the right opportunity and deciding whether I'm willing to compromise who I am in order to get the jobs, if you see what I mean.

Meanwhile, Tom's career has progressed faster than expected:

I have been promoted above where I should be at this point in my career. I think I have been bumped up a couple of spots… I am now at a bit of a crossroads. I could go down the senior management route and that would be fine, or I could try and keep both sides (administration and research) going. I enjoy both, but research is valued more highly. (Tom, Senior Lecturer, White British, Male, 20–29 years)

Despite success 'on paper' in terms of career progression, Tom's map and his accompanying narrative strongly suggest a sense of alienation. He chooses the triangle, draws four lines in it to represent levels of seniority throughout the organisation, then places a dot outside and below the triangle.

It is very hierarchically organised. In an ideal university the students would be at the top. My role is somewhere in the middle. But me, who I am, what I do, my hopes, my dreams, my aspirations, that is not interesting or important to anybody. I feel relatively powerless to affect change in any meaningful way in my institution. (Tom)

In contrast to Tom and despite her expertise, Reeta feels her career has stagnated. As the sector goes through rapid change, 'space-time … always under construction … never finished, never closed' (Massey 2005, p. 9), she experiences conflicts between research and teaching:

I did my degree and then I ended up in industry for about twelve years first. HE is definitely one place where I haven't really progressed compared to all the jobs I've had in industry. My students are always satisfied. I get everything done on time. I like to think that my work speaks for itself – but now there's this massive push on writing and research, and I can't fit the time in physically. (Reeta, Senior Lecturer, Female, British Asian, 40+ years)

Reeta feels stuck. Yvonne struggles to establish herself in the prestige economy. Anne's working life has been shaped by the endemic precarity of academic roles. Tom reluctantly faces choosing between academic research and management. As an interviewer, I was alert to ways in which blocks, interruptions, stagnation and serendipity shape and complicate the 'career' path. Very few of the stories-so-far gathered for this project align with linear, uninterrupted, upward career progress. If as a researcher, I acknowledge and respect the complexity in these research findings, then this leads me as diversity worker to argue for more nuanced and intersectional understanding of the factors impacting every individuals' experiences of the workplace, those identifying as male and gender fluid or non-binary as well as female.

Gender and Identity

Jo performs a balancing act between her professional and personal lives:

> It seems to me a suit and tie can get you into all sorts of places – but only if you're a man. As an adult, my performativity, certainly out of work, is very much more male than female. My performativity in work has leaned a bit more towards obviously female, now that I'm more senior because you just spend too much time having to reassure people and it's just so tedious having to accommodate their confusion. I think it has a huge impact, I think it's certainly limited my career now, I think I've gone as far as I can because I don't conform sufficiently. (Jo, Senior Professional Services Manager, White British, Female, 50+ years)

Resisting sexism in the academy means not only challenging a 'one-size-fits-all' model of career but also being careful that, while weighted towards female disadvantage in the HE workplace, implementing the Athena SWAN framework does not 'reinforce essentialist and heteronormative assumptions that all women live in nuclear families… nor 'ignore differing cultural and social capital relating to social class, age, sexualities, disabilities and ethnicities' (Morley 2013, p. 122). As Yvonne says: *I think what a shame Athena SWAN has been reduced to – how can we all become more confident? I think the different ways of being a woman are maybe still not visible.*

Reeta experiences not only the conflicting demands of research and teaching, but of balancing personal, professional and cultural identities, at work and at home:

> People talk about dual identity in terms of being a professional in the industry and then being academic. Well, I've got that, but then I've got the whole cultural thing too. There was an expectation from me, as a daughter-in-law, living in my husband's family's house, that balancing act was really quite hard. I'm British, born here and embraced being here, but then there's a lot about my own culture that I do like. So, there's that balance as well. (Reeta)

In the mapping exercise, she chooses the rectangle shaded blue with a solid outline and places herself just inside:

> I've been boxed into an identity, because I think my department see me as a mother before a professional and it's only because I made a bit of noise about it that I've been given more opportunities now. I think if one of my male colleagues had had a kid tomorrow, they're not going to say, 'Oh, he's got kids. He can't do this or that.' (Reeta)

Institutional Speech Acts?

The Athena SWAN Charter champions parental leave and flexible working arrangements and its awards emphasise institutional obligations to address and mitigate the impact of gendered primary care responsibilities on working lives and careers. However, Lena's story-so-far reveals it is quite possible to implement legal requirements without tackling underlying structural bias.

> I went on maternity leave. When I came back I was suddenly reporting to a new colleague. When I was finally promoted to the same level as him I was fascinated to discover that I wasn't being paid the same, because he had negotiated a higher starting salary. We have a flexible working policy. I work from home one day a week but I often feel as though I'm having to justify it, to say, 'Well, no, it's fine, because look, there's a piece of

paper that says the University signed up to it'. There's this notion that flexible working is somehow something that women ask for and therefore it is something which is basically irritating to an organisation because it's some kind of extension of maternity leave and maternity leave is an irritation as well. Although flexible working is this term that is used about accommodating work and life for everybody in the 21st century, it's actually a kind of workaround to shoehorn an old-fashioned career pattern into something which you have to try and make work around the commitments that you can't change. (Lena, Professional Services Manager, Female, White British, 30+ years)

Lena distinguishes between the university's commitments to equality on paper, and attitudes and behaviours which sustain institutional and individual sexist practices. Maternity leave and flexible working arrangements are presented as an employee benefit, but women's absence from working spaces can reinforce male ownership of those spaces and a hidden curriculum of influential informal networks. If the complex lived experiences of parental leave and flexible working are silenced in corporate conversations then, as Ahmed describes it: 'institutional speech acts… do not go beyond pluralist understandings of diversity and are non-performative in the sense that they fail to deliver what they have promised' (2006, p. 764).

Consideration of wider organisational culture is a key element of the Athena SWAN process. Applicants are required to reflect on workload, role models, outreach activities and accessibility of corporate social events. They must also quantitatively record gender balance in senior academic and managerial roles, in key committees and decision-making processes. These data are valuable. Numbers can shock, motivate and encourage—but resisting sexism is not just a numbers game. Tom draws attention to ways in which a gendered geography of power is enacted via microaggressions in meeting behaviours.

There is often an expectation in meetings, there is a particular kind of conversational style the male academics are meant to engage in. In the most diplomatic terms, very forthright 'I am always right, everyone else is wrong, I will stick to my opinion, I will think that everyone else is not seeing the full picture'. I've never been comfortable with that kind of

confrontational style of interaction. I don't engage in that at all… If there is a gender dimension here at all that would be it for me. I try to have a more co-operative style of conversation. Whether that has put me at a disadvantage I don't know. (Tom)

Anne refers to her own experiences of resisting sexism within the workplace and of the strain this exacts on her.

I think people would think twice about saying something inappropriate in meetings I'm in. In another audience they may think that was amusing, to throw a comment in. But they never would do it in front of me, because they know I would jump on them. The trouble with that is, I do feel like I end up being the kind of feminist police a bit, which is a bit wearing. (Anne)

Concluding Remarks

In *Gender(s) at Work* I use spatial storytelling to map and report stories beyond dominant and exclusionary narratives, to reveal the way gender operates as a geography of power in the academy, to uncover spaces between. Even this small selection of stories-so-far reflects the multidimensionality of gendered and intersectional lived experiences within the contested space of the university. Spatial storytelling foregrounds relationships between spaces and power. Reading the 'spatial' in these stories-so-far emphasises not only the material and metaphorical power structures of the academy, but also a psychosocial sense of gender as a geography of power in terms of peripherality, constraints and powerlessness.

Throughout the process of writing this chapter I have been reflecting on the alignments and tensions within my dual role: as an academic researcher and as an Athena SWAN Project Manager in the same university. Without the catalyst of Athena SWAN, the already glacially slow progress towards gender equality in HE might become frozen over. However, I recognise Athena SWAN as entangled in and identified with an established geography of power within the academy which promotes and privileges a linear, uninterrupted career trajectory. This inevitably limits the Charter's capacity to structurally redress inequality's silences, discrimination and exclusions.

My research role enables me to bring criticality to my role as organisational diversity worker and to the normative career model. Resisting sexism in the academy means making visible the mechanisms that have bumped Tom up 'a couple of spots' and directing corporate effort into understanding 'how women can be supported to achieve their aspirations and flourish in HE without being damaged and impeded by patriarchal practices and norms' (Morley 2013, p. 116). It means continually questioning whether equality and diversity policies are being used as 'masks to create the appearance of being transformed' (Ahmed 2017); whether 'complaints can be stopped by the appearance of being heard' (Ahmed 2018). Resisting sexism in the academy is about removing the mask and raising the volume. I regard my research practice as a form of activism towards that end.

References

Acker, J. (2006). Inequality regimes gender, class, and race in organizations. *Gender & Society, 20*(4), 441–464.

Advance HE. (2018a). *About Advance HE's Athena SWAN Charter.* https://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/about-athena-swan/. Last accessed September 2018.

Advance HE. (2018b). *Athena SWAN members.* https://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/athena-swan-members. Last accessed September 2018.

Advance HE. (2018c). *Athena SWAN review.* https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/advance-he-announces-athena-swan-review. Last accessed September 2018.

Ahmed, S. (2006). The nonperformativity of antiracism. *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism, 7*(1), 104–126.

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2018, June 28). *Refusal, resignation and complaint.* Feministkilljoys. https://feministkilljoys.com/2018/06/28/refusal-resignation-and-complaint/. Last accessed September 2018.

Allen, M., & Castleman, T. (2001). The 'Pipeline Fallacy' and gender inequality in Higher Education employment. *Policy, Organisation and Society, 15*(1), 23–44.

Bagilhole, B. (2002). Challenging equal opportunities: Changing and adapting male hegemony in academia. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 23*(1), 19–33.

Bagilhole, B. (2007). Challenging women in the male academy: Think about draining the swamp. In P. Cotterill, S. Jackson, & G. Letherby (Eds.), *Challenges and negotiations for women in Higher Education* (pp. 21–32). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Bathmaker, A.-M. (2010). Introduction. In A.-M. Bathmaker & P. Hartnett (Eds.), *Exploring learning, identity and power through life history and narrative research* (pp. 1–10). London, UK: Routledge.

Bhopal, K. (2016). *The experiences of Black and Minority Ethnic academics: A comparative study of the unequal academy*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bilimoria, D., O'Neil, D. A., Hopkins, M. M., & Murphy, V. (2010). Gender in the management education classroom: A collaborative learning journey. *Journal of Management Education, 34*(6), 848–873.

Blackmore, J. (2014). Wasting talent: Gender and the problematics of disenchantment and disengagement with leadership. *Higher Education Research and Development, 33*(1), 86–99.

Blackmore, J., Sanchez-Moreno, M., & Sawars, N. (2015). Globalised re/gendering of the academy and leadership. *Gender and Education, 27*(3), iii–vii.

Brown, J., & Jones, A. (2015, December). *Joining the dots: Making connections between institutional research, HE research, policy and practice*. Conference paper at annual Society for Research into Higher Education (SRHE) conference, Newport, Wales.

Burkinshaw, P., & White, K. (2017). Fixing the women or fixing universities: Women in HE leadership. *Administrative Sciences, 7*(30), 1–14.

Carruthers Thomas, K. (2017). Towards a methodology: Organisational cartographies. *International Journal of Professional Management* [Special Issue Arts and Management], *12*(3), 55–64.

Carruthers Thomas, K. (2018). *Athena SWAN: Principles and practice* (Unpublished research). Birmingham City University, Birmingham, UK.

Carruthers Thomas, K. (in press). *Rethinking student belonging in Higher Education: From Bourdieu to Borderlands*. London, UK: Routledge.

Coate, K., Kandiko-Howson, C., & de St Croix, T. (2015). *The prestige economy and mid-career academic women: Strategies, choices and motivation* (The Leadership Foundation for Higher Education report). https://www.srhe. ac.uk/conference2015/abstracts/0002.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Connelly, M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5), 2–14.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Equality Challenge Unit (ECU). (2018). http://www.ecu.ac.uk. Last accessed September 2018.

Gabriel, D., & Tate, S. A. (Eds.). (2017). *Inside the Ivory Tower: Narratives of women of colour surviving and thriving in British academia*. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham Books.

Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE). (2015). *Equality and diversity in the 2014 Research Excellence Framework*. Bristol, UK: HEFCE.

Jarboe, N. (2016). *Women leaders in Higher Education*. WomenCount. https://womencountblog.files.wordpress.com/2016/03/women-count-2016-leaders-in-he-020316.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Jones, L. (2018, February 5). *What is the gender pay gap?* BBC News. https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-42918951. Last accessed September 2018.

Kesby, M. (2000). Participatory diagramming: Deploying qualitative methods through an action research epistemology. *Area, 32*(4), 423–435.

Lynch, K. (2010). Carelessness: A hidden doxa of higher education. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 9*(1), 54–67.

Lynch, K., & Feely, M. (2009). *Gender and education (and employment): Gendered imperatives and their implications for women and men. Lessons from research for policy makers*. European Commission, Brussels. http://www.nesse.fr/nesse/activities/reports/gender-report-pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Massey, D. (1998). High-tech in Cambridge. In R. Ainley (Ed.), *New frontiers of space, bodies and gender* (pp. 157–175). London, UK: Routledge.

Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. London, UK: Sage.

McDowell, L. (1999). *Gender, identity and place: Understanding feminist geographies*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Morley, L. (2013). The rules of the game: Women and the leaderist turn in higher education. *Gender and Education, 25*(1), 116–131. http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/42920/.

Morley, L. (2014). Lost leaders: Women in the global academy. *Higher Education Research and Development, 33*(1), 114–128. http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/47478/.

Morley, L. (2016). Troubling interactions: Gender, neo-liberalism and research in the global academy. *Journal of Education Policy, 31*(1), 28–45.

Morley, L., & David, M. (2009). Celebrations and challenges: Gender in higher education. *Higher Education Policy, 22*(1), 1–2. http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/16712/.

Noble, D. (1992). *A world without women: The Christian clerical culture of Western science*. New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.

O'Connor, P. (2014). *Management and gender in Higher Education*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Rose, G. (2014). On the relation between 'visual research methods' and contemporary visual culture. *The Sociological Review, 62,* 24–46.

Solnit, R. (2001). *Wanderlust: A history of walking*. London, UK: Verso.

Solnit, R. (2006). *A field guide to getting lost*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Canongate.

Solnit, R. (2010). *Infinite city: A San Francisco Atlas*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Solnit, R. (2013). *Unfathomable city: A New Orleans Atlas*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Tate, S. A., & Bagguley, P. (2017). Building the anti-racist university: Next steps. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 20*(3), 289–299.

Thomas, K. (2016). *Dimensions of belonging: Rethinking retention for mature part-time undergraduates in English Higher Education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of London, UK.

White, K., & O'Connor, P. (Eds.). (2017). *Gendered success in Higher Education: Global perspectives*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Yarrow, E. (2017). *National research evaluation and its effects on female academics' careers in the UK* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Queen Mary University of London, UK.

12

Collective Biography as a Feminist Methodology

Susanne Gannon and Marnina Gonick

Introduction

Collective biography was inspired by the collaborative strategy of memory work developed by Haug and her colleagues in Germany in the 1980s, as an intervention into the sexist knowledge practices of Marxist-socialism. They set out through the collaborative writing and analysis of memories of girlhood to discover the constitutive means by which they had formed themselves into feminised subjects, thereby reproducing the 'pre-given structures of society' and the oppression that they entailed (Haug et al. 1987, p. 40). Collective biography took this approach into an explicitly post-structural direction, developing methods for theoretical and practical inquiry into the discursive constitution

S. Gannon (✉)
Western Sydney University, Penrith, NSW, Australia
e-mail: S.Gannon@westernsydney.edu.au

M. Gonick
Mount Saint Vincent University, Halifax, NS, Canada

207

of gendered subjects and experimenting with a range of deconstructive and creative strategies for generating 'mo(ve)ments' of embodied experiences within discursive regimes (Davies and Gannon 2006). Rather than identify singular truths of remembered events, we have aimed to interrogate and unpick those movements, forces, energies, affective and material conditions within which sense is made. In this chapter, we turn to our collective project on girlhood and sexuality, published as the book *Becoming Girl* (Gonick and Gannon 2014) and coedited special issue of journal *Girlhood Studies* (Gannon et al. 2013; Gonick 2013; Gonick and Gannon 2013). We re-examine our processes, protocols, experiences and findings through these collaborations in Australia and Canada to consider the extent to which Haug's claims for memory work as inherently feminist (1987, 2008), and our own subsequent claims for collective biography, are relevant and defensible in the present. We ask what does it mean to adopt a feminist methodology, what are its parameters, pitfalls, ethical constraints and possibilities, and what are its blind spots? Given that collective biography is a remarkably elastic method for investigating lived experience and interrogating the utility of theory in the every day, this critical investigation of the feminist underpinnings and aspirations of the method will be timely and useful to researchers interested in adapting it for their own work.

We might also ask, given the title of this book, what is 'sexism' in the academy? How does it manifest? How does it impact on our everyday lives as women scholars? Neoliberal ideologies and new managerialist practices have captured all aspects of teaching, research and governance in contemporary universities. Scholars are compelled to operate as individualised entrepreneurial subjects, competing for grants, funds, rankings, promotions, awards, hours of paid work; developing ourselves as academic brands, managing our reputations and curating our online and offline selves, anticipating algorithms and adjusting our behaviours accordingly (Gannon 2019). We are not so different, in some of these factors, to other human subjects living in these times. Sexism arises in the interstices of everyday academic life, where precarious working conditions, exclusions and slights fall unevenly on different sorts of bodies. Many feminist scholars have documented the gendered contours of neoliberalism in academia (e.g. Taylor and Lahad 2018), including our own

collective biography work (Bansel et al. 2008; Charteris et al. 2016; Gannon et al. 2015, 2018). We might ask if it is possible to separate out the sexism of universities from the neoliberal restructuring underway. What are the ways in which sexism is marbled into neoliberalism? What new forms of sexism have emerged due to neoliberal restructuring? Our intention here is to examine the implications for feminist research methodologies in a dramatically changed university environment from the times in which many of the goals, objectives and alternative visions for what feminist research might look like were developed. We do not intend to produce nostalgia for an idealised past, since universities have always been sites of exclusion and epistemological hierarchies that marginalised and demeaned women's experiences and knowledge. Rather than posit collective biography as any sort of solution, we want to pause, reflect upon and problematise our work together—acknowledging that we are and always were already captured by the neoliberal imperatives of our workplaces. These imperatives are to secure grants, produce publications and establish international collaborations with various public yet opaque metrics attached to all of these.[1] Our personal imperatives might have been to find ways of working together because we liked each other, respected each other's work and wanted to bring networks of other women we knew together in collaborative inquiry. Funding from Marnina's university and a small grant from ACSANZ, the Association for Canadian Studies in Australia and New Zealand, awarded to Marnina, Susanne and Canadian/Australian scholar Jo Lampert enabled us to convene meetings in both countries and investigate neoliberalism and gender in our two countries. These activities included collective biography workshops in each country.

In the girlhood project, we formed two collectives. Susanne joined six women in a pre-existing interdisciplinary Girls Studies collective in Halifax, Nova Scotia; and Marnina joined six women in NSW, Australia in the following year. The workshop in Halifax took place on the university campus, while the workshop in Australia took place in a house rented for a week on the coast. We followed the procedures for collective biography that we have laid out elsewhere: broadly, that participants agree on a focus emerging from readings on a topic, that they share emerging memories of experiences, telling, listening, writing and

rewriting these through the workshop as precise vignettes of experience, and usually agreeing to continue writing analytically about these memory stories subsequent to the workshop (e.g. Davies and Gannon 2006, 2009; Gonick and Gannon 2014). The accoutrements of our workshops on girlhood included cakes, guest lecturers, sewing machines, art materials, beach walks, photographs, drama activities, chocolate, artmaking experts, academic texts, dreams, tears and much more. We incorporated whatever we could that might enhance the pleasure, the knowledge building potential and the collaborative atmospheres. Both collectives included women from multiple universities, and at varying 'stages' in their academic careers, with varied disciplinary allegiances, diverse pressures and expectations of the processes and of each other. This, we suggest, is part of the richness of this methodology, and it also contributes to an unruliness that has usually remained present but unspoken about in the final academic 'product'. We worked together for 4–5 days with a pack of readings selected by Marnina and Susanne and then intensively for many months to develop papers and chapters for the outcomes we had committed to—the journal special issue and the book. Feminist practices such as inclusion, mutual respect and horizontal non-hierarchical power structures were our touchstones throughout the project; however, inevitably, the passage of research is more complex and moments when ideals and pragmatics collided are also part of our stories of working within feminist frames.

In all, our collectives through this project comprised fourteen co-researchers/co-authors and our discussions in this chapter are not directed at any individuals within these collectives (except perhaps ourselves). To varying degrees, issues that arose within these collectives resonate with other collectives with whom we have written. We are interested here in the processes and perhaps politics of collective biography within the university contexts in which we work. We proceed by examining the broad parameters of what is perceived to be as feminist methodology, and how this was claimed initially by Haug et al. (1987), and subsequently by others (including ourselves) working with collective biography. Then, we turn to the girl project as our case study for a closer look.

Feminist Methodologies

Universities and the knowledge produced within them are founded in deeply sexist thinking. Historically, women were both physically barred from attending them and the sociopolitical and economic issues in their lives were often dismissed for being of little interest or relevance. Writers as diverse as Virginia Woolf, Simone de Beauvoir and Betty Friedan write about the exclusion of women from these institutions and seeing their own experiences, concerns and worth diminished and invalidated by them (Hesse-Biber 2012). Obviously, huge inroads have been made; however, the vestiges of sexism undergirding the foundations of the university remain; and in addition, new forms of sexism are evolving. Feminists contest both the exclusion of women's and other marginalised people's experience and knowledge from academic discourse and many of the protocols of patriarchal research paradigms. In the words of sociologist Dorothy Smith (1974, p. 7), 'The women's movement has given us a sense of our right to have women's interests represented in sociology, rather than just receiving as authoritative the interests traditionally represented in a sociology put together by men'. Something different from what existed was needed. In the feminist literature that developed to address this need, themes such as the errors and biases in scientific research, the impact of feminism on disciplines, the philosophy or epistemology of feminist research, the right to criticise the accepted body of knowledge, the right to create knowledge without being trapped into the reproduction of patriarchal ways of knowing and the right to be educators was elucidated (Reinhartz 1992, pp. 5–11). Haug and her collaborators in Germany contesting the patriarchal myopia of the Marxist-socialist movements which they were part of, and sociology itself, developing their method for working with memories from 'within the women's movement in the beginning of the 1980s' (Haug 2008, p. 537), could be considered as part of this wave of contestation of sexist knowledge practices. For Haug, in retrospect, it was always a 'highly open methodology' underpinned by 'the proposition that each could recast the methodology for herself' (2008, p. 537). This was a

radical challenge to the rigid parameters that had been laid down in conventional academic sociological research. Further, Haug suggests that 'everyday forms of looking for "truth"' in individual's stories is 'a hindrance' to the work—more interesting are the contradictions, contestations about truth, slippages, failures and 'sparks of hope' that might be collaboratively investigated (2008, p. 538).

The radical break that feminist methodologies exert is to contest core principles of positivist research including the concepts of objectivity, universality, and generalisability and to replace them with other values. For example, Donna Haraway (1988), Sandra Harding (1991), and Kum-Kum Bhavnani (1993) make the case for a feminist objectivity that differs from positivist notions of the concept. For Haraway, feminist objectivity is 'situated knowledge': knowledge and truth are partial, situated, subjective, power imbued and relational. What is rendered explicit here is the connections between the researcher's position in the social world and the kinds of knowledge claims that can be made. Rather than denying the values, biases and politics a researcher brings to her work, feminist methodologies show how these are always present and should be engaged with and made explicit. Dualisms such as rationality/emotion, objective/subjective and researcher/researched are also understood as supporting patriarchal hierarchies and are thus disrupted. In feminist research practice, neither piece of the dualism is privileged over the other and the boundaries between them are blurred and understood to be fluid. Rich new meanings are created, a process that Trinh (1991) terms becoming 'both/and'—insider and outsider—taking on a multitude of different standpoints and negotiating these identities, affects and ways of knowing simultaneously.

The consequences of these processes of re-defining, re-prioritising and refuting are feminist methodologies that forge links between feminism, activism, the academy and women's everyday lives. What is enabled is the seeing of patterns, inter-relationships, causes, effects and implications of questions that patriarchal science does not see, does not acknowledge and does not allow for. To engage in feminist research disrupts the notion that what 'is true for dominant

groups must also be true for women and other oppressed groups. Feminists ask "new questions" that place women's lives and those of "other" marginalised groups at the center of social inquiry' (Hesse-Biber 2012, p. 3). The work of Haug and her colleagues in developing a feminist research method that collapsed 'subject' and 'object', researcher and researched, and that aimed to multiply perspectives and potential readings of experience was thus consistent with these emerging feminist perspectives. While the underlying goals and principles of feminist research have been developing since the 1960s and 1970s, they have not remained static or fixed. On the contrary, different theoretical movements including political economy, post-structuralism and post-humanism have each enabled different sets of questions, priorities and urgencies to be addressed. There are ongoing heated debates on issues such as ethical practices, collaboration and what distinguishes feminist methods from other methods. The unsettledness of the field is, we suggest, a sign of its vitality. In the light of the contestations, we might think of the work of thinking about feminist methodologies as what Ahmed (2017, p. 12) calls a 'sweaty concept'. These are concepts that are generated by the practical experience of coming up against a world, or practical experience of trying to transform a world that is amiss. They emerge from involvement in the complexities of ordinary living and are a starting point for critical work. For Ahmed, sweaty concepts are linked to a situation that demands a response, and she draws on Lauren Berlant's description of a situation: 'A state of things in which something that will perhaps matter is unfolding amidst the usual activity of life' (2008, p. 5). In feminist research, it is often the usual activity of life that is our focus of attention. Ahmed (2017, p. 12) goes on to describe a sweaty concept as one that comes out of a description of how it feels not to be at home in the world, or a description of the world from the point of view of not being at home in it. Feminist methodologies emerged as an attempt to make a home in the world for these kinds of descriptions and situations and for exploring and exposing the difficulties of these trying circumstances.

Returning to the Girl Project

In our girlhood and sexualities project, we drew on the practices of collective biography that we had developed, inspired by Haug's early work, but within a post-structural frame and explicit in our use of theory to make sense of lived experience (Davies and Gannon 2006). Bringing our bodies to theory, making sense of abstract concepts from philosophers through our experiences, testing the limits of theories as well as their potentials for helping us think otherwise about sedimented ways of making sense of ourselves is affectively intense, sometimes exhilarating, often exhausting work. Davies and Gannon explain the intent as a sometimes uncomfortable 'ethical reflexivity' that enables us to be 'each fully present to the other, and at the same time vulnerable to the other, and vulnerable to our own incomplete knowledge of ourselves' (Davies and Gannon 2006, p. 183). This responsibility to the other entailed in collective biography is the opposite to the 'responsibilization' generated in neoliberal academia where 'each individual must accept responsibility for self but shed any responsibility for others – except to participate in acts of surveillance and control' (Davies and Gannon 2006, p. 183). Though, as we have suggested earlier, despite our best intentions, neoliberal constraints, including surveillance technologies, always hover nearby. For example, in the public 'Researcher Portal' at Susanne's university, where all researchers at the university are organised in terms of data about their relative research productivity, the 'Projects' tab lists the small grant with the value $0 and the note: '…[via Mount St Vincent University, Halifax, Canada – no funding to UWS]…' This captures the complication of how research collaboration is recognised within the neoliberal university. On the one hand, collaboration has become a buzzword within academic settings, while on the other what is valued about collaboration is only what accrues monetarily since only one university in a collaboration administers the money. Some universities take an administrative fee from incoming grants, reducing the funds available for doing the actual research. Yet for Susanne, where these numbers materialise in public portals, the trace marks simultaneous success and failure. For all the other participants in our collective biographies,

visible traces were limited to the publications we co-authored from the projects. At Marnina's university, surveillance has recently been an issue in a different way. A graduate student, who is planning to use collective biography in her thesis work, was initially denied her request to book a room in the university in which to hold her group's meetings. As her professor, Marnina was also not allowed to book a room on a student's behalf, in a university which is publicly funded. In other words, the neoliberal university is making it more difficult to conduct the kinds of research where people gather and need space in which to do so, although it is very eager to rent space to outside groups for income generating purposes. In the next section, we address some of the backstories and byways of the pathways that took us to publication.

Becoming Girl, Becoming (and Unbecoming) Collective(s)

In the girlhood project, we began to work with the philosophies of Deleuze and Guattari, as they were being elaborated by educational scholars Emma Renold, Jessica Ringrose, Rebecca Coleman, Alecia Jackson, Anna Hickey-Moody, Catherine Driscoll and others. We thought girlhood through 'affective assemblages' that were simultaneously discursive, relational and material, always precarious and continuously in motion (Davies et al. 2013; Gannon et al. 2013; Gonick and Gannon 2014; Gottschall et al. 2013). Amongst our collectives, we had varying familiarity with, and interest in, the theoretical readings that Susanne and Marnina had put together prior to the workshops, and similarly varying commitments to the arts-based methods we had brought into the workshops (collage works in Australia, facilitated by a group member, and drama activities in Canada, facilitated by an outside expert), and the potentials they afforded for 'deterritorialising' the method itself (Gonick 2013; Gannon et al. 2014). These variations are always present, and as collaborative knowledge building is always our goal, we move towards new horizons of understanding as we work together after the workshop in writing a paper together.

Collective biography almost always, in our experience, results in an academic publication as an outcome; however, this requires sustained and rigorous work over an extended period of time. It may be just as likely that issues of vulnerability and inadvertent (or overt) exercise of power may arise. Participants in workshops who may find the processes of the workshop rewarding may not always be interested in collaborating in the writing that follows. We don't always know why this is so. For example, one group Susanne has worked with pondered whether several women who participated in the workshop but did not send through their stories or continue into the writing of the article had been excluded through the very processes that endeavoured to produce inclusion (Gannon et al. 2015), while a group that Marnina worked with interrogated the extent to which collective biography simultaneously produced and obscured differences (Gonick et al. 2011). In Canada, our workshop with the well-established Halifax Alliance for Girls' Studies (HAGS) collective began with a review of the formal ethical Research Protocol the group had collaboratively developed for themselves. The agreement to be signed by all participants emphasised the core principles of ethical transparency, accountability and collaboration and formalised these in 9 detailed items. Data for the HAGS group are construed as a jointly held pool of materials that may be drawn on by individuals and by various configurations of group members. For example, item 7 states that 'Where one researcher intends to use data belonging to the collective, she agrees to notify (the other) researchers named in the RP prior to any such use of the data – and also to share papers/presentations, etc. in a timely manner. Single authored papers must acknowledge the contributions of the collective (see # 6)' (HAGS 2010). Items 8 and 9 detail the protocols for co-authorship. However, having the protocol in place did not necessarily eliminate the conflicts it was designed to avoid. There were differing interpretations about the meanings of some of items, particularly those relating to what authorship actually entails (contributing a story, physically doing the writing, editing others' words, sharing ideas verbally), and commitment to seeing the writing project through to the end. One participant in our workshops chose not to continue because of other writing obligations but left her story in the mix, another who had agreed to co-author

decided to withdraw part way through the drafting process and to also withdraw her story. Agreed timelines went awry. Drafts languished for longer than we had hoped, and authors disappeared for varying lengths of time. Several of the chapters/papers we had all agreed upon did not happen, while others emerged instead. In a recent chapter on collaborative authorship (Wyatt et al. 2018), Susanne and her co-authors—all experienced with collective biography—suggested a need for clear protocols and processes to be established at the beginning of any project; however, the final version of the chapter did not contain the 'draft contract' that had been proposed as an appendix halfway through our drafting of the chapter. We settled instead for a more Deleuzean understanding of collaboration; however, the trace remains of some ethically sticky writing moments in our histories.

Neither of our girlhood collectives went through formal university ethics procedures as we had assumed and agreed prior to the workshops that all participants also intended to be authors, although as outlined above this did not always occur. In the neoliberal university, ethics procedures are mainly designed as protection for universities and not for authors or research participants.

In the writing of our chapters/papers, and the collective analysis of stories, sometimes things took off in new directions. Susanne and Marnina spent a week in a cabin at the edge of the snowline in Whistler one April, reading through the first full drafts of every chapter for our book, detailing the changes that were needed if this was to look like a coherent project with a high-quality contribution to make to the field. With both of the outcomes—the book and the special journal issue—we were locked in to promises to publishers. Almost a year after our revisions, more than two years after the workshop, after every chapter had been rotated through to every author and rewritten, the book was sent out as a whole manuscript to three external reviewers. More changes were required. The chapters went around again. We exceeded the agreed timeline because that is what happens with a complex multi-authored project. It was almost two years between the signing of the contract and the publication of the book, even longer since the workshop. That is what happens. We worked with amazing committed scholars and we learned so much with and from each other, but to achieve the outcome

we desired—a quality book with a feminist publishing house—we had to make demands of very busy scholars compelled at the same time to build individualised profiles in their precise fields as required by their employing institutions. The book stands up well—a recent review concludes that the book is a 'highly significant edited collection' which makes an 'important contribution to girlhood studies' through its 'rich combination of reflexivity and strong theoretical engagement' (Douglas 2016, p. 460). We wonder now whether ERA imperatives in Australia would have directed us away from the Canadian Women's Press and the *Girlhood Studies* journal—despite them being so right as homes for the work. We don't think so, not yet, but we have heard of Australian universities where people are forbidden to publish outside what have been deemed by algorithms to be Quartile 1 or 2 journals in the decidedly un-feminist metrical worlds that our universities now occupy.

Our stories, as Haug had warned decades earlier, were sites of contestation as well as collaboration. In the chapters/papers we published, various combinations of authors, including sole authors, drew from the materials that their collective had generated during the workshop. Sometimes analyses of stories by others provoked a shift in perception or reaction from the person who had initiated that narrative. Sometimes this might be a misalignment with, or move away from, the ways the originating author had been used to thinking through her story. Almost always there is a shift through the workshops and the writing that follows. We are likely to think differently about an event once we have analysed it from various angles and perspectives, even as Haug suggested, experimenting with writing from the imagined points of view of others who were there (Gannon et al. 2014). And through analysis and experimentation, dislodging the omnipotent self who is sole author and interpreter of her own experience. We have thought of these often subtle shifts as potentially enabling 'a different kind of agency…not through memories that might be fixed and interpreted scene-by-scene' as in a therapeutic setting, 'but through memories as mo(ve)ments' where 'processes of selving' can be glimpsed (Davies and Gannon 2006, p. 7). In Haug's terms, the contradictory moments that are worked into in our stories are where 'sparks of hope' for thinking differently might

emerge. In their project, Haug and her collaborators detail the difficult work of unpacking 'the slavegirl' metaphor in one of their stories of sexualised performance in a nightclub that had been offered to the group as evidence of empowerment (1987). As we have noted, neither of our collectives went through formal university ethics processes as we had anticipated and agreed that all participants would also all be authors, and in any case, who could we ask for permission if we were ourselves both subjects and objects of inquiry? Do we ask each other for an individualised consent to use whatever it might be that we might produce when we do not yet know that either? And when we do we ask for this? Before the workshop? Before the writing? During the writing? Or is a better feminist strategy what we have tried to do which is to trust that we will get through and respect one another? These aspects are always more complex than we imagine. Nor are they new. See, for example, the epistolary chapter on the struggles of collaborative writing in our methodological book (Davies and Gannon 2006). Bronwyn begins by suggesting our goal is to 'search for those "scenes, moments, illustrations" that take us to an unexpected and wonderful place of resonance and agreement, not just among ourselves but with others who read what we finally write' (2006, p. 115); and Susanne responds later that this sounds like 'some sort of fictional feminist utopia which is not how it was either' (2006, p. 121). Many of our co-authors in various chapters in that book write back—words like 'trauma' and 'tough' and 'dangerous' and 'incredibly difficult' are added to 'struggle' (as well as 'love' and 'care' and 'joy' and 'brave', and so on). One respondent raises 'the important unexamined issues of silence, power and collectivity', while another writes: 'I have now read the chapter and wish I had been there!' (2006, p. 135). What it sounds like is feminist work. Not easy. Not compliant. Cacophonous, committed, collective.

Our emails in the girlhood project suggest some of the struggles of writing. The passionate attachment to our own stories arises in Bronwyn's words—'a difficulty is the letting go of our own individual egos as we launch into the collectivity of the writing. We were dismayed when words we might have struggled over disappeared in someone else's drafting. We felt obliterated' (2006, p. 116). In some

of the emails around the girlhood project, we find permission being given for a co-author to work on 'my story' in a particular paper, or being congratulated for honouring 'my draft' usually by not writing or problematising what has been written by the author who continues to claim ownership of the story. She does, on the one hand, but if the method moves into a collective authorship and a critical space, then this should not be easy work. As Haug says, it is not about 'teasing out individual memories in order to give them a coherent and meaningful conclusion' (2008, p. 537), it is not about seeking or constructing an 'underlying truth'—rather it is the hard search for contradictions that enables us to map how we are implicated in power relationships. If it can't do that then how we claim it as a feminist method? The method of working with memories that Haug pioneered must 'permeate and complicate the linear search for truth' (2008, p. 538). Informed by a post-structural orientation to texts, where meanings are always multiple and excessive of their intent, and where close reading strategies from literary theory may be more useful than a social scientific orientation, then 'my story' restricted to my analysis of it on my own terms is inconsistent with the method. This is one of the paradoxes at the heart of collective biography. For Susanne, who has that disciplinary background, a text is always a text, even when it is a text of the self. Open to curiosity, contestation, even to a loving collaborative interrogation.

Conclusion

Collective biography is a feminist research methodology that draws on many of the principles and goals of feminist research originally articulated by early feminists struggling to work in and change patriarchal universities and knowledge production. It counters the individualistic and competitive versions of research and publishing processes, even as these processes are being strengthened through neoliberal accountability and surveillance practices within universities. It not

only makes room for, but also pays focussed attention to 'the usual activity of life' (Berlant 2008, p. 5). The stories that are the material of collective biography work are about the mundane, the usual and the everyday. It is through analysing these kinds of stories that patterns emerge and the familiar is made strange. The effect is an opening up of a deeper understanding of how we are collectively constituted by the everyday activities in which we participate and how these are embedded within discourse, sometimes rendering the processes invisible to us. The practice of collective biography thus challenges sexist notions of what counts as important, what data should consist of, and whose stories matter. Collective biography breaks down the divisions of researcher-researched, since the stories we work with are those produced by the group. In the process, traditional notions of research objectivity are rendered meaningless. Both of these notions are central to feminist debates about research and challenging research norms within the university.

However, it is also important to not overestimate the success of feminist methodologies in challenging research norms and practices within the university. While feminists have created openings for working in alternative ways, these are not always valued or respected institutionally. Women's Studies departments are under threat in many different countries as neoliberal budget cuts to university funding have resulted in department closures and/or relying on part-time faculty.

While collective biography aspires to meeting the criteria of a feminist methodology that both creates new possibilities and contests existing research practices and principles, it, like any methodology, bumps up against situations which complicate the process. These situations include the working conditions within neoliberal institutions as well as the limits of the people trying to work collectively and in more feminist ways. We do not see these as failures. But, rather as the practical experience of coming up against a world that is amiss. We see these situations as a starting point for more critical work as we continue

to grapple with and shape feminist methodology, our sweaty concept (Ahmed 2017).

Note

1. Although at the time of writing Google Scholar tells us that our book *Becoming Girl* has 20 citations (i.e. a metric measure), we were more thrilled by the video book review by a teenage reader that we stumbled over in cyberspace.

References

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bansel, P., Davies, B., Gannon, S., & Linnell, S. (2008). Technologies of audit at work on the writing subject: A discursive analysis. *Studies in Higher Education, 33*(6), 673–684.

Berlant, L. (2008). Thinking about feeling historical. *Emotions, Space and Society, 1*(1), 4–9.

Bhavnani, K. (1993). Tracing the contours: Feminist research and feminist objectivity. *Women's Studies International Forum, 16,* 95–104.

Charteris, J., Gannon, S., Mayes, E., Nye, A., & Stephenson, L. (2016). The emotional knots of academicity: A collective biography of academic subjectivities and spaces. *Higher Education Research and Development, 35*(1), 31–44.

Davies, B., & Gannon, S. (2006). *Doing collective biography: Investigating the production of subjectivity*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: Open University Press and McGraw Hill.

Davies, B., & Gannon, S. (2009). *Pedagogical encounters*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Davies, B., Gonick, M., Gottschall, K., & Lampert, J. (2013). Ruptures in the heterosexual matrix through teenage flows and multiplicities. *Girlhood Studies, 6*(1), 46–62.

Douglas, K. (2016). Becoming girl: Collective biography and the production of girlhood. *Contemporary Women's Writing, 10*(3), 458–460.

Gannon, S. (2019). On being and becoming the monstrous subject of measurement. In S. Riddle, D. Bright, & E. Honan (Eds.), *Writing with Deleuze in the academy: Creating monsters.* Springer.

Gannon, S., Gottschall, K., & Camden Pratt, C. (2013). 'A quick sideways look and wild grin': Joyful assemblages in moments of girlhood. *Girlhood Studies, 6*(1), 13–29.

Gannon, S., Walsh, S., Byers, M., & Rajiva, M. (2014). Deterritorializing collective biography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 27*(2), 181–195.

Gannon, S., Kligte, G., McLean, J., Perrier, M., Swan, E., & Vanni, I. (2015, December). Uneven relationalities, collective biography and sisterly affect in neoliberal universities. *Feminist Formations, 27*(3), 189–216.

Gannon, S., Powell, S., & Power, C. (2018). On the thresholds of legitimacy: A collaborative exploration of being and becoming academic. In Y. Taylor & K. Lahad (Eds.), *Feeling academic in the neoliberal university: Feminist flights, fights and failures* (pp. 261–280). Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gonick, M. (2013). Entanglements: Art-making, becoming girl and collective biography. *Girlhood Studies, 6*(1), 63–77.

Gonick, M., & Gannon, S. (2013). Collective biography: An introduction. *Girlhood Studies*, *6*(1), 7–12.

Gonick, M., & Gannon, S. (Eds.). (2014). *Becoming girl: Collective biography and the production of girlhood*. Toronto, ON: The Women's Press.

Gonick, M., Walsh, S., & Brown, M. (2011). Collective biography and the question of difference. *Qualitative Inquiry, 17*(8), 741–749.

Gottschall, K., Gannon, S., Lampert, J., & McGraw, K. (2013). The Cyndi Lauper affect: Bodies, girlhood and popular culture. *Girlhood Studies, 6*(1), 30–45.

Halifax Alliance for Girls' Studies [HAGS]. (2010). *Research protocol*. Unpublished document.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies, 14*(13), 575–599.

Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science, whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Haug, F. (2008). Memory work. *Australian Feminist Studies, 23*(58), 537–541.

Haug, F., Andresen, S., Bünz-Elfferding, A., Hauser, C., Lang, U., Laudan, M., et al. (1987). *Female sexualization: A collective work of memory* (E. Carter, Trans.). New York, NY: Verso.

Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2012). Feminist research: Exploring, interrupting, and transforming the interconnections of epistemology, methodology and method. In S. N. Hesse-Biber (Ed.), *The handbook of feminist research* (pp. 2–26). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Smith, D. (1974). Women's perspective as a radical critique of sociology. *Sociological Inquiry, 44*(1), 7–13.

Taylor, Y., & Lahad, K. (Eds.). (2018). *Feeling academic in the neoliberal university: Feminist flights, fights and failures*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Trinh, T. M. (1991). *Framer framed*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Wyatt, J., Davies, B., Gale, K., & Gannon, S. (2018). Creating a space in between: Collaborative research inquiries. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Sage handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed., pp. 738–765). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

13

Recipes on Arts-Based Research Practice as a Form of Feminist Resistance

Briony Lipton and Gail Crimmins

Food for Thought: Introduction

In this chapter, we play with the metaphor of a recipe to explore creative arts-based research practices and the impact they have on sexism and gender inequality in Australian higher education. A recipe is a set of instructions that describes how to prepare or make something, most often a culinary dish, though they are also used in many fields, including but not limited to medicine, science, information technology and education (Wall 2016, p. 4). Tracing the origin of the word 'recipe', it seems obvious that we would think of food ingredients: flour, spices, milk and eggs,

———————————————
B. Lipton
Australian National University, Canberra, ACT, Australia

G. Crimmins (✉)
School of Communication and Creative Industries,
University of the Sunshine Coast, Maroochydore, QLD, Australia
e-mail: gcrimmin@usc.edu.au

but surprisingly perhaps, we're also transported to medicine cabinets and apothecary's shops. The word derives from the Latin verb *recipre*, meaning *to receive, or to take*. *Recipe* appears to have entered the English language in the 1400s. At this time, it was common for physicians to place the word *recipe* at the top of prescriptions, before listing the ingredients that the patient should 'receive' for their medical remedy. It was not until late 1716 when the first citation for the word recipe was in relation to cookery, and the culinary recipe more specifically (Wall 2016; Arendholz et al. 2013, p. 120).

This chapter is concerned with the etymology of words, and of discourses, that is the way language is communicated and the way it is written and spoken, 'always the same metaphor: we follow it, it carries us, beneath all its figures, where ever discourse is organized' (Cixous and Clement 1994). We follow words around—in the Ahmedian sense—to see what they 'do' (Ahmed 2017). Discourse is often difficult to define—which is due, in part, to its complex history and the multiple ways it is taken up within academic disciplines. Discourse is not a transparent representation or expression of language and its communication. Feminist theorists have long questioned the naturalisation of discourse and the ways in which they subjugate women (Lazar 2007). Language influences the way we think, feel and express ourselves, and alternative ways of knowing are often excluded from dominant institutional narratives. Discourses constitute our academic identities and performativities in a myriad of complex and contradictory ways. This way, that way and which way, as feminist academics, we are simultaneously pulled into line and pushed to the margins by words. We are at once both compliant and resistant to neoliberal new managerialist discourses of merit, productivity, accountability and competition.

The gendered origins of the word recipe are not lost on us. Everywhere we look we are positioned in binary opposition:

> Where is she?
> Activity/passivity
> Sun/Moon
> Culture/Nature
> Day/Night. (Cixous and Sellers 1994, p. 37)

When done in the home, recipes and cooking are associated with women, domesticity and femininity, and yet professional, high-status, celebrity, gastronomy remains the domain of men and masculinity in the public sphere. Just as there remains a distinct gendered binary in culinary discourse (Williams 2014) so too, in Australia, where we both reside, there is a distinct gendered division in academic labour whereby women significantly over-represent at the lower academic levels, are more likely to occupy fixed-term contracts (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2017), and understood as undertaking the majority of 'organisational housework' (Blackmore and Sachs 2007, p. 14). Indeed, academic knowledge is predicated upon a masculine legacy of science and rationality (Harding 2011; Leathwood and Read 2009). In the gendered neoliberal university organisation, the ideal academic is ostensibly male and gender bias is neutralised by the masculine norm, a norm that continues to render the feminine, as well as the sexual and racial 'other', outside of institutionalised sites of intellectual practice (Phillips et al. 2014). Much academic research continues to adhere to ideals of scientific rationality and objectivity shaped by a stereotype of manliness and masculine rigour.

We recognise that most academic standards, including its modes of communication, were established before women's mass entrance into the academy, and as such, they reflect patriarchal categories of what is valued (Shuman 1993). Indeed, Patricia Bizzell (1992) identifies that the precise, concise, formal language employed in a highly structured form of academic argument emulates the masculine, upper-class code of communication of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. She maintains that scientific journals continue to act as academic gatekeepers by categorising and rewarding objective reason, as separate from emotion, as 'proper' knowledge, and so by doing, the *reason*able and r*ational*/non-emotional person is constituted as the ideal academic (Bizzell 1999). The ideal academic inhabits these modes of thinking and communicating as the economically privileged, white male (Bizzell 1999; Thornton 2013).

There is an intimate connection between recipes, feminism and gender inequality in higher education, and we experiment with these culinary metaphors and inventive, arts-informed research practices as food

for thought. To question, inform, and resist neoliberal values in the contemporary university, we need to use a language that reflects a different set of ideas and standards. This chapter therefore exposes the traditional academic discourse as inhabiting patriarchal and upper-class principles and presents an alternative feminine/feminist code of communication, in order to expand the category of who and what counts as 'academic'. The etymology of the recipe is *to take* as well as *to receive*. Here, we reclaim academic marginality as a site of resistance (hooks 1990).[1] We *take* this opportunity to write together and gratefully and humbly *receive* with open hearts (Mackinlay 2016) the accounts of sexism and discrimination shared with us that gently combining with our own narratives rise into a collective story (Holman-Jones 2016). This chapter thus sifts, stirs and combines a mixture of feminist theories and methods to explore the potentiality of a feminist language and a feminine modality in collaborative arts-based research practice. Our active ingredient is Hélène Cixous' bodily and experimental form of writing known as *écriture féminine*, which we draw upon to challenge the androcentrism of scholarship and tell stories of sexism in the neoliberal academy that might otherwise go untold.

Our Cookbook: *Écriture Feminine*, Critical Autoethnography and Arts-Based Research

The concept of *écriture féminine* is a way of exploring how we might research and write differently and resist the reproduction of androcentrism in the contemporary Australian university. Cixous' *écriture féminine* or 'feminine writing' is a liberating bodily practice that aims to release women's repressed creative agency and transform phallogocentric structures. Cixous' concept of *écriture féminine* is developed both conceptually and aesthetically within her essay *The Laugh of the Medusa* (1976). In this work, she explains that to be effective, feminine writing must resist the conventions of logocentric, impersonal, 'masculine' discourse. In particular, she urges women writers to sweep away syntax and abandon the linearity and orderly

characteristics associated with a masculine hegemonic-filled communi-
cation (Crimmins 2018). Cixous' writing radically and creatively dis-
rupts everyday gender norms and distinctions and instils a desire to
escape the masculine mastery and hierarchy by 'writing through the
body' (Cixous 1976). Cixous poses that:

> If woman has always functioned 'within' the discourse of man, signifier
> that has always referred back to the opposite signifier which annihilates
> its specific energy and diminishes or stifles its very different sounds it is
> time for her to dislocate the 'within,' to explode it, turn it around, and
> seize it; to make it hers, containing it, taking it in her own mouth, biting
> that tongue with her very own teeth to invent for herself a language to get
> inside of. (Cixous 1975, p. 356)

Cixous invites women to reclaim their physicality, sexuality and sub-
jectivity through a feminine and feminist mode of women's writing.

In this chapter, we interweave *écriture feminine* with critical autoeth-
nography. Broadly, autoethnography refers to writing or research about
an individual or set of experiences and its relationship to the broader
social or cultural context (Ellis 2004; Ellis and Bochner 2006). Critical
autoethnography is an embodied reflexive movement, a spiral 'cir-
cling, pulling, and beginning again' (Adams and Holman-Jones 2011).
Similarly, Cixous employs a circular form and sensual, metaphorically
illustrated narrative to create cohesion between her ideas about the need
for women to not reproduce androcentric knowledge, to not 'make a
paper penis', urging women to 'write herself' (Cixous 1976). She fuses a
poetic style with philosophical and feminist polemic by adopting a flu-
idity of form that compliments and complicates our understanding of
the self and society. Critical autoethnography involves us as researchers
equally describing, contesting and resisting what we see, hear and know
(Hamilton et al. 2008, p. 22), and embracing these personal-cultural
entanglements (Adams et al. 2015, p. 22). Critical autoethnography is
not only a contemplation of the self (Denshire 2014, p. 833) but also
an examination of systems, cultures, discourses and institutions that
privilege some and marginalise others.

Arts-based research practices promote dialogue (van der Vaart et al. 2018). For us, they are a way of representing the possibilities of *écriture féminine* and autoethnographic writing in the in-between-ness of the gender binary. Arts-based research practices are a set of methodological tools used by researchers across disciplines during all phases of the research process. Arts-based practices draw on literary writing, music, dance, performance, visual art and film, to produce research in the form/s of short stories, novels, experimental writing, graphic novels, poems, stories, collages, paintings, drawings, sculpture, quilts and embroidery, performance and the theatrical (Leavy 2014). The way that art forms facilitate conversations is important. The arts ideally evoke emotional responses, and so the dialogue sparked by arts-based research practices is highly engaged. It connects people on emotional and visceral levels, facilitating empathy, which is a necessary precondition for challenging stereotypes and building community across differences.

We use arts-based research in combination with *écriture féminine* and critical autoethnography as a methodology for resisting sexism in the contemporary Australian university. As critically reflexive researchers, we write with and through our bodies to present narratives that transgress normative and oppressive performativities. Understanding who we are in relation to others. Knowledge is not just from above, or located in a brain. It is embodied. As Tami Spry notes, our bodies are the 'nexus of meaning making' (2016, p. 35). These methods serve postmodern attempts at subversion by disrupting certainty, opening up multiplicity in meaning-making instead of pushing authoritative claims' (Leavy 2014, p. 26). Our pieces of collaborative writing are also eclectic in the way that they deny the comfort of a regularity of form and meaning. As Leavy reminds us, there is no one way to make or make sense of a piece of art. Thus, our collaborative critical autoethnographic *ecriture feminine* can also be understood as democratising meaning.

It'll Be a Piece of Cake: Trial and Error in Writing with/in the Feminine

We are embroiled in the possibilities and paradoxes of writing with/in *écriture feminine*. We embrace this intensity. Cixous describes writing in the feminine as trial and error. She stresses the importance of the improvisational and iterative processes of feminine expression. Cixous suggests that feminine processes are not linear, but circular and daring: 'trial, that is to say, error. Error: progression', she encourages (Cixous 1998, p. 26). Within her poetic prose, Cixous urges women to employ image, metaphor and free association in order as an alternative to the teleological structures of masculine writing. She also identifies the importance of drawing as an improvisational feminine process that she recognises to be encouraged in children but discouraged in adulthood. Cixous finally muses that the interplay between image and text, what she calls the 'twin adventures' (Cixous 1998, p. 21), offers an alternative to the pre-planned teleology of masculine thought process as well as communication.

For many, engaging with *écriture féminine* is less a denunciation of traditional forms of scholarly writing and more of a process of be/coming in/to a feminist/feminine mode of writing. The bisexual Cixousian-inspired writing in this chapter takes the possibilities of in-between-ness inherent in *écriture féminine* both figuratively and literally as bursts or disruptions within the traditional chapter format. Most often these fissures feature under the more conventional signposting of subheadings and topic sentences. They offer the reader moments of provocation and reflection, drawing together multiple, changeable and conflicting academic subjectivities and performativities. In each of these ruptures, we have experimented with different methods and writing styles which are performative and creative. This allows us to write our own stories alongside that of other academic women and has the potential to transform academic writing, altering the relationship between scholar and reader in new ways (Livholts 2009, p. 121).

Step by Step: A Chapter Outline

If we strip back academic writing to its conventions, the outline for this chapter is also recipe, and it looks like this:

Step 1: Introduce and present self as an 'expert'.
'Hi, I'm Briony ~~and I'm casual academic. A~~ a recent PhD graduate, ~~leaving the nest~~ of a prestigious research-intensive institution ~~in search of postdoctoral pastures. My~~ I research on academic women and gender inequality in Australian higher education ~~is also a process of my own becoming as a researcher and the development of my own academic identity~~' (Editor/peer-reviewer: less subjectivity, more authority).
'Hi, I'm Gail, ~~after five years on casual academic contracts~~ I ~~now~~ I have a full time, ongoing academic appointment. I am a Lecturer in Communication. I also research gender inequity in the academy, ~~and focus on exposing how the everyday lived experience of women academics reveal the deeply entrenched structures of dis/advantage~~' (Editor/peer-reviewer: aim at concision).

Step 2: Explain the goals of this chapter.
This chapter seeks to describe, and latterly employ, *l'ecriture feminine* as a form of arts-informed research that can both accommodate and re-present the woman academic's lived experience through embodied, sensual and creative expression. The employment of *l'ecriture feminine* in and on the academy can create a counter-narrative to the dominant discourse within which the woman's experience is sm/Othered.

Step 3: Ask the reader to reflect on what they hope or need to get out of thinking about resistance in the neoliberal university.
Please do this.

Step 4: Explain the arrangements of this chapter: its directions, beginnings and endings.
This chapter purposefully off-shoots in/to different directions; we allow an idea in one sentence or paragraph to germinate or birth a tangential or 'seemingly related' idea into the next. We didn't set out with a clear plan of what will be said when and why; we instead improvised. In this respect, the chapter is organic and has been allowed to grow.

We have also written the chapter collaboratively, sharing emails with ideas and attached 'papers'. Our emails juxtapose scholarly ideas with notes on how we and our families are doing, sentences heavy with pain of trauma and light with the joys of a bottle of red and the energy of new ideas. We send drafts to-and-fro also, drafts that surprise as they look dissimilar from previous ones. Opening a draft is an exciting process as we don't track change with a metaphorical red pen; we just add new or reorder and put quietly to bed ideas and references that no longer fit or resonate. Respectfully irreverent of what was there before, each draft is a new gift.

Step 5: Explain the benefits of reading this chapter, including how everyone benefits.

As critics of the logocentrism and teleology of masculine knowledge production and traditional academic discourse, we deliberately do not delimit the outcomes or benefits of reading this chapter by prescribing how you should engage with it. We simply say that we have experienced, as audience and producers of arts-informed research texts, a liberation in breaking the rules of the well-made sentence/play/paper. We have been affectively engaged and forever changed by engaging in others' creative works, works that have evoked in us recognition of the beauty and vulnerability of lived experience. It is for these reasons we play with the form of academic discourse, extending its boundaries to accommodate the rhythm of our days and ways, and the colour and vibrancy of women in academia.

The following subheadings adopt an *écriture féminine* methodology under the three key themes of research, teaching and service. The traditional linear career trajectory of an academic from postdoctoral researcher, lecturer, senior lecturer, associate professor, professor, adjunct and emeritus is being displaced by far more fractured academic life course (Taylor and Lahad 2018; Goodwyn and Hogg 2017). Academic work is often divided into teaching and related duties, research and scholarship, service and leadership. This is commonly understood as the 40:40:20 research-teaching formula (forty per cent research, forty per cent teaching and twenty per cent service) and is one of the key ways that academics' work is quantified and (self)surveilled (Henderson 2018, p. 41).

A Recipe for Academic 'Success': Research

Research remains the most prestigious of the three main areas of an academic role, while teaching and administration duties are often syphoned off to academics who are earlier in their careers and are often short-term or on hourly based contracts (Thwaites and Pressland 2017).

The measured university with its rankings and performance appraisals places unprecedented pressure on academics, particularly those early in their careers, to publish research (Altbach 2014). However, academic women continue to take on greater responsibilities for teaching, administration and pastoral care which are accorded less weight than research, entrepreneurialism and leadership (Thornton 2013, p. 128). Our research anxieties around academic publishing and the sector's intent on the measurement and ranking of research output create the ideal conditions for universities to justify exerting increased pressure on academics in different ways.

Research

best paired with a double shot latte on a Saturday morning
and any substance over 7% on a Saturday night
textures of guilt, panic, and grandeur
mouthfeel: dry

There's a body in the mouthfeel of how we *feel* about academic research cultures and practices. 'It is time for her to dislocate the "within," to explode it, turn it around, and seize it; to make it hers, containing it, taking it in her own mouth, biting that tongue with her very own teeth to invent for herself a language to get inside of' (Cixous and Calle-Gruber 1997, p. 257).

Her research schedule:
2.5 hours teaching preparation
4 hours teaching
1-hour consults
30 mins respond to emails
Collect kids from school
Recurring

His:
Say yes to the invitation to join
  senior (male) academic's grant team
3 hours writing revisions on academic
  journal article, submit to journal
1-hour lunch/catch-up with Andrew,
  Dave and Tim about the latest data
  analysis Kristel (the RA) sent through
3 hours writing 'Discussion' around the
  latest data analysis
15 min set up appt for Jane to undertake
  a lit review on topic of new grant app

Without the need for evidence weighted with citation, this poem speaks a truth to many women academics, saddled with heavy teaching loads, who see across the corridor the male academic on a research-intensive academic appointment. In league tables, the woman is pitted against the man. The league table fails to make manifest the context though and within which the academic outputs were produced. Poems open a space for context and the recognisability to be seen and acknowledged.

Burning the Candle at Both Ends: Teaching

Despite research being the coveted academic activity, teaching and teaching-related activities 'represent the bottom line in a sector that derives more than half of its income from student fees via Commonwealth grants' (Papadopoulos 2017, p. 515). Teaching has its own distinct temporal rhythms and activities which include the preparation of lectures, timetabling tutorials and marking assignments. In these predominately precarious positions, doctoral students, postdocs and sessionals are charged with delivering mass undergraduate programmes often with little official training or support. Moreover, the pay in these positions frequently only rewards 'contact hours', meaning that preparation, marking and pastoral care of students are not remunerated.

Even if consultation time is factored into marking, tutoring and class preparation rates, for instance, this does not necessarily translate into the amount of communication students expect outside of class time, either in person or through email (Gregg 2011, p. 59). Entrapped in insecure, low paid and highly demanding roles, many casualised academics are 'on the front line' in classrooms attempting to meet the competing demands of students and institutions (Natanel 2017).

Marking Period Menu

Thorough understanding of the different sign classifications demonstrated	One dark chocolate Tim Tam from the fridge
'Expensive' and 'Broodingly' are interesting observation but perhaps a little too expressive for describing denotations	Handful of roasted and slated cashews and two slices of salami
Very astute point, explaining what modality is and how it is impacted by different aspects of the text	
This section would have been enhanced by explicitly stating that they are denotations	Sip of salted caramel hot chocolate
*It could make a viewer think—important to word it this way as there are multiple meanings/connotations that could be taken from this. It's also a good idea to again state explicitly that these are connotations	Sip of salted caramel hot chocolate
Name withheld—this contains some carefully thought out semiotic analysis. You are able to cover a wide breadth of key terms, with your knowledge and ability to identify them within the stimulus clearly present. Some points were muddled in non-academic language or needed expansion. Some key terms were left out to the detriment of your intro. Overall however, your analysis was thorough and intriguing, well done	End of assignment walk to the kitchen. Two large spoonfuls of ice cream

Academics are being asked to do more with less, to use our own personal time and money for attending conferences and publishing research to remain competitive in the neoliberal environment. Academics are part of what Guy Standing (2014) terms 'the precariat'. The precarity are a class category evolving out of neoliberal ideology. The precariat is people living in unstable and untenable conditions. The precariat is not a homogenous societal group, but what unites them is 'a sense that their labour is instrumental (to live), opportunistic (taking what comes) and precarious (insecure)' (Standing 2014, p. 14). Statistical data about the employment of academics reveal a transformation of higher education over the last two decades, with the systematic casualisation of the workforce. In Australia, approximately half of all academic staff are employed on an hourly rate basis, with seventy-five per cent of new university jobs since 2005 being insecure, casual and contractual appointments (Lane 2017). Precarity in academia is gendered. It is not only women's presence in the academy, but the positions they occupy that expose continued gender inequality in Australian higher education.

Serving as a Casual Academic

For the silver service of academia
I slip on my white shirt and black skirt
to take orders for
passes, credits and
desserts of distinction

We draw on a smile
polish a 'concerned-for-you' head tilt
and serve generous portions of extra thyme
in lengthy email-entrees,
because our customer missed a previous sitting
or wants someone with whom to w(h)ine and dine.

Restaurants the world over are attracting increased numbers of 'patrons'
with diverse appetites and many are under-prepared for the dining experience,
who need lots of help to understand the ingredients, contexts, histories and potential of various culinary dishes on offer.
Most [patrons] are grateful for our recommendations, prompts and provocations to try new flavours,
while others expect a pre-packaged meal that's easy to swallow.

We try always to offer service with a smile
because we value our customer's experience
but if truth be told,
we also need good ~~three~~-course reviews -
to secure another shift.

Precarious academic positions remain highly sought after for gaining experience and building CVs with the hope of securing more secure academic employment in the future, even when these contract positions are a result of university management cost-cutting measures (Taylor and Lahad 2018). Driven by a need for work, academics often internalise what are ostensibly structural issues associated with life as a sessional academic. Melissa Gregg argues that the lack of critique of the long hours' culture and the gendered assumptions underpinning it are a consequence of women feeling grateful for 'flexible' work arrangements (2011, p. 4). The temporariness of contract work also leads to a sense of being outside of the profession (Thwaites and Pressland 2017, p. 3). The interdependency of academics and institutions in terms of casualised labour is part of an ongoing process of subject formation in relation to temporality. The intensification of work and precarity has resulted in more 'yay-saying'. That is, when offered another semester of teaching, or a short-term research contract, those without the stability of a permanent position are disinclined to turn down the invitation. Moreover, even those with job security also feel pressured to say yes to additional leadership responsibilities and opportunities because of the continuous scrutiny of academic performance.

'You Should Be Writing': Service

Administrative work in the contemporary neoliberal university is particularly prone to being discredited, regarded by many academics as abject, internalising crucial aspects of academic work and dismissing them—meetings, committees, lecture and tutorial preparations, responding to emails. These tasks can easily fill our days, and yet we punish ourselves for doing this work because it was at the expense of researching or writing. These 'non-promotable tasks' in higher education are not necessarily minor. We have found that in many research-intensive institutions, teaching is effectively 'non-promotable' even though it takes up most of academics' time (Guarino and Borden 2017).

The Good Woman

The good woman / mother / academic
makes refined sugar free date and cacao bliss balls as a healthy afternoon snack
The good woman is mother and academic and so tries to be good and set an example
Humming a naptime lullaby to her co-sleeping companion, she grades yet another awful opinion-based essay.
Not even students have time for reading any more.
The good-woman-mother-academic wants to be good, so she works from home on the weekend
But when faced with a digital pile of marking and a literal mound of washing she secretly eats a block of Lindt chocolate in bed instead.
Bliss, balls!

Wide Awake

> When all the family is sleeping, and the sun has gone to bed
> Up jumped the associate professor and this is what she said
> 'I'm an ideal academic with a flippy floppy hat. I can shake my head like this *yes* and send passive aggressive Director emails like that.'
> When all students were returning from a night out clubbing and the moon behind a cloud
> Up jumped the associate professor and shouted very loud
> 'I'm an ideal academic with a flippy floppy hat. I can write book chapters like this, and grade exam papers like that.'

Spending much of our time in motherhood reading children's literature aloud, and in the next moment delving back into our academic readings, this piece was written to the tune of children's nursery rhyme 'Dingle Dangle Scarecrow' (1964). Used around the world, a scarecrow is a humanoid mannequin, usually dressed in old clothes and placed in open fields to discourage birds from disturbing and feeding on recently cast seed and growing crops. It is a recognisable symbol of agriculture and country life. In the corporatised university, the academic becomes a scarecrow, a prop dressed in professional work attire and sometimes black robes, hoods and bonnets. Academics are a recognisable symbol of scholarship, the scarecrow academic in its flippy floppy bonnet is a puppet for the neoliberal university.

Banging on the Pots and Pans: Conclusion

In line with the concept of a feminine cognition, Cixous (1976) appealed for women to write themselves in a feminine form. In particular, she urged women to employ *écriture féminine* and advocated a departure from objective, dichotomist representations and linear teleological structures by promoting improvisational writing. Within her

works, Cixous both endorsed and employed the engagement of circular and poetic form, image-infused and sensual narrative, and a word-playfulness that has established her as a pioneer of women's writing. What also resonates is the way *écriture féminine*, critical autoethnography and arts-based research methodologies raises questions about what counts and is valued as knowledge, and what cultures, and bodies count as human. It places value on those marginalised or subjugated experiences, and the emotional vulnerability, complexity and fragility of diverse cultural communities.

If ideas and our perceptions of ourselves are constituted by language and structure, then we need new forms of communication for new concepts and identities to emerge. When we restructure discursive form we restructure thought, we restructure possibilities. As Fluffy Singler (2017) asks, 'how is one to rethink the world, remake the world… Among the onslaught of images that perpetuate someone else's vision?' before suggesting:

> To remake language to find new
> creative imagistic practices of language
> is to make resistance possible to move us
> toward our vision to have visions
> never before possible. (Singler 2017, n.p.)

A form of resistance to the androcentric discourse, in form and content, of the academy requires us to heed Cixous' provocation that 'Women must put herself into the text' (1976, p. 875). That is, if the patriarchal cookie cutters of rationality and logic are used by women, then we will continue to serve up rational judgements and paper penises in the shape of previously (per)formed judgements. Whereas, embodied and non-rational processes and premises may lead to new experience/s, new ideas and a dismantling of outdated structures.

Note

1. Who are we to claim such marginality, you might ask? As white scholars, it is important to acknowledge that feminism in and outside the academy has a particularly 'white' façade, colonial foundation and exclusionary reputation (Lipton and Mackinlay 2017). Race privilege must be owned and challenged. The dominance of a white, middle-class feminist subject position diminishes the inclusiveness of a politics of difference in Australian feminism (Moreton-Robinson 2004). Academic women are neither complete 'outsiders' in the academy nor entirely depoliticised and complicit neoliberal subjects. Together, feminist poststructuralist, postmodern, intersectionalist and new materialist thought transforms our way of thinking about gender and race, knowledge, power, social relations and cultural change. bell hooks (1990) writes of marginality as a space from where we can imagine alternative ways of existing outside of hegemonic culture and presents an opportunity to create counter-hegemonic cultures. Resistance, for Cixous, involves subverting both the masculine concept *and* language structure, because all forms of communication inhabit a philosophical and political position.

References

Adams, E., & Holman-Jones, S. (2011). Telling stories: Reflexivity, Queer theory, and autoethnography. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, *11*(2), 108–116.

Adams, T., Ellis, C., & Holman-Jones, S. (Eds.). (2015). *Autoethnography: Understanding qualitative research*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Durham, UK: Duke University Press.

Altbach, P. (2014, July 18). What counts for academic productivity in research universities? *University World News*, 329. http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20140715105656393. Last accessed March 2018.

Arendholz, J., Bublitz, W., Kirner, M., & Zimmermann, I. (2013). Food for thought—Or, what's (in) a recipe? A diachronic analysis of cooking instructions. In C. Gerhardt, M. Frobenius, & S. Ley (Eds.), *Culinary linguistics: The chef's special* (pp. 119–138). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2017, September). *Gender indicators, Australia*. http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Lookup/by%20Subject/4125.0~Sep%202017~Main%20Features~Education~5. Last accessed July 2018.

Bizzell, P. (1992). *Academic discourse and critical consciousness* [in English]. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Bizzell, P. (1999). Hybrid academic discourses: What, why, how. *Composition Studies, 27*(2), 7–21.

Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2007). *Performing and reforming leaders: Gender, educational restructuring and organizational change*. New York, NY: State of New York Press.

Cixous, H. (1975). The laugh of the Medusa. *Chicago Journals, 1*, 347–362.

Cixous, H. (1976). The laugh of the Medusa. *Signs, 1*(4), 875–893.

Cixous, H. (1998). *Stigmata: Escaping texts*. London, UK: Routledge.

Cixous, H., & Calle-Gruber, M. (1997). *Rootprints: Memory and life writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Cixous, H., & Clement, C. (1994). The newly born woman. In S. Sellers (Ed.), *The Helene Cixous reader* (pp. 35–46). London, UK: Routledge.

Cixous, H., & Sellers, S. (1994). *The Hélène Cixous reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Crimmins, G. (2018). *Theatricalising narrative research on women casual academics*. Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Denshire, S. (2014). On auto-ethnography. *Current Sociology, 62*(6), 831–850.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The ethnographic I: A methodological novel about autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2006). Analyzing analytic autoethnography: An autopsy. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 35*(4), 429–449.

Goodwyn, H., & Hogg, E. J. (2017). Room for confidence: Early career feminists in the English department. In R. Thwaites & A. Pressland (Eds.), *Being an early career feminist academic* (pp. 93–108). London, UK: The Palgrave Macmillan.

Gregg, M. (2011). *Works intimacy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Guarino, C. M., & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education, 58*(6), 672–694.

Hamilton, M. L., Smith, L., & Worthington, K. (2008). Fitting the methodology with the research: An exploration of narrative, self-study and auto-ethnography. *Studying Teacher Education, 4*(1), 17–28.

Harding, S. (2011). Interrogating the modernity vs. tradition contrast: Whose science and technology for whose social progress? *Feminist Epistemology and Philosophy of Science, 1*, 85–108.

Henderson, E. F. (2018). Feminist conference time: Aiming (not) to have been there. In Y. Taylor & K. Lahad (Eds.), *Feeling academic in the neoliberal university: Feminist flights, fights and failures* (pp. 33–60). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Holman-Jones, S. (2016). Living bodies of thought: The 'critical' in critical autoethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry, 22*(4), 228–237.

hooks, b. (1990). *Yearning: Race, gender, and cultural politics*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Lane, B. (2017, August 23). Insecurity reigns as universities embrace part-time and casual work. *The Australian*. https://www.theaustralian.com.au/higher-education/insecurity-reigns-as-universities-embrace-part-time-and-casual-work/news-story/835b58b51a63b680eded6bef7b9470bd. Last accessed September 2018.

Lazar, M. M. (2007). Feminist critical discourse analysis: Articulating a feminist discourse praxis. *Critical Discourse Studies, 4*(2), 141–164.

Leathwood, C., & Read, B. (2009). *Gender and the changing face of higher education: A feminized future?* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Leavy, P. (2014). *Method meets art, second edition: Arts-based research practice*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Lipton, B., & Mackinlay, L. (2017). *We only talk feminist here: Feminist academics, voice and agency in the neoliberal university*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Livholts, M. (2009). To theorize in a more passionate way. *Feminist Theory, 10*(1), 121–131.

Mackinlay, E. (2016). The heart lines in your hand: Writing autoethnography with Helene Cixous and Virginia Woolf. In E. Emerald, R. E. Rinehart, & A. Garcia (Eds.), *Global south ethnographies* (pp. 153–168). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2004). *Talking up to the white woman: Aboriginal women and feminism*. Brisbane: University of Queensland Press.

Natanel, K. (2017). On becoming 'bad subjects': Teaching to transgress in neoliberal education. In R. Thwaites & A. Pressland (Eds.), *Being an early career feminist academic* (pp. 239–253). London, UK: The Palgrave Macmillan.

Papadopoulos, A. (2017). The mismeasure of academic labour. *Higher Education Research & Development, 36*(3), 511–525.

Phillips, M., Pullen, A., & Rhodes, C. (2014). Writing organisation as gendered practice: Interrupting the libidinal economy. *Organization Studies, 35*(3), 313–333.

Shuman, A. (1993). Gender and genre. In S. Tower Hollis, L. Pershing, & M. J. Young (Eds.), *Feminist theory and the study of folklore* (pp. 71–88). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Singler, F. (2017, November 26). *Ecriture feminine* and women's transgressive writing. *Fluffy's World*. http://fluffysingler.blogspot.com.au/2017/11/ecriture-feminine-and-womens.html?m=0. Last accessed April 2018.

Spry, T. (2016). *Body, paper, stage: Writing and performing autoethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.

Standing, G. (2014). The precariat. *Contexts, 13*(4), 10–12.

Taylor, Y., & Lahad, K. (2018). *Feeling academic in the neoliberal university: Feminist flights, fights and failures*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Thornton, M. (2013). The mirage of merit: Reconstituting the 'ideal academic'. *Australian Feminist Studies, 28*(76), 127–143.

Thwaites, R., & Pressland, A. (2017). Introduction: Being an early career feminist academic in a changing academy. In R. Thwaites & A. Pressland (Eds.), *Being an early career feminist academic* (pp. 1–28). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

van der Vaart, G., van Hoven, B., & Huigen, P. P. (2018). Creative and arts-based research methods in academic research. Lessons from a Participatory Research Project in the Netherlands. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *19*(2), 1–30.

Wall, W. (2016). *Recipes for thought: Knowledge and taste in the early modern English kitchen*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Williams, S. J. (2014). A feminist guide to cooking. *Contexts, 13*(3), 59–61.

14

Working Across/Within/Through Academic Conventions of Writing a Ph.D.: Stories About Writing a Feminist Thesis

Anna R. Moxnes

Introduction

I wanted to write a feminist thesis long before I received a Ph.D. scholarship. I thought it would be a relatively straightforward process, but my experience has identified some paradoxes between feminist research/writing and the academic traditions, canon and demands of the Norwegian Teacher Education. It has also prompted me to consider how to write a feminist Ph.D. thesis without it being considered too provocative, inciting judgement, or causing feelings of exclusion. I discuss, in this chapter, how using feminist new materialist perspectives (e.g. Barad 2007, 2014; Dolphijn and Van der Tuin 2012; Haraway 2004, 2016; Lenz Taguchi and Palmer 2013; Osgood and Giugni 2015; Van der Tuin 2014) helped to ease but did not fully reduce the worries or tensions created when writing with a feminist lens in the academy. In this chapter,

---

A. R. Moxnes (✉)
Faculty of Humanities, Sports and Educational Siences,
Universty of South-Eastern Norway, USN, Kongsberg, Norway
e-mail: Anna.Moxnes@usn.no

I also consider reflection and diffraction in Early Childhood Teacher Education (ECTE), using feminist perspectives when re-analysing the literature review for my Ph.D. In addition, I re-activate some memory stories of being a Ph.D. student, and being of the world. Since the aim of this chapter is to investigate *how it is possible to unsettle imposed academic structures, and make space for differences*, numerous memory stories from my process of writing a feminist Ph.D. are used.

Using memory stories is considered a useful empirical tool in post-qualitative research (Hohti 2018; Palmer 2011; Taylor 2017). Hohti (2018, p. 8) engages with memory stories in order to foreground material practices and objects. In this chapter, I engage them to expose the (often) hidden aspects of feminism and sexism through a re-analysis of a literature review, with the aim of encouraging multiple voices to entwine in the discussion of the review. There are several stories to tell, layered stories, emotional stories, conflicting stories and hopeful stories. Such complexities are considered by working with the SF philosophy offered by Haraway (1997, 2004, 2016). Haraway (2016) describes SF as a philosophy of 'staying with the trouble and both as a practice a process and as a figure for ongoingness'. The philosophy incorporated bag-lady storytelling. Bag-lady stories are different from, and not as 'exposable', as other stories. They do not necessarily activate the same feelings as grand narratives and 'killer-stories' (Le Guin 1989, p. 168). But they are still stories that carry affect and embodied experience. In this chapter, these stories are told to expose the tensions involved in working with feminism across/within/through academic conventions; they are 'the kind of survival stories we could need today' (Haraway 2004, p. 128).

Bag-Lady-Practices of Feminist Events/Tails/Stories

Using a bag-lady-carrier-bag is an ontological, epistemological and methodological point of departure within this chapter. Barad (2003, p. 289) claims that to obtain knowledge we have to take part in the world, accept that we are part of the world, and contribute to its and our own becoming. A bag-lady is part of the world, a collector who

gathers experience and knowledge from different 'becomings' of the world. According to Haraway (2016, p. 40), 'no adventurer should leave home without a sack' in which to collect items/events/tales/things for later use. Bag-lady storytelling invites us to a work with difference. Difference in this context is a 'valuable compass for today's feminism', 'it allows us to think otherwise' (Haraway 2016, p. 40). Differences arise when bag-lady storytellers create unexpected partners and find irreducible details in their bag (Haraway 2004, p. 127). Putting irreducible details together can create insight into other (often unseen/unnoticed) sides of the world, or can create new angles of seeing the world.

Le Guin (1989) proposes that a carrier bag is 'full of wimps and klutzes and tiny grains of things smaller than a mustard seed, and intricate woven nets…' (p. 169). Bag-lady storytelling is therefore not about narrating tales of heroes. It is instead a process of being and telling without endings or morals/lessons to be learned. Becoming a bag-lady requires you to become a collector of different items. Letting items meet in an imaginary carrier-bag enlarges the capacity of all potential players, or artefacts, to expose differences (Haraway 2016, p. 7). Working to enlarge the capacity of these 'smaller' players and material beings can be challenging, since human beings often centralise themselves or other humans and human activity in their narratives. When I reopen the literature review of my Ph.D., as a bag lady, I thus search for 'other', less visible, less heroic stories, and seek to enlarge the capacity of the players/materials in these stories, as that they partner and pattern with other players/materialities.

Discussions around what counts as legitimate data, what constitutes 'empirical' research and how these 'lines' and categories can be moved (MacLure 2013a, b; St. Pierre 2016; St. Pierre et al. 2016) further inspire the production of this chapter. In this context, lines can be created by following the ideas of Haraway (2016) and Le Guin (1989) in relation to woven nets, or string figures. String figures materialise or form from the content of a bag-lady bag, since the bag's contents enact and propose figures or patterns for how things can be seen, sensed, thought and felt. The intention when activating string figures is to create hope and possibility, or as Le Guin (1989) writes '[s]till there are seeds to be gathered, and room in the bag of stars' (p. 170).

Haraway (2004) and Le Guin (1989) are concerned with how we tell stories, to whom we tell them and for what purpose we tell. The intention here, and in my feminist Ph.D., is to tell stories that contain difference/s. Stories about difference/s can generate diffractive readings; readings that challenge us to see and to think differently (Barad 2014; Grebowicz and Merrick 2013; Moxnes and Osgood 2018). In this chapter, the bag-lady-bag is useful as a metaphor for rethinking and diffracting academic standards in and around the literature review in a Ph.D. thesis. My memories and feminist reflections evoked will be written in *italics* so that you can identify what was written in my original literature review and what are memory stories of the process.

Writing a Feminist Thesis

I open up this chapter's bag-lady bag, and discover an old file, the one which holds the sketch I created when I hoped to get the PhD scholarship. A sentence catches my attention: 'Both feminism and praxis are the theoretical anchoring and background for developing new theories and tools for reflection in teaching'.

I don't remember what I was thinking when I wrote and sketched these lines/thoughts, but one thing is clear to me – feminist founded perspective was a high priority. Wonderings about when a text gains status as a feminist text have developed subsequently. Wonderings also developed about how a feminist works with/reflects on/rejects the masculine canon on the process of reflection within Early Childhood Teacher Education. Reflection was a core element in my study, and I started to wonder, fairly early on, whether reflection is connected with feminist perspectives. Yet, advice in relation to what theories I should consider discouraged the possibility of a feminist reflective focus:

> *Professor 1: So, you are writing about reflection in ECTE. Then you are probably using Dewey?*
> *Anna: I am, now using Søndenå, a Norwegian feminist, kindergarten teacher and professor in pedagogy, and here concept 'powerful reflection'.*

Professor 1: Søndenå? Is she writing about reflection? I advise you to use Dewey instead.

Or, they could be like this:

Professor 2: So, you are writing about reflection in ECTE. Then you are probably using Schön?

Anna: I am, at this stage using Søndenå, a Norwegian feminist, kindergarten teacher and professor in pedagogy, and here concept 'powerful reflection'.

Professor 2: Søndenå? Is she writing about reflection? I really think you should use Schön. His theories are very interesting!

I could have continued this referring to professor 3, professor 4, etc., *all proposing their preferred theorists. All the theorists proposed were male. I started to realise that becoming a feminist scholar was not going to be easy.*

These conversations cause me to wonder whether reflection itself is also a gendered concept, and how it has been adopted by, or ascribed to, male theorists.

From outside of my university environment, I encountered suggestions that feminists should cite and build on the work of other feminists (Ahmed 2017), or at least other women scholars. However, this conflicted with the seemingly well-meaning, though potentially sexist, suggestions I received from academics within the university for which I worked, and for whom I had a deep respect. I felt I could not just ignore the advice offered, and still be a successful Ph.D. candidate. Yet the discourse within Norwegian research about higher education and ECTE were dominated by a few (male) theorists. I considered this as a small thing initially, maybe smaller than a mustard seed (Le Guin 1989), so I popped my observation as material into my bag-lady-bag, and I carried the curiosity with me for some years.

Nevertheless, like walking with a small sand corn in a shoe, the mustard seed kept stinging, step on step.

My Ph.D. was created by publication, and the first article I had published was a literature review on the concept of reflection within ECTE in Norway (Moxnes 2016). This article was written early in the project period, and I did not feel confident at that time to critique the dominance or privilege of male voices in the ECTE discourse arena. I simply scattered a few small traces of suggestion here and there that the

literature was heavily informed by only a few theorists. However, now that I reopen these small traces within the review and use a feminism lens looking for difference, air and sun flow on and around the curiosity, I seek to sew the seed of curiosity or difference some more.

Revisiting Data, a Search for Feminism in Reflection

When analysing the literature in my area of research, I initially used the Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) four steps review process. Step 1: Identify and retrieve literature, step 2: Review and analyse the literature, step 3: Synthesis: write the review, and step 4: Develop the conceptual framework (Bloomberg and Volpe 2012, p. 79). As part of step two, Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) propose an investigation of the foundational theories on which the review text builds. I therefore followed this proposition and listed the theoretical sources identified in each text. The review text-materials were all published between 2010 and 2015 and consisted of 111 academic articles and chapters from textbooks. Fifty-four of the sources are textbooks or articles representing ECTE in Norway, the remaining 57 represent research from all over the world. The literature therefore does not offer a full representative or complete picture of the discourses within ECTE, but seeks to simply highlight key concerns and ideas. All the 111 texts were deconstructed and details were categorised into main themes, in tables. I predominantly used American search engines complemented with research from Africa, Asia, Australia and Europe within educational and kindergarten-related journals accessed directly.

Re-examining the completed literature review a few years later offers opportunities for different perspectives to emerge, and here are my feelings and thoughts that emerged on my re-reading of my literature review.

First, as I re-examine my literature review I experience some unpleasant feelings of not being precise enough in my analysis or discussion, of missing out important details, of occasionally misinterpreting the data. A review is a 'test of your ability to manage the relevant texts and

materials' (Bloomberg and Volpe 2012, p. 74), and the fear of not being accurate enough became an obsession. After spending months or years categorising ideas or data into charts and re-checking the accuracy of content, I now, according to Bloomberg and Volpe (2012), should have a foundation for the development of clear arguments.

But on re-entering the research materials from the charts I find that many of the texts are reflected on and written about without the author(s) anchoring reflection in a theoretical frame(s). Yet in 58 of the texts, Schön and his concepts of 'reflection-in-action' and 'reflection-on-action' (1983, 1987) are discussed in 26 texts, Dewey's theoretical concerns (e.g. 1933) are mentioned in 22 of the papers/chapters (eight of which also reference Schon). In addition, Korthagen et al. (e.g. 2001, 2013) theories are referenced in 8 texts, van Manen (e.g. 1999) in 6, Vygotsky (e.g. 1978) in 4 and Säljö (e.g. 2006) in 2. Thus, theories developed by men have a dominant position in the discourse arena of ECTE. The only 'female' traces in the international text-materials consisted of two articles by Bayat (2010) and Cherrington and Loveridge (2014) reference to Elisabeth Davis's (2006) concept of 'productive reflection'. Yet further analysis of this trace shows that Davis's (2006) construct was presented as inspired by Dewey (1933) and Loughran (2002), and it was discussed that her construct of *effective reflection* was inspired by Dewey, Schön and Korthagen. All of whom are male. The other trace was Elizabeth Anne Kinsella and Gail Elizabeth Witheford (2009) used in one source—Lanas et al. (2015). So, even when women theorists are discussed, it is suggested that they build on and so to an extent are reliant on male theorists/theories.

In the Norwegian-based research in my selection (54 of the sources), as in much of the international research, Dewey and Schön frequently dominate the discourse and receive regular mention and citation. However, in the Norwegian materials, there were a few references to the Norwegian Professor Kari Søndenå (2002, 2004) and her concept of *powerful reflection*. Søndenå and her clear feminist perspective, which develops in reflection of concept inspired by Hanna Arendt (2013) and Simone de Beauvoir (1949/2000), is also featured. Søndenå's concept of *powerful reflection* posits that reflection might result in fundamental changes to professional practice. In research texts representing ECTE in the period of 2010–2015,

Søndenå is referenced in seven publications I reviewed. (Seven, out of 54 texts, written by Norwegian researchers, or textbook authors who focus their research in a Norwegian educational context.) In some of these texts, Søndenå is referred as one source, mentioned together with other theorists such as Solstad (2010), or is featured in literature reviews in Ph.D. works as e.g. in Steinnes (2014) and in Ødegård (2011). However, only a handful of texts from the selected period activate her concept. Thus, although the Norwegian literature on ECTE contains more references to female theorists, it has less reach and impact than the 'world' literature, and concepts developed by women are rarely employed.

As a woman-gatherer, I follow Haraway (2004, p. 127) by putting unexpected partners and irreducible details into my bag-lady bag. My 'bags' are PowerPoints, easy to glue Internet-links and other 'things' too. A photo in the bag attracts my attention. It contains an image of the Norwegian small salamander or water-salamander (*Lissotriton vulgaris*).

Water salamanders are 6- to 9-centimetre-long, brown back, yellowish belly, with dark spots. Small salamanders live in ponds often near populated areas. They are endangered due to new settlement, infrastructure and changes in agricultural traditions (the pond on the farm is no longer important, so it is drained, or filled up).

The photo of a salamander has followed me for some years now. It both entangles with and interrupts the intentions of writing a feminist thesis, and challenges me to think differently about what feminism is. Reading this together with a feminist lens and the reflection in ECTE creates a wonderment of the position of women and feminism in traditionally male-dominated discourse fields. It is difficult to build on the work of women when we know so little about it, when it is men's work that becomes the suggested platform for our new research. Feminism, for me, allows researchers to examine and make manifest 'difference', and the salamander in a review study also reflects differences. And reading my literature review again/differently makes me curious about whether female researchers engaging in traditional fields saturated with masculine-dominated discourses drown, or research differently, built on different lesser-known theories, and so become a threat—a threat that bleaches the masculine stain or fills up the reflection-drain with other disturbing concepts.

Other Disturbing Concepts

Going back to the data charts and Søndenå (2002) concept of powerful reflection, I consider again how this concept is critical to our understanding of reflection, as a traditional understanding of it in higher education, and the claims that it often mirrors and reinforces what is already known/ practised. Powerful reflection, Søndenå's (2002) contribution to the field, encourages a collective process. It is a concept within which new thoughts and ideas are encouraged, and where the objective is to break with established truths, conventions, and what is taken for granted. Like Søndenå, other female researchers often propose active or collective reflective concepts as critical reflection (Garvis and Lemon 2015; Ha 2014; Kolle et al. 2010; Solstad 2013) or reflexivity, which Kinsella (2012) argues is something that 'goes beyond reflection, to interrogate the very conditions under which knowledge claims are accepted and constructed, and it recognises the sociality of that process' (p. 45).

Critical reflection when described as a collective process is designed to disturb established beliefs (e.g. Åberg and Lenz Taguchi 2006; Kolle et al. 2010; Larsen 2015). Some researchers link critical reflection to the practical working-processes inspired by Reggio Emilia-pedagogy (e.g. Baker 2013; Garvis and Lemon 2015; Khales and Meier 2013). Others turn away from reflection and propose optical or physical concepts, such as *diffraction* instead of reflection (Barad 2003, 2007, 2014; Haraway 1997; Lenz Taguchi 2010, 2012; Moxnes and Osgood 2018), and/or *refraction* (Grüters 2011; Lafton 2016). Both refraction and diffraction, as a form of radical reflection, refer to other optics, describing behaviour from waves or particles from light. These concepts connect to thinking-processes that are more than just mirroring or producing more of the same (as reflection is claimed to do), as they challenge us to think differently and to focus upon differences.

Yet radically different and active processes of reflection, often promoted by females, seem to provoke significant criticism. For instance, Hostetler (2016) and Gur-Ze'ev et al. (2001) criticise these active reflective concepts as ideologies or ideas where explaining steps for reflection are more important than the thinking itself. Gur-Ze'ev et al. (2001)

go so far as to claim that 'they share a dangerous conception of "reflection"', and further proposes the promoted process is a 'repudiation of the ethical' (p. 103).

I reflect on this defence against feminist concepts filling up the salamander pond. Such attacks make a Ph.D. student anxious. If I use these concepts as a basis for my work, will I too be judged harshly and considered unethical? To enact feminist principles is risky. Undertaking a feminist Ph.D. study is a risk. It is time to reengage with the bag-lady-carrier-bag.

A Headless Woman Bag

> Feminists do kill joy in a certain sense: they disturb the very fantasy that happiness can be found in certain places. To kill a fantasy can still kill a feeling. It is not just that feminists might not be happily affected by the objects that are supposed to cause happiness but that their failure to be happy is read as sabotaging the happiness of others. (Ahmed 2010, p. 66)

To transcend or unsettle imposed academic expectations, conventions and structures, somehow risks sabotaging the happiness of others. Opening the carrier bag, a little wider, a post shared with me on Facebook pops up.

A woman who calls herself AJ+ asks '[h]ow many headless women have you seen in movie poster? (Hint: Probably a lot)'. AJ+ has collected photos of film posters from different categories of films. Here purpose with posting these photos of posters is to point to how the film industry make use of women as headless objects: (https://www.facebook.com/ajplusenglish/videos/1162569753884530/).

Action movies, crime movies, phantasy, science fiction, gangster, comedy, western movies, – even movies where children are the target audience – use headless women on their film posters. Seeing all these headless women has become an affective embodied experience. These headless women inspire critique of active reflective concepts that goes deeper than just academics criticising each other.

According to van der Tuin (2014, p. 106) feminism works as a 'project for changing the parameters of recognition that have lured so many Western scholars into falsely opposing dogmatic thought'. Feminists move to change the 'parameters of recognition' through concepts such as critical reflection, reflexivity, powerful reflection, diffraction and other concepts calling for alternative perspectives and change. These concepts push thought forwards. They challenge, bend or split beliefs, and challenge established concepts. Just as AJ+ does, by just showing film posters of decapitated women, reminds me of how easy parameters of recognition work, to blindfold. We often don't see what we are shown as the images/ideas are so commonplace, so regular, and made so ordinary. Dogmatic ideas about how to reflect can also blindfold us, unless we are made aware of the blindfold. A handful of academics' suggestions direct us to reflection in ECTE. Can AJ+ or the salamander help to read it differently?

Risking being a killjoy, sabotaging others' happiness, I ask whether the use and privilege of concepts within academia are a form of sexism? Are some perspectives on reflection more real, cleverer or more authentic/better than others are? Yet criticism of new concepts developed by women keeps them and others outside of an academic society. Some academics divide researchers into groups, based on whether they write about reflection, reflexivity or diffraction, or those who use Schön or Dewey. Yet to me, the demarcations are feeble, as they all reflect the theories and patterns of behaviour promoted by white men.

'To kill a fantasy can still kill a feeling', writes Ahmed (2010, p. 66). I wonder if my ideas shared above kill feelings, kill joy, and will prevent me from continuing to work across/within/through academia. I worry that my feminist lens that turns my gaze to 'difference' and the lack of and the criticism of women scholars in the field of reflection in ECTE, will place me on the wrong side of academics' demarcations. Nevertheless – still the seeds gather in my lady bag-carrier bag…

Getting a Grip on It

Thomson and Kamler (2016) advise Ph.D. students to represent a contribution to knowledge where they show depth of knowledge and expertise, while showing awareness of the limitations of the work by making it 'sound unduly tentative' (Thomson and Kamler 2016, p. 198). This conflicts with my urge to shout out against the gendered (or even sexist) encouragement of male theories and theorists and criticism of women theories and theorists. How to be tentative, very, very tentative, at this? The concept of differences in reflection evokes reflection as a sensing and at the same, a power. *There is power involved in how scholars refer to others' work, as e.g. 26 (international and Norwegian) scholars cite Schön, compared to seven theorists who refer to Søndenå. How to state this as a tentative idea?*

Yet to weave stories together from things smaller than a mustard seed (Le Guin 1989, p. 169) must always be a tentative practice, not claimed as knowledge or expertise. Being a Ph.D. student brought me opportunities to let skilled senior researchers read parts of my project and give suggestions about how to proceed. Many of these researchers have written about reflection in higher education themselves, and who share their knowledge, and promote theories. I have respected and honoured their willingness to share. Me, a headless woman with a thesis that spreads in different directions, counting as a voice in an academic setting. Also, the killjoy-bag-lady putting a hand randomly into the bag picking up another story. A story from a research conference.

A friend, also a PhD student presents her research for an audience. She feels honoured since a well-known professor on her field pays her attention by attending her presentation. After, she gets very excited when he seeks her out in the crowd of people. Later she expresses her disappointments and anger, since the professor used the encounter to comment on her body-shape and the way she dressed. Not one comment on her work – or encouragement of her academic progress.

Deeper into the Feminist-Bag of ECTE

A glance into the history of ECTE in Norway can be a helpful prompt to rethink my literature review further. The history of ECTE can reveal a long feminist fight. Early Childhood Teacher Education, as a discipline, was founded in Norway in 1935 (Korsvold 2005, p. 135). In its establishment, and first many years of ECTE, it had clear female leadership. For the potential kindergarten student, the chance to become a teacher both helped to support the development of a professional identity, and affirmed one's gender (Korsvold 2005, p. 154). The criteria for applying to study Early Education excluded men, since typical female educational experience was expected at that time. Even an expert conference hosted in Paris in 1956 by UNESCO and WHO claimed that work as kindergarten teachers was not suitable for men (Korsvold 2005, p. 157). It was 1970 before the first man was accepted as a student teacher in ECTE in Norway. From the 1970s, theoretical knowledge, such as developmental psychology, gained greater weight than the expanse of women and family-related knowledge (Korsvold 2005, p. 159), and since then, the education syllabus reformed gradually and moved closer to academic traditions, into a Bachelor programme that Korsvold (2005, p. 158) describes as *male* coded.

   I wonder, then if reflection is also male-coded? Is reflection gendered? Can the salamander obstruct and, diffract the dominant narrative in order to create something different? The last salamander in the pond, becomes the first man in ECTE. The pond fills and female knowledge is overtaken by masculine knowledge – that is considered more 'real' and authentic. ECTE in Norway has changed as more young men enter the classroom (though still in the minority), there are discussions about how the syllabus and the profession will need to change to attract more men, and I am wondering why we have this discussion, and why we do not discuss how traditional male dominated syllabi needs change to attract more women).

   To 'gender' a concept such as reflection may not be sexist but the way it is promoted may be. The salamander is; opposite to men in ECTE, feminist is real and is threatened. Adopting the position of the salamander stimulates other perspectives on reflection, diffraction, reflexivity and powerful

reflection, it brings together all these smaller than mustard seeds as materials or players in my bag lady bag. I continue into Le Guin's (1989) world of small items, wondering about female produced theories and the position of what is threatening about female-focused knowledge in academia. Why replace women-focused knowledge with male-dominated discourses and theories? Together the salamander and environmental changes force the need to think/be differently. Established academic structures can be rethought/remade and a bag lady lens can help to identify the need to transcend or unsettle male favoured academic structures, to make space for differences.

Writing Across/Within/Through Academic Demands

As a Master's student, my tutor gave me the following advice: 'When you are working on your PhD—do as they say! Then after, you can do whatever you like'.

Engaging with feminism, reflection and differences has turned out to be an epistemological project; it challenges my ontological understanding of what it is to be in the world and what constitutes research. Being a Ph.D. student has been a formation into, and a dance with, organisational demands. Re-examining my Ph.D. literature review has prompted me to consider how it is possible to unsettle the masculine canon, and make space for differences. Applying other stories through the bag-lady metaphor has both helped me see differences from across/within/through traditional academic ways of doing a research project and recognise that applying bag-lady stories is a risky project, since the stories potentially kill others' joy (Ahmed 2010, 2017) or position the researcher on the outside. Nevertheless, the first stage of resisting sexism is identifying and exposing it, and finding other ways of seeing and knowing.

My carrier bags are working across/within/through reflection and teaching in early childhood teacher education (ECTE). My bags have the potential to be dangerous. They contain different stories, which joining others, create string figures of sexism and the need to dissent/resist/change the dominant masculine discourses in academia. They can kill joy or lead to places

where some may not want to go, or do not dare to go. They affect who writes, what is written, and who is cited in the writing. They also contain new ideas, and inspiration to go on – to go on – and to press the button and submit, to spread that mustard seed to be caught in others' shoes.

References

Åberg, A., & Lenz Taguchi, H. (2006). *Lyttende pedagogikk* [Listening pedagogy]. Oslo, Norway: Universitetsforlaget.

Ahmed, S. (2010). *The promise of happiness*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Arendt, H. (2013). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Baker, F. S. (2013). Shifting sands in the United Arab Emirates: Effecting conceptual change for creativity in early childhood teacher education. *Teacher Development, 17*(1), 72–91.

Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 28*(3), 801–831.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Barad, K. (2014). Diffracting diffraction: Cutting together-apart. *Parallax, 20*(3), 168–187.

Bayat, M. (2010). Use of dialogue journals and video-recording in early childhood teacher education. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education, 31*(2), 159–172.

Bloomberg, L. D., & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation. A road map from beginning to end*. London, UK: Sage.

Cherrington, S., & Loveridge, J. (2014). Using video to promote early childhood teachers' thinking and reflection. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 41,* 42–51.

Davis, E. A. (2006). Characterizing productive reflection among preservice elementary teachers: Seeing what matters. *Teaching & Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies, 22*(3), 281–301.

de Beauvoir, S. (1949/2000). *Det annet kjønn* [The Second Gender]. Oslo, Norway: Pax Forlag.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. New York, NY: Dover.

Dolphijn, R., & Van der Tuin, I. (2012). *New materialism: Interviews & cartographies*. Ann Arbor, MI: Open Humanities Press.

Garvis, S., & Lemon, N. (2015). Enhancing the Australian early childhood teacher education curriculum about very young children. *Early Child Development and Care, 185*(4), 549–563.

Grebowicz, M., & Merrick, H. (2013). *Beyond the cyborg: Adventures with Donna Haraway*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Grüters, R. (2011). *Refleksjon i blogg: En hermeneutisk studie av refleksjon og dens tekstlige og retoriske manifestasjoner i en ny type skrive- og arkiveringsteknologi* [Reflection in blog: A hermeneutic study of reflection and its textual and rhetorical manifestations in a new type of writing and archiving technology] (Doctoral dissertation). Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway. https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/handle/11250/244000. Last accessed August 2018.

Gur-Ze'ev, I., Masschelein, J., & Blake, N. (2001). Reflectivity, reflection, and counter-education. *An International Journal, 20*(2), 93–106.

Ha, Y. L. (2014). Who's the teacher? Who's the learner? Professional growth and development of a novice teacher in Hong Kong. *Childhood Education, 90*(1), 43–53.

Haraway, D. J. (1997). *Modest_Witness@ Second_Millennium. FemaleMan©_ Meets_OncoMouse^TM: Feminism and technoscience*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Haraway, D. J. (2004). *The Haraway reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hohti, R. (2018). Siiri and the 'Bag Lady'. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology, 9*(1 special issue), 6–16.

Hostetler, K. D. (2016). Beyond reflection: Perception, virtue, and teacher knowledge. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 48*(2), 179–190.

Khales, B., & Meier, D. (2013). Toward a new way of learning—Promoting inquiry and reflection in Palestinian early childhood teacher education. *The New Educator, 9*(4), 287–303.

Kinsella, E. A. (2012). Practitioner reflection and judgement as phronesis: A continuum of reflection and considerations for phronetic judgement. In E. A. Kinsella & A. Pitman (Eds.), *Phronesis as professional knowledge. Practical wisdom in the profession* (pp. 35–52). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.

Kinsella, E. A., & Whiteford, G. E. (2009). Knowledge generation and uti-lisation in occupational therapy: Towards epistemic reflexivity. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal, 56*(4), 249–258.

Kolle, T., Larsen, A. S., & Ulla, B. (2010). *Pedagogisk dokumentasjon* [Pedagogical documentation]. Bergen, Norway: Fagbokforlaget.

Korsvold, T. (2005). *For alle barn. Barnehagens framvekst i velferdsstaten* [For all children. The emergence of kindergartens in the welfare state] (2nd ed.). Oslo, Norway: Abstrakt Forlag.

Korthagen, F., Kessels, J., Koster, B., Lagerwerf, B., & Wubbels, T. (2001). *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Korthagen, F., Kim, Y. M., & Greene, W. L. (2013). *Teaching and learning from within: A core reflection approach to quality and inspiration in education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lafton, T. (2016). *Refleksjoner og handlinger i barnehagens møter med teknologi. Sosio-materielle teorier som optikk for (re) konstruksjoner av barnehageprak-siser* [Reflections and interactions with technology at kindergarten meetings with technology. Socio-material theories as optics for (re) constructions of kindergarten practices] (Doctoral dissertation). University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway. https://www.duo.uio.no/handle/10852/51209. Last accessed August 2018.

Lanas, M., Rautio, P., Koskela, A., Kinnunen, S., Viljamaa, E., & Juutinen, J. (2015). Engaging with theoretical diffraction in teacher education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 38*(4), 1–12.

Larsen, A. S. (2015). *Forstyrrelsers paradoksale kraft. En studie av hvordan forsty-rrelser kan virke produktivt i pedagogisk arbeid i barnehagen* [Paradoxical power of disturbances: A study of how disturbance might work productively in pedagogical work in kindergarten] (Doctoral dissertation). Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway. https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/handle/11250/300773. Last accessed August 2018.

Le Guin, U. (1989). *Dancing at the edge of the world*. London, UK: Victor Gollancz.

Lenz Taguchi, H. (2010). *Going beyond the theory/practice divide in early child-hood education*. London, UK: Routledge.

Lenz Taguchi, H. (2012). A diffractive and Deleuzian approach to analysing interview data. *Feminist Theory, 13*(3), 265–281.

Lenz Taguchi, H., & Palmer, A. (2013). A more 'livable' school? A diffractive analysis of the performative enactments of girls' ill-/well-being with(in) school environments. *Gender and Education, 25*(6), 671–687.

Loughran, J. J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(1), 33–43.

MacLure, M. (2013a). Researching without representation? Language and materiality in post-qualitative methodology. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 26*(6), 658–667.

MacLure, M. (2013b). The wonder of data. *Cultural Studies—Critical Methodologies, 13*(4), 228–232.

Moxnes, A. R. (2016). Refleksjon i barnehagelærerutdanningen [Reflection in early childhood teacher education]. *Journal of Nordic Early Childhood Education Research, 12*(7), 1–13.

Moxnes, A. R., & Osgood, J. (2018). Sticky stories from the classroom: From reflection to diffraction in early childhood teacher education. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 19*(3), 1–13.

Ødegård, E. (2011). *Nyutdannede pedagogiske lederes mestring og approppriering av barnehagens kulturelle redskaper* [Newly educated educational leaders' management and appropriation of cultural tools in kindergartens]. Oslo, Norway: Unipub Forlaget.

Osgood, J., & Giugni, R. R. S. M. (2015). Putting posthumanist theory to work to reconfigure gender in early childhood: When theory becomes method becomes art. *Global Studies of Childhood, 5*(3), 346–360.

Palmer, A. (2011). 'How many sums can I do'?: Performative strategies and diffractive thinking as methodological tools for rethinking mathematical subjectivity. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology (RERM), 1*(1), 3–18.

Säljö, R. (2006). *Læring og kulturelle redskaper* [Learning and cultural tools]. Oslo, Norway: Cappelen Akademiske Forlag.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Solstad, A. G. (2010). Praksisnær teori og teorinær praksis – den nødvendige relasjonen [Practical theory and theoretical practice—The necessary relationship]. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift, 94*(3), 203–218.

Solstad, A. G. (2013). Profesjonsorientert refleksjon i praksisopplæringen – en utfordring for lærerutdanningen [Job-oriented reflection in practice training—A challenge for teacher education]. *Norsk Pedagogisk Tidsskrift, 97*(2), 97–108.

Søndenå, K. (2002). *Tradisjon og transcendens: ein fenomenologisk studie av refleksjon i norsk førskulelærarutdanning* [Tradition and transcendence: A phenomenological study of reflection on Norwegian pre-school teacher education] (Vol. 175). Gothenburg, Sweden: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Søndenå, K. (2004). *Kraftfull refleksjon i lærarutdanninga* [Powerful reflections on teacher education]. Oslo, Norway: Abstrakt Forlag.

Steinnes, G. S. (2014). *A study of preschool teachers in mastery of roles, in qualifications for the profession and division of labor with assistants* (Doctoral dissertation). Oslo and Akesrhus University College, Oslo, Norway. https://oda.hioa.no/nb/profesjonalitet-under-press-ein-studie-av-forskulelaerarar-si-meistring-av-rolla-i-lys-av-kvalifiseringa-til-yrket-og-arbeidsdelinga-med-assistentane. Last accessed August 2018.

St. Pierre, E. A. (2016). Rethinking the empirical in the posthuman. In C. A. Taylor & C. Hughes (Eds.), *Posthuman research practices in education* (pp. 25–36). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

St. Pierre, E. A., Jackson, A. Y., & Mazzei, L. A. (2016). New empiricisms and new materialisms: Conditions for new inquiry. *Cultural Studies—Critical Methodologies, 16*(2), 99–110.

Taylor, C. A. (2017). Rethinking the empirical in higher education: Post-qualitative inquiry as a less comfortable social science. *International Journal of Research & Method in Education, 40*(3), 311–324.

Thomson, P., & Kamler, B. (2016). *Detox your writing: Strategies for doctoral researchers*. London and New York: Routledge.

van der Tuin, I. (2014). *Generational feminism: New materialist introduction to a generative approach*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

van Manen, M. (1999). Knowledge, reflection and complexity in teacher practice. In M. Lang, J. Olson, H. Hansen, & W. Bünder (Eds.), *Changing schools/changing practices: Perspectives on educational reform and teacher professionalism* (pp. 65–76). ISER, international series on educational renewal. Louvain, Belgium: Garant Publishers.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Part IV

Case Studies of Women Collectives Which Expose, Satirise and Subvert Sexism in the Academy

15

Punk Feminism and #FEAS: A Low-Brow Protest of Academic Sexism

Mindy Blaise, Linda Knight and Emily Gray

Introduction

Contemporary times are characterized by a global rise of populist conservatism that has consciously targeted specific groups of people: racial and ethnic minorities, LGBTIQ people and women. This populist rise has, however, also precipitated resistance. For instance, in response to the then Presidential hopeful Donald Trump's comments about the right he felt to freely grab women's genitals, the Pussyhat Project™ (n.d.) was born.

M. Blaise (✉)
Edith Cowan University, Mt Lawley, WA, Australia
e-mail: m.blaise@ecu.edu.au

L. Knight
Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, QLD, Australia

E. Gray
Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology, Melbourne, QLD, Australia

People around the world knitted pink pussyhats and wore them to anti-Trump Women's Marches across the globe. There is also Columbia University artist Emma Sulkowicz's feminist endurance protest *Mattress Performance (Carry that Weight)*. Female students carried a 23 kg mattress around campus from September 2014 through to graduation ceremony in May 2015 to protest campus sexual assault and the administration's handling of this case (*Columbia Daily Spectator* 2014). Such protests echo the punk movement of the 1970s which set out to challenge the establishment, but through dress, music and a do-it-yourself ethos. The punk mentality shaped, in part, responses to the relentless discrimination that women musicians were experiencing during the 1990s when the Riot Grrrl movement created a punk-feminist subversive community that encouraged women to resist sexism and to explore radically different ways of being women musicians (Downes 2012).

In this chapter, we reflect on several arts-based 'pop-up' interventions that were created and performed at educational conferences by #FEAS Feminist Educators Against Sexism, a feminist collective that was founded in Australia in 2016 that has international reach. The interventions under discussion here aimed at protesting the everyday sexism that women face in the university workplace. We make connections between these interventions and with a feminist punk ethos and a DIY attitude that characterized the 1990s feminist punk music scene. In doing so, we are able to see traces of punk feminism in #FEAS interventions and argue they provide an important mode to mobilize and connect feminists to resist sexism in the academy.

The chapter begins by introducing the 'problem' of everyday academic sexism and the role #FEAS plays in addressing it by building a feminist collective. We then discuss punk and the role that a feminist punk ethos and DIY attitude played in this subversive movement. By bringing together a series of personal feminist punk memories, research about feminist punk practices, and examples of arts-based 'pop-up' interventions, we explore how *visual symbols* and *ugly* were used by young punk protestors in the past to develop and employ the tactics to effectively challenge sexism they experienced in the music industry. Interestingly, we realize that these practices are useful to irreverently respond to the working lives of many academics today. Inspired

by these feisty feminist punks, we draw from their feminist punk ethos and DIY attitude to make links with the present protesting work of #FEAS. We contend that there is much to learn from how feminist punks built a subculture within the punk music scene to protest sexism while building an international collective. The chapter concludes by discussing the usefulness of a feminist punk ethos and DIY attitude for both protesting sexism and generating a much-needed feminist collective in current times.

Introducing the Problem

Universities are complex working environments for women across disciplines, academic levels, age groups, and social identities. Glenda Strachan and colleagues' (2016) report, *Women, Careers, and Universities: Where to from Here*?, analysed the gendered nature of employment, working conditions, and career patterns of university staff at Australian universities. This report, like other studies (Barrett and Barrett 2013; Morley 2006), details how women's disadvantage within the academy is complex and multifaceted, and how various forces are at work that prevent career advancement. For example, a recent survey of sexual and gender-based discrimination and abuse in Australian academia (AWHN 2018) found that 66% of respondents experienced sexual or gender-based discrimination in their workplace. Men belittling, marginalizing, and colluding against female colleagues were common patterns of discrimination. Respondents also described uneven workloads between genders, with the expectation that women would carry out more teaching and service than their male colleagues. Such inequitable practices go unrecognized and prevent research productivity. It is these forces, which are made up of a combination of structural and everyday sexism that prevents all kinds of women from succeeding in the academy. For instance, when meetings and events are held in the early morning, late afternoon, or evenings women who are often the primary caregivers of children in their households are faced with the extra labour of sourcing care arrangements or not attending because children need to be dropped-off, picked-up, and cared for. Not

being able to attend meetings, or unable to go to international conferences, means that mothers and caregivers are not fully participating in work-related activities that get their ideas and research noticed. They are then overlooked, not invited to serve on subcommittees and working groups, not invited onto research teams, or not nominated for key roles that help them in promotion.

Although universities across the globe have actively promoted formal programmes, strategies, and policies aimed specifically at women to address some of the discrimination they face, such as learning how to write 'assertive' promotion applications, the statistics clearly show that this is not working. According to Strachan et al. (2016),

> vertical segregation by gender remains in Australian universities, with women disproportionately represented at the lower levels and men disproportionately represented at the higher levels of both academic and professional staff. (p. 9)

This report also reminds us that because of the complexity and varied workforce in universities, '…there is no single policy change that can be nominated to "fix" gender inequity' (p. 8). Instead of advocating for 'more training' or formal leadership programmes to address gender equity in higher educational workplaces, we argue that radically different tactics are required for challenging everyday academic sexism and for producing a strong feminist collective that enables and supports such actions. Paying attention to a feminist punk ethos and DIY attitude is useful for building and strengthening the #FEAS creative approach to resisting academic sexisms and are useful for building and maintaining a strong feminist collective.

The Feminist Collective

#FEAS are an Australian-based international feminist collective committed to interrupting, resisting, and protesting sexism in educational spaces. #FEAS was founded in 2016 by Mindy Blaise, Emily Gray, and Linda Knight. As a collective, we draw on our experiences of everyday

academic sexisms as well as Linda's identity and history as a feminist punk. The personal narratives that we draw upon throughout this chapter are a feminist performative practice in itself because it is an active demonstration that the 'personal is political' (Behar 1996). Similar to the methods used throughout feminist autoethnographies, autobiographies, and narrative inquiries, Linda's personal reflections are used as a method of being, knowing, and doing that highlights her experiences as a young working-class woman with power and politics. These reflections then help us to connect this personal knowledge, with feminist punk research and #FEAS interventions.

> I became a punk at the age of 12, during my final year of primary school. I asked my mother to cut off all my long blond hair and dye it red, and to buy me a pair of pvc trousers and knit me a mohair sweater. My mother did what I asked. My mother was a crucial feminist agent, assisting me to develop my own feminist punk identity.

Feminist Agents

Feminist agents are necessary for activating and supporting all forms of resistance. In 2016, we were awarded a Strategic Initiative Grant from the Australian Association for Research in Education (AARE), the national professional organization for educational research in Australia. This grant funded the project, *Developing arts-based interventions into sexism in the academy*. It assisted us to develop a project that productively and creatively responded to the current research about women[1] working in higher education.[2] It did this by engaging with and mobilizing the experiences of women who work within the broad discipline of education at the university level. The project consisted of workshops with women of the association and the development of three arts-based 'pop-up' interventions that we performed at the annual AARE national conference. These pop-ups included sexist/anti-sexist BINGO, stand-up comedy, and #FEAS merchandise (see Gray et al. 2018, for a complete theoretical and practical overview of why and how the interventions were created and performed). Not only did the 'pop-ups' aim to challenge everyday academic sexism, but they simultaneously produced a feminist collective.

During the workshops, several participants showed interest in performing some of the interventions, but as Early Career Researchers they felt nervous about being singled out or identified with the group. Conscious of these feelings of uncertainty, we ensured that there were various ways participants could be involved with different levels of engagement and anonymity. For instance, women's experiences of sexism in the university that were turned into one-liners for the stand-up comedy were anonymized, participants could discreetly place #FEAS business cards on conference seats or hand them out to delegates, or they could support a colleague by attending their presentation and asking the first (and 'real') question during discussion time.

Similar to the ways in which Linda's mother was a feminist agent for activating and supporting her feminist punk identity, AARE was our initial feminist agent because the funding made this project possible. In addition, #FEAS became a feminist agent for Early Career Researchers and other academics who feel unwelcome or uncomfortable in the academy because they quickly became part of a growing feminist collective and the interventions provided opportunities for them to contribute in various ways and belong.

An original aim of the project was to build a feminist network across Australia. To do this protest work, we needed to generate a collective and collateral group. #FEAS are a collective because we work across academic levels, disciplines, experiences, and countries. Members assist each other through an assortment of mentoring and collaborations. This in turn develops collateral with which to better negotiate the systems in which we work. We wanted to build a community and to network, but on our own terms. That is, we were not interested in replicating the mainstream programmes that are offered at universities in the form of grant writing workshops, or women in leadership courses. Instead, something different was needed. Sexism was the hinging and circumstantial factor. Deploying a series of arts-based pop-ups, that were developed collaboratively and from the ground up, not only raised awareness of everyday academic sexism, but also played a role towards generating a collective.

One way in which we deliberately tried to build the collective was through the use of social media. During the conference, we created a Twitter account (@FEASproject) and used it to highlight the work

and achievements of #FEAS members, especially the Early Career Researchers. For instance, photos were taken of members wearing #FEAS T-shirts during the conference and tweeted; tweets of women receiving awards for best dissertation or best paper were highlighted and congratulated; paper presentations by Early Career Researchers were sought out and content and questions that the research raised about gender were tweeted. Rather than using social media as a platform to promote our scholarship, we were using it to boast about others' achievements, build new networks, and create a supportive space for women academics. Social media allowed us to communicate to a wider audience and show that women academics were smart, clever, and capable of conducting high-quality and rigorous research. Our strategies were effective, however their careful planning and collective operation purposefully challenged the idea that successful women academics were somehow just 'lucky' (Diezmann and Grieshaber, in press) in being given a chance opportunity to further their career. We aimed to make a public comment on the vital role that mutually collective work plays in one's academic career progression. It did not take long for participants to follow suit and start highlighting other women's participation and achievements at the conference. The collective #FEAS was building.

What Is Punk?

Punk is most often defined as a musical genre that developed in the mid-1970s, first as a form of 'proto-punk' in the USA and then further advanced in the UK. We recognize that there are several punk styles (i.e. hard-core punk, glam punk, pop punk), and that punk scenes emerged around the globe (i.e. Australia, Sweden, Japan) in particular ways. Although the USA and UK punk scenes were emerging in large numbers in the mid-1970s, rejecting the excesses of mainstream rock music, they came into being for slightly different reasons. In the USA, punk grew from garage bands that young people in the suburbs created out of boredom. For these groups, punk was an attack on the dullness that capitalism produces for young people. Instead of

taking part in capitalism through consumption, young people created garage bands. With a DIY attitude, these were formed from the ground up, with members often teaching themselves how to play the instruments.

Drawing from Linda's history as a UK feminist punk, we illustrate how the punk music scene is much more than lyrics, performances, and dress. Rather, all styles of punk share a philosophy of protest and defiance, and work towards social change (Kristianson et al. 2010).

> In the UK, punk emerged through a disenfranchised working class youth who had grown up amid the dismal working conditions and mass strikes of the 1970's. Rather than join the teddy boy/girl subculture of the 1950's, punks rejected melodic rock 'n' roll for a style of music that screamed out its frustration with the unfairness of being poor and at the bottom end of a rigid class system. In my hometown, as a child I remember seeing groups of these young people hanging around the city centre and being mesmerized by them, by their striking appearance and their powerful impact on others. Without doing much more than standing around, these early punks made their resistance politics and their protest very clear: we refuse to be good, we refuse to fit in, we refuse to adopt the expectations society has for us.

Similar to what was happening in the UK, where punk was a reaction to the contradictions inherent of the British class system, #FEAS is also reacting to the contradictions inherent in the university workplace, namely everyday academic sexism. It is common for women, and especially women of colour, Indigenous women, queer women, working-class women, etc., to feel disenfranchised in higher education (Reay 2001; Thiel 2016) because universities have evolved from the Enlightenment era and its rational, empirically minded male subject (Moreton-Robinson 2004). Punk, on the other hand, stands for a set of identifiable attitudes, most notably a class-based politics of refusal and a belief in doing things yourself. This generative politics captures our dissatisfaction with the mainstream leadership programmes for women in universities and offers a collective approach to working. A low-brow,

punk politics underpins the emergence and continued development of #FEAS as a collective, and DIY activist group inventing creative ways to resist everyday academic sexism.

What Is a Feminist Punk Ethos?

Women have contributed to the world of music for a long time, including the punk music scene. Siouxsie Sioux and Patti Smith are often identified as two of the original female punks, who challenged the misogynist and patriarchal discourses of the punk music industry (Kennedy 2012).

> My punk music collection includes vinyl by Dirt, Crass, The Slits, Wendy Wu, Blondie, Penetration, L7, Hole, and many other women artists. However, my favorite female punks were Siouxsie Sioux (Siouxsie and the Banshees), Poly Styrene (X-Ray Specs), and Joy De Vivre and Eve Libertine (Crass). I was totally in awe of their raw, powerful voices and how they screamed and pushed the lyrics and melodies out of shape. I'd never heard women sing like this before! I tried to make my teenage voice sound like theirs, but I could never get even close. I also loved the presence they had, which was so defiant against the highly sexualised costumes and dances in pop and disco at that time. These women sang, behaved and curated their appearance to stick a big middle finger up to femininity and conformity, and it was amazing and wonderful.

Like the dominant punk music scene, feminist punk shares a philosophy of both defiance and social change. Although originating in the USA, the Riot Grrrl movement responded to the sexism that punk women musicians across the world were coming up against. A unique aspect of Riot Grrrl was their direct critique of gender power relations within the punk subcultures, and through feminism they opened up a politics for women to access and assert (Downes 2012). This is evident in Allison Wolfe's oral history about her experiences with Riot Grrrl culture when she shares:

> For me what riot grrrl meant was a way of making punk rock more fem-inist, because really it was like this boys' club for the most part. But [riot grrrl was] also a way of making academic feminism more punk rock or more DIY […] a lot of it with riot grrrl too was a reclamation of taboo imagery or things that were considered not feminist, but trying to reclaim those and say well actually girly can be feminist, lipstick and make-up people can be feminists, we can wear skirts and still be feminists. We can be cutesy and girly and whatever we want but we still should have rights and we still should be taken seriously. (Downes 2012, p. 211).

Allison's awareness about the boys' club is familiar in higher educa-tional contexts too, as research shows that women remain disadvantaged because of the male social networks that exist (Strachan et al. 2016). Riot Grrrl encouraged women to challenge gender power relations, het-erosexual masculinities, and male violence they were experiencing and opened up space to generate a collective subculture of resistance. Riot Grrrl attempted to confront conventional standards of gender and gen-der relations by provoking, politicizing, and resisting hetero-femininity (Downes 2012). Similarly, the work of #FEAS, especially the produc-tion of an international feminist collective, is also attempting to con-front a similar type of subculture within academia and is resisting the conventional male standards of work and success.

During our first foray as #FEAS at the 2016 AARE conference, we decided to create a closed Facebook site for members. It originally con-sisted of just us, Mindy, Linda, and Emily. Over the months it grew. Two years after our first interventions, the #FEAS Facebook site has grown to almost 800 members from around the world. It is a space for discussion, celebrating achievements, ranting, and reflecting upon significant moments such as the #MeToo movement. Such an inter-vention echoes Riot Grrrl music performances that set out to collec-tively challenge the gendered aspects of the performance in ways that build on a feminist punk ethos. They did this by making it explicit to the audience that they wanted young women and girls to partici-pate in their shows. Only girls and young women were allowed in the front rows and they were invited up on stage to play instruments.

In order to blur that distinction between audience and musicians further, Riot Grrrl would often jump down off the stage and play amongst the audience. These were all intentional strategies to collectively challenge gender power relations found within the single male artist relationship with passive female fans (Downes 2012). The ways in which we used social media, first through Twitter and then through the closed Facebook site, is a DIY example of how #FEAS sets into motion collective action and support.

DIY Attitude

A hallmark of punk is a DIY attitude. This was first seen in the ways in which punks would teach themselves how to play their instruments. Naomi Griffin (2012) writes about the potential of DIY punk to be empowering and resisting. The DIY aspect is of relevance to #FEAS work because, like those women in the DIY Punk scene, Emily and Mindy do not come to the project with any formal training in the arts. We deliberately create interventions so that participants don't have to be an artist to take part in creating and performing. The point is that we can do it ourselves, without relying on formal training. Griffin (2012) shows how some punk bands utilize the political potential of punk to challenge assumptions about gender within punk. We can do the same. That is, #FEAS interventions are a punk challenge that are performed within the higher education workplace, which has been shown to be hostile, discriminatory, and disengaging for women.

Feminist Punk Practices: Visual Symbols, Ugly, Communication

In order to explore the potentials of a feminist punk ethos and DIY attitude, two interrelated feminist punk practices; *visual symbols* and *ugly* will now be discussed.

Visual Symbols

For feminist punks, this collaborative movement is about defying stereotypical notions of what it means to be a female musician and resisting the gender power relations of male punk music subculture (Downes 2012) which espouse individual fame based on particular gender norms. Punk philosophy and identity extends beyond music; feminist punks defied the heteronormative, gendered dress and behaviour codes assigned to young women by wearing mismatching items of clothing that were ill-fitting, shapeless, ripped, and pinned together.

> My friends and I wore clothes sourced from charity shops. Our items of clothing, that we wore in various combinations included ex-army combat gear, dinner jackets, men's underwear such as string vests, sweaters full of holes, large boots, ripped fishnet stockings, cheap jewelry and motorbike jackets punched full of metal studs and painted with the names of our favorite bands. On the surface we looked like we had no taste, but these outfits were carefully constructed to critique the dominant and governing representatives of the establishment: the armed forces, the aristocracy, the men.

Using dress to subvert symbols of the establishment was a strategic tactic for young punk women to play with the ways their bodies and appearance are constantly interpreted and subjectified through the male gaze (Berger 1972). The highly codified items of clothing, taken out of context and worn by youth who were openly critical of the power structures they represent was also an effective way for young women to demonstrate and perform their political agency.

A key item of punk protest wear was the T-shirt. In addition to appropriating and subverting establishment clothing, first-wave punks used T-shirts as wearable billboards to promote punk bands and anarchist politics. #FEAS also use visual symbols to protest sexism by using statistical 'facts' on printed T-shirts. Drawing from research carried out by Strachan et al. (2016), which demonstrates how vertical segregation by gender is real for women in the academy, we created, sold, and wore

Fig. 15.1 The Pipeline Myth T-shirt (Author's photograph)

T-shirts with the facts regarding women's academic levels. According to the Australian Government Department of Education and Training, Selected Higher Education Statistics, over the course of a decade women's attainment of higher level positions had increased, but when compared to men inequities remain (as cited in Strachan et al. 2016, p. 22). According to these 'unpublished statistics' (p. 22), in 2011, 40% of women were at Level B; 22% at Level C; 14% at Level D; 7% at Level E (professor). T-shirts were created representing each academic level in Australia (see Fig. 15.1).

We were not explicit about the statistical 'fact', allowing conference delegates to draw their own inferences and use the T-shirts as a discussion point about the gendered division of labour in Australian universities rather than as a social scientific 'fact'. Each T-shirt was also accompanied with a curated card that explains the concept of what we have now called The Pipeline Myth T-shirt and reminds those wearing it that they might activate interest and possibly questions. We encouraged women to take this opportunity to explain the pipeline myth and how these statistics, which show that women are not moving through the pipeline from lecturer A to Professor, highlight a form of sexism.

By creating the T-shirts and then having a pop-up T-shirt stall where we sold T-shirts to the growing #FEAS collective reflects a DIY attitude. In the early evening, during conference drinks, we arrived with boxes of T-shirts and sold them to women who then wore them throughout the conference. This was a non-profit venture, and money made was used to fund the #FEAS website (see www.feministeducatorsagainstsexism. com). This intervention not only used visual symbols to protest sexism, but it created opportunities for women to practise telling stories of everyday sexism and why it matters to a range of audiences.

Ugly

One of the ways feminist punks resisted stereotypical ideals of femininity is evident through the ways in which they engaged with 'ugliness' (Eileraas 1997). Ugliness was invoked by deliberately behaving, looking, and acting in ways that are not considered conventionally nice, pretty, or stereotypically feminine. Girl punks mobilized several other sites of ugliness, including album cover art, voice, lyrics, and stage antics. This ugliness is much more than intentionally performing 'ugly', instead it is a strategy of resistance (Hole 1991, as cited by Eileraas 1997) and therefore has an anti-establishment attitude. Paying attention to and embodying ugliness illuminates the problematic status of the rebellious, irreverent, and unconventional woman throughout Western history (Eileraas 1997).

I regularly wore ripped stockings, garish face makeup, cheap jewelry, piercings, and dyed, spiked hair. My presentation of 'young woman' was a very enthusiastic rejection of any kind of gender norm and purposefully critiqued societal expectations to be a sweet, feminine, gentle, modest-but-available, attractive young woman.

As a young feminist punk, I guess I didn't look very 'nice'. My clothes either exposed too much or too little of my body, my hair was spiked on end and was often different colors, and my facial features were often distorted by dark make-up. I had piercings in my ears and nose. I received plenty of derisory commentary, insults, and invasive questions and judgements about my appearance. I have been jeered and spat on in the street, I

have been refused entry to places and on public transport, and my parents were asked not to bring me to social gatherings. I made a commitment during my youth to refuse to be the good, attractive girl and to perform the expectations piled on young women, and I was regularly reminded of the impact of that refusal through these vocal, social and gestural attacks.

Intentionally making themselves unattractive meant that feminist punks, like Linda, refused to perform the expectations of being a respectable 'good girl', obedient and pliable. Shaving their head or spiking their hair in tufts, wearing a safety pin through the nose, or mismatching clothes was to make their appearance shocking, and to cause shock in others. Punk subcultures gave Linda opportunities to explore gender boundaries and her own power, including anger and other 'unfeminine' acts. However, the sometimes extreme public and social reactions that Linda experienced exposes how difficult it was for her, and other young punk women, to rally against deeply entrenched ideas and expectations about gender.

Ugliness was mobilized across several #FEAS interventions, including the intentional timing and location of the pop-ups. For example, #FEAS chose to perform the pop-ups during morning and afternoon tea and lunchtime. This mobilizes 'ugly' because we were not following conference protocols. These informal breaks usually provide opportunities for socializing, making small talk, and exchanging business cards, not performing loud comedy about sexism, selling T-shirts, or handing out sexist/anti-sexist Bingo Cards. The pop-ups were therefore unattractive and non-compliant.

The stand-up comedy was deliberately not funny. It was designed to make audience members uncomfortable and was performed by Linda wearing a brash and loud gold lamé suit. Emily's embodiment of the 'feminist killjoy' also harnessed the ugly. By acting as a stoic door butch, unsmiling but activating canned laughter to accompany the one-liners that were based upon experiences of sexism in the academy, the comedy performance aimed to unsettle and to comment on the idea that women should be able to 'take a joke' when sexist comments are made. Like the feminist punks who deliberately were cutting and destroying the established image of femininity, this intervention is doing the same.

Fig. 15.2 Young, feminist, and defiant (Author's photograph)

Our pop-ups are intentionally loud and garish. They draw attention to sexism and inequity. By drawing attention to ourselves and the academic sexisms we face every day, we are no longer silent. Instead, we are wearing, speaking, and shouting about sexism (Fig. 15.2).

I was really young when I realised I was a punk, however it wasn't just a teenage phase. I am much older now, but I am still a punk, still living by the same ethos and still resisting the mainstream. My appearance is less shocking, but I am certainly not very conventional! It is easy to see that I am not your average middle-aged female academic.

I am really thankful of my punk heritage in offering generative, irreverent ways to support the #FEAS collective and how colleagues deal with the conditions of their working lives. The ethos of punk, to joyfully stick a finger up to discrimination and oppression and to those that wield it is what makes our #FEAS work so meaningful and so important. I see how punk feminism channels our feelings and ideas into these really creative and strident interventions, and it's utterly fantastic. Long live punk.

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated how a feminist punk, DIY ethos is deployed by #FEAS in order to challenge sexism in the academy in creative and subversive ways. Subversion is crucial during contemporary times in order to draw attention to the hypocrisy, discrimination, and sexism that characterizes them. We have demonstrated how Linda's punk history continues to shape the #FEAS project and how we reflect a punk mentality through our use of visual symbols and ugly. #FEAS intend to disrupt, to (re)produce affect in all of its uncomfortabilities, to highlight sexism in both formal and informal spaces. As such, '#FEAS are part of the rebellion, a rebellion with equality and justice at its heart. Here we assemble and find power in the collective' (Gray et al. 2018).

Notes

1. We use the term 'woman/women' as an inclusive strategy and to move away from essentialized notions of female/femininity/feminine to make room for transgender women in our project.
2. There is a large body of research including sexism, sexual harassment, barriers to promotion and success, casual employment, etc.

References

Australian Women's History Network (AWHN). (2018). *It destroyed my research career': Survey of sexual and gender-based discrimination and abuse in Australian Academia* (Research report). Australian Women's History Network. http://www.auswhn.org.au/awhn/sexual-gender-based-abuse-discrimination-academia-australia-survey/. Last accessed July 2018.

Barrett, P., & Barrett, L. (2013). *Project report: Promoting positive gender outcomes in higher education through active workload management.* Manchester, UK: University of Salford. http://pharmacyswan.qub.ac.uk/uploads/1/8/1/5/18158341/salford_gender_and_academic_workloads_report_2013.pdf/. Last accessed July 2018.

Behar, R. (1996). *The vulnerable observer: Anthropology that breaks the heart.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Berger, J. (1972). *Ways of seeing.* London, UK: Penguin Books.

Columbia Daily Spectator. (2014, September 2). Emma Sulkowicz: 'Carry that weight' [video file]. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l9hHZbuYVnU. Last accessed July 2018.

Diezmann, C. M., & Grieshaber, S. (in press). *Women professors: Who makes it and how?* Singapore: Springer.

Downes, J. (2012). The expansion of punk rock: Riot Grrrl challenges to gender power relations in British indie music subcultures. *Women's Studies, 41*(2), 204–237.

Eileraas, K. (1997). Witches, bitches, and fluids: Girl bands performing ugliness as resistance. *The Drama Review, 41*(3), 122–139.

Gray, E. M., Knight, L., & Blaise, M. (2018). Wearing, speaking and shouting about sexism: Developing arts-based interventions into sexism in the academy. *The Australian Educational Researcher.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s13384-018-0274-y. Last accessed July 2018.

Griffin, N. (2012). Gendered performance and performing gender in the DIY punk and hardcore music scene. *Journal of International Women's Studies, 13*(2), 66–81.

Kennedy, D. (2012). Afterword: From Patti Smith to Paramore. *Women's Studies, 41*(2), 238–244.

Kristiansen, L. J., Blaney, J. R., Chidester, P. J., & Simonds, B. K. (2010). *Screaming for change: Articulating a unifying philosophy of punk rock.* Lanham, MA: Lexington Books.

Moreton-Robinson, A. (2004). Whiteness, epistemology and indigenous representation. In A. Moreton-Robinson (Ed.), *Whitening race: Essays in social and cultural criticism* (pp. 75–88). Canberra, ACT: Aboriginal Studies Press.

Morley, L. (2006). Hidden transcripts: The micropolitics of gender. *Women's International Forum, 29*(6), 543–551.

Pussyhat Project™. (n.d.). *Our story.* https://www.pussyhatproject.com/our-story/. Last accessed July 2018.

Reay, D. (2001). Finding or losing yourself? Working-class relationships to education. *Journal of Education Policy, 16*(4), 333–346.

Strachan, G., Peetz, D., Whitehouse, G., Bailey, J., Broadbent, K., May, R., et al. (2016). *Women, careers and universities: Where to from here?* Brisbane, QLD: Centre for Work, Organisation and Wellbeing, Griffith University.

Thiel, J. J. (2016). Working-class women in academic spaces: Finding our muchness. *Gender and Education, 28*(5), 662–673.

16

Civic Engagement as Empowerment: Sharing Our Names and Remembering Our Her-Stories—Resisting Ofuniversity

The Women Who Write

Linda Henderson, Ali Black, Gail Crimmins and Janice K. Jones

Introduction

This chapter draws upon the dystopic narratives of survival and surrogacy in Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale* (1988). It is set against a global context of increasingly corporatised representations of the academy, where universities reward and promulgate positivist illusions of meritocracy, certainty, and productivity over the messy and complex experience of being human. And, where women's academic careers are impacted by years of contract work, probation, and academic theft.

L. Henderson
Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

A. Black · G. Crimmins (✉)
University of the Sunshine Coast, Maroochydore, QLD, Australia
e-mail: gcrimmin@usc.edu.au

J. K. Jones
Southern Queensland University, Toowoomba, VIC, Australia

Shaping our chapter as a script-like narrative of characters and scenarios based on our lived experiences, we use Atwood's novel and storylines from the television series to speak of and to hierarchical regimes inflected by patriarchal dominance. Determinedly rebellious, we reveal the 'below-stairs' reality of university business and carve a space for our lived experiences—re-positioning ourselves not as the public persona of academia, but as beings Ofearth, Ofourselves, and Ofeachother.

The television series of Atwood's novel *The Handmaid's Tale* (Atwood et al. 2017, 2018) is a dystopian story where society has been taken over by a fundamental regime. Women have no rights and are subservient to men. The Handmaids are fertile women tasked with breeding and supplying the regime with more children. As surrogates, they are both important and oppressed, ignored and overlooked. They are caught up in a network of surveillance and audit where their daily chores and worth are tied to their capacity for (re)production. Their ability to produce is their only value. Should they conceive, the babies the Handmaids give birth to are not regarded as theirs, but the Commander's and his wife's. Should the Handmaids not produce they will be sent to The Colonies.

The Handmaids are not meant to have an identity, to see or be seen, and they are forbidden to use their real names. Instead, they are given new names which consist of the word 'of'' coupled with the first name of their Commander. They must wear a particular uniform that reveals their status and hides their female bodies and their individuality. Their headwear disables their peripheral vision.

Ofuniversity also has its uniform and yokes which it drapes over shoulders to ensure allegiance and compliance. Too often, the design and markers of belonging are explicitly gendered, the lines and structures masculine. And with these markers, codes of behaviour, vows of silence:

The performance begins.

Opening Scene: Daring to Speak Our Names

> We learned to whisper almost without sound. In the semi-darkness we could stretch out our arms, when the Aunts weren't looking, and touch each other's hands across space. We learned to lip-read, our heads flat on the beds, turned sideways, watching each other's mouths. In this way we exchanged names, from bed to bed. Alma, Janine, Delores, Moira, June. (Atwood 1988, p. 4)

We are *The Women Who Write*, a collective of woman academics working/writing together to survive the ruthless academic machine. We are refusing to forget *our* names, our identities. With vulnerable stories, we are revealing 'hidden transcripts' and what occurs 'offstage' (Scott 1990, pp. 4, 13–14); those gendered affective assaults that women academics experience yet rarely voice. Here, though, we *are* speaking—back to the structures and strictures that try to determine our worth using a set of numbers that deidentify us and name us Ofuniversity. Together we stand to say: 'We are more-than' a number. 'We are more-than' a cog in the academic machine.

Scene One: Stories of Academic Surrogacy

> Give me children, or else I die. Am I in God's stead, who hath withheld from thee the fruit of the womb? Behold my maid Bilhah. She shall bear upon my knees, that I may also have children by her. (Atwood 1988, p. 88)

The academy makes women 'a producer of profit and a reproducer of power structures' (Kirby 1996, p. 105). We are caught up in the (re)production. We need to (re)produce to survive.

Handmaid One:

[She cares about her students and her creative work. This course is a creative conception of voice and viewpoint. But, the baby is swathed and passed to another.]

We were told academics did not 'own' courses, but this course carried my DNA, looked out at the world through my eyes, spoke with my tongue after seven years of creative rebirths. Students responded with visions of an imagined future and gave exceptionally positive evaluations. The course gained awards for innovation and teaching excellence.

*Almost midnight. I'm at my laptop finalising assessment rubrics a few days before the 'go live' date, when the course disappears off the screen. A technical glitch? Wrong. **My course has been given to a new male employee** 'to fill up his workload'. Senior management know the importance of this course to my application for promotion to Associate Professor.*

My appeals are rejected: it would be 'unfair' to this new member of staff to change his workload at 'this late stage'. 'If I like', I can provide 'reasons to be considered for examiner next year'.

My self-image – 'the creative academic'– peels back revealing a thing hunched in front of a laptop, serving the machine. When the university offers voluntary 'severance' I am one of many who apply. A line manager advises only 'a single sentence' is required: why I have no useful contribution to make to the university. There are no public announcements, no recognition of the years of labour. Names disappear off the email lists. The administrator comes to tick her checklist that I have not stolen any equipment. I shut down the computer, hand over keys, take my name plaque from the door and drop it in a rubbish bin as I walk away.

Handmaid Two:

[She created and developed the project to fruition. Her work is repossessed and renamed.]

Four years ago, on my own, I wrote a university grant to partner with four other universities. It was a seven-million-dollar project.

I got the grant.

Now, there is an opportunity for a high-profile step-up grant. I've led the project on my own to date (and without maternity cover when I gave birth to my daughter). Somehow, I've held my shit together. As I prepare to go for the step-up grant, I receive communication 'from the top' stating I 'may be named' on the application 'BUT' my 'senior male colleague' (who has not been involved in any way with the project to date) will be the 'Project Lead'.

On reviewing the grant documentation, **I see my name has been removed**.

It's hard to know whether the sacrifice to my maternity leave was worth it. There is no recognition I was the one who achieved the original funding status. The message is clear: A junior female staff member can take risks, not receive maternity cover, and go the extra mile to ensure a project's credibility. However, if she is successful, ***'her' project*** *will be* **taken away, and her words and name deleted***.*

Handmaid Three:

[She led the application process to recognise the collective work. She knew the pain of sacrificial labour.]

I was part of a team of five academics who worked together to design and deliver a large whole-of-university initiative. The Project Lead was a man, the four co-leads were women – yet, the reality was we all co-designed and co-coordinated the project. In recognition of the collaborative design and support for student learning, we were urged to write a national teaching award application. I took carriage of the application process – developing the application during a week of recreation leave. While colleagues contributed specific sections, I crafted the seven-page document. We decided to present our names alphabetically as co-designers of the project.

We were successful. The national award was received at Parliament House. When the announcement was made in the press and through intra-university communications, **the name of the male was listed first. My name was listed last***. The name-ordering listing no longer alphabetical.* **The male gained a promotion because of the award. The women did not***.*

These are secret stories of women's lived experience in recent past, told in ways to protect our existence. Like the Handmaids, we share them whilst wearing our Ofuniversity uniform. These stories of trauma, robbery, and renaming, whilst not uncommon, are generally not shared or made public. Many of us know the conditions of helplessness, rage, and fatigue that follow these types of abuse. Perhaps it is the utter shock and despair of being displaced as unwilling surrogates in reduced circumstances that creates a pressure for these stories to be told.

The stealing of work, the erasure of women's names and identities, is not merely used to support individual male academics' careers, but is deployed as a rationale for the disproportionate representation of women in the lower levels of academia, and the glut of male academics in senior positions (Grieshaber 2016). The perpetuated narrative: 'men are more productive than women'.

Scene Two: Stories of Supervision and Serving Time

> …this may not feel ordinary to you right now but after a time it will… this will become ordinary… (Atwood et al. 2017)

In the *Handmaid's Tale*, the central Handmaid, Offred/June, intends to be a survivor. Her survival is a serious, necessary business. Her public identity/performance as Handmaid is continuously precarious. As a 'new recruit', she must engage in the play and adhere to her role/part thoroughly and exhaustively. She must **(re)produce**. She hopes she is 'lucky'. She hopes she will be assigned to a fertile male so she can demonstrate 'her' fertility. Her fertility is being monitored. She is under surveillance. She is on probation.

  We recognise the personal risk of speaking up and speaking out. The risk feels even greater during short-term contacts and probation. We carry the risk, and the academy carries the power.

Handmaid Four:

['*Under his eye'*. She is on probation. Should she be retained? Is she in the long-term interests Ofuniversity? She moved universities. She had already met probation requirements, twice, but the move means probation all over again.]

> *It's my fault. I am forgetting too much. Tonight, I will say my prayers… for emptiness, so [I can be] worthy to be filled… with self-denial, semen and babies.* (Atwood 1988, p. 193)

I am finding it harder to recall my name.

It is my fault. For this is what I desired – to work in the Ofuniversity. I worked hard to get here. I sacrificed health, friends and family. Now, my family is broken and I do not know how to mend the shards. So, I return to what I know: the work of a Handmaid – the property Ofuniversity.

Numbers and outputs surround me, demanding my attention. They direct me in ways that insist I make myself count and demonstrate my ability to maintain long-term (re)production. ***I display obedience and piety. I demonstrate my fertility and productivity***.

I am learning that underneath this Handmaid's uniform is a life longing to escape. I dare to hope I may be worthy of being more-than just a surrogate. I am learning that my access to 'the master's tools' (Lorde 1984), can break open cracks and reveal this other life that is seeking to escape.

Returning to a previous Commander, I misguidedly think I have already proved my worth as his Handmaid and recognition will be mine. So, I write and ask for recognition for my continued years of faithful service, and for the probation period to end. I have already met the stipulations. Security is all I seek.

My request is considered an 'unnecessary' request – 'Why bother? You are fertile and meeting the work assigned to you – and, it would be considered suspicious by the regime. Continue your obedience – we appreciate your fertility and what it produces. In due course your outputs and your faithfulness will be rewarded'.

Handmaid Five:

[She (re)produced year after year, but it was never enough.]

I was on teaching-intensive-fixed-term-casual-contracts for five consecutive years, which contravened the university's legally-binding Enterprise Bargaining Agreement. I ought to have been employed on an ongoing contract. I spoke to my Union Representative. He agreed my casual employment contravened the law and he could, should I wish him to, develop a 'case against the university'. 'However,' he cautioned, a similar case had been taken against a university in another state several months prior, and although the court ruled in favor of the Union, the academic was made redundant shortly after the ruling. I sat with the injustice of this conundrum for months. To take a stand against my unlawful contract meant risking my livelihood, my (unstable) foothold in academia. ***I (ashamedly) stayed silent and carried on with my work, fully aware of my self-exploitation***.

Handmaid Six:

[She brought skills and expertise. They wanted her, but they didn't want to acknowledge her properly. She was both important and overlooked.]

I have been working in academia for decades, got my PhD in my first five years – a condition of probation. I have little to show in terms of status and position. Is it the breaks I took to be a mother? Or the time I gave to the care of my aging, dying parent?

I have moved to different universities/locations to support the financial/emotional/health needs of my family. My outputs have been consistent. I have achieved the standards and the requirements of probation three times – eleven years all up! This last move I had hoped to have my previous experience recognised, perhaps move 'up' a rung.

*I got offered the job but was told it was 'not possible' to be employed at the level I had achieved at the previous university. 'The rules', 'unfortunately', 'due to how the job was advertised'. 'But', I would be employed at the 'top of the lower band' (a band I had passed six years previous). 'And', I could go for 'promotion' quickly and return to the higher level. A few months later, an unsuccessful applicant for the job I won – a male – had a position created for him at the level I was told would/could not be advertised or made available. I guess they told the truth in that the senior role given to him was not advertised at all. The university rules meant I couldn't apply for 'promotion' until I had worked there for three years. I estimate a loss of $120K in income during this time. **I lost something of myself too, a sense of my own worth**. Perhaps I should have stayed where I was before? Stood my ground and risked unemployment? Or just grown a penis? As Offred/June says at the end of Episode Nine – 'Smart Power' (Series Two): 'Well fuck that!'*

The conditions described by the 'Academic Handmaids' in this chapter, are a feature of the neoliberal culture. Workloads are so heavy and expectations of productivity so high they can only be achieved by workers who have no relationships or responsibilities that might constrain

their productive capacities (Lynch 2010). This kind of ruthless culture breeds heightened competition, individualism, and 'care-less workers' (Lynch 2010). And, the manoeuvres of power are subtle. As Spooner (2015, p. 5) suggests: 'Sometimes the antagonist isn't wielding a gun. In this kind of attack, there is no person or event that can be met head-on with a protest or a strike. There is no explosion, no great conflict, no epic battle'.

When academic promotions/periods of probation are based on being leads on grant applications, recipients of national teaching awards, and producers of successful courses, names matter. When we serve our time but our names or achievements are erased and replaced by males and males' names, two things happen. First, we become unwilling surrogates. Second, the promotion of men in academia is cast as a meritocratic process (Grieshaber 2016). It's believed the reason there are more males than females in the Professoriate, is men legitimately fulfilled the criteria and women didn't (Mihăilă 2018).

It is important to speak the secrets of surrogacy, surveillance and serving time in academia and acknowledge the accompanying 'hidden injuries' (Gill 2009). It is time to question the forces that determine which scholarship is legitimised and which is delegitimised (Spooner 2015), *who* is legitimised, and *who* remains unnamed/delegitimised. It is time to disrupt the myths of academic meritocracy that abound, the legend that male academics are never barren.

Our storying together thus highlights how important it is to attend to our lived experiences, share these hidden transcripts and render them knowable and speak-able (Wright et al. 2017). This is activism. This is resistance. This is our research. Excavating and representing incidents of lived experience allows us to make manifest the structural patterns of gender discrimination experienced by women. Our experiences are not individual, one-off, unconnected happenings. They are part of a disturbingly broader picture of male power and privilege (Mihăilă 2018).

Scene Three: Stories Ofearth, Ofourselves, and Ofeachother

Atwood's Handmaids developed their own 'small acts of resistance' through such things as a posture, a gesture, a glance, a story, etchings on a door frame and handwritten letters. These enabled friendship, border crossing, and resilience. We see these aspects reflected in the narration of Offred/June as she reviews/relives past narratives and considers their place in her present. Her memories and observations draw on the sensual and the emotional. This narrating of self is a political act, an act of resistance and an exercise in survival, ethics, and intellect.

Central to the narrative (in *The Handmaid's Tale*) is the notion of voice. The Handmaid women speak and remember their names and stories of who they were/are. Their letter writing to and of each other is a form of camaraderie and retention of self. This resonates closely with *The Women Who Write*, in principle and practice. We speak across space and time, 'exchanging our names from bed to bed'. We are *Linda. Janice. Ali. Gail.*

Through sharing our vulnerabilities, our potencies and our will to survive, we are creating a care-full way of producing valid research that honours the voices of women in academe—research the master must count. And so, we write…

My name is Gail, and I am more-than:

My name is Gail. On the night I was born there was a huge storm and the midwife suggested my parents call me Gail, so they did. Some thirty years later on presenting my copy of Storm Damage to the poet Brian Patten to sign, he crossed out the title and wrote Gail Damage. Born in a storm, perhaps born to storm? So, Gail is my name and in this chapter, I speak of and in my name.

When John Proctor (the central character in the play 'The Crucible' by Arthur Miller) is asked to testify against another to save his own life he refuses; and when asked his reasons Proctor says, 'Because it is my name and I cannot have another'. When Antigone is asked to deny her brother in order to be saved, she refuses. Proctor's and Antigone's resolve remind me of the personal integrity and legacy of speaking one's name/truth, regardless of the consequences.

I have my name and I cannot have another.

I write my story as a her-story so it is not only the story of the 'Victors' that are heard, but the 'Victoria's and the Vanessa's' too. I write so I don't forget – amidst the spreadsheets of citation indices and student evaluation scores – that I am a woman born into a working-class family in South Wales, UK. I write to capture in social her-story my childhood home, a home that also periodically acted as a local election/political campaign headquarters. Many a time our home was crammed with leaflets, posters, placards, cigarette smoke, mugs of tea, over-full ashtrays, and people wearing 'Ban the bomb' badges on their jackets and hearts on their sleeves. Our hallway was stacked with plastic buckets emblazoned with 'Support the miners', boxes of canned food and cartons of long-life milk, and people calling day and night to organise collections or make donations. The large Anti-Apartheid poster that filled our front window signalled a Tardis of hope and activism.

I write to remember – and have remembered – the vitality of my dad (as he enters old-age physically tired, disabled by a stroke),

> *I write to remember days and evenings of my dad, sister and I sitting*
> *on the floor of the living room folding leaflet*
> *after leaflet*
> *after leaflet*
> *and placing them into piles for*
> *Cyfatha Street,*
>   *Treharris Street,*
>   *Arran Street,*
>   *Kincraig Street,*
>   *Upper Kincraig Street,*
>   *and*

then we three running up and down the streets delivering them.

My dad on one side of the road my sister and I on the other racing-each-other-to-see-who-could-finish-first. My dad always letting us win.

I write to remember beliefs beget action/s, and I must envision the change I want for the world – envisage how it should be, could be, must be, and move crumb by crumb towards it.

I write to break open a space in academia for women's beings, for my own being.

My name is Linda, and I am more-than:

Writing has always been my friend, a quiet confidante in whom I can trust. Its swirling affects arrive unannounced, reminding me of who I am.

I am a fragile, yet stubbornly strong woman, a mother, yet not a mother, a sister, yet not a sister, a daughter, yet not a daughter. In truth, I am only beginning to learn who I am. But I know my name and I am learning to speak this name. My name is Linda and I write.

Reaching back into my past I have always felt at home when connected to, and belonging with, Ofearth. As a young child, I sought the solitude Ofearth provided me. She held me in her motherly arms in an embrace otherwise unavailable. I learned to commune with the animals. Speaking their many languages, I joined in their songs. My heart would leap with joy as I fell into their worlds.

Listen to the laughing
The Laughing Kookaburras
Cackling laughter, hooting and chuckling
Inviting the world to enter their jubilant refrains
Unique, opening up space
Falling joyfully into this space
My Kookaburra laugh received
With playfulness,
Reciprocated and welcomed
Child Becoming-Kookaburra

Memories are vivid. I would walk up the mountain and climb up the trees. Higher and higher to sing with the Laughing Kookaburras. Reaching vantage points, finding escape. Solitude, yet never alone, always a cacophony of songs. Becoming-Kookaburra cracking open the binary world I was forced to inhabit as a child. Becoming-Kookaburra was a powerful entering of conversation with Ofearth. It was a moment – an event – of leaving behind the territory defining me as 'child' – invisible and silenced. Ofearth gently offering the protection and guidance this child sought.

In adulthood, Ofuniversity robbed me of my many languages. It told me how I had to write and what I could not write. Identified as a fertile Handmaid for Ofuniversity, I had to learn the rules of my Commander to survive.

Survival is important. But of late, I am learning that survival asks me to return and to recall my name and what it holds. It asks me to dwell with/in the deeply held knowledge and wisdom Ofearth shares with me.

Time – not that linear time of humans – but time that is cyclical, rhythmic and repetitive in the way Ofearth provides – has been generous. Patient. She has been waiting. Patiently waiting for my return. I find myself writing/walking with Ofearth. I walk gently, consciously, and deliberately upon her surface. She is, always has been, my teacher, my intimate, my holder of knowledge and beauty. I look to her for wisdom. She counsels me, nurtures me and heals me. In her healing embrace I recall who I am. I am Linda and I write.

And so, I am (re)(in)sisting the languages once stolen from me are returned. With this return, I am daring to share her-stories in my name. Stories that show there is more to me than my quantification as a Handmaiden. I am speaking-back and writing-back to Ofuniversity with my body. I am writing about messy complex things that matter: AIDS, death, motherhood, sisterhood, relational spaces. I am coming together with woman I know and love; writing with them joyfully, playfully, experimentally; engaging in the creation/generation of a 'feminist shelter' (Ahmed 2015) in which to (re)(in)sist that I/you/we am/are more-than. I am Linda and I write.

My name is Ali, and I am more-than:

It is Monday morning. I awake to a new day and feel grateful for my life. The weekend has been spent with my children and I had time to read and relax in amongst the chaos and energy of family gatherings where we celebrated my father-in-law's 90th birthday. I have been thinking a lot about life, legacy, privilege, family, sustainability, health and hope. Last night as I settled into bed I felt the fear I sometimes feel – this life is fleeting, this life is short, this life is precious, it will soon be over.

On this new day, my cat jumps up on the bed to greet me, he rubs his forehead into mine, purring, and demanding affection which I happily give him. My husband has brought me a hot cup of tea and we talk softly about the weekend and hold each other's hand. I enjoy the warmth I feel, in my hands and heart and in my home. This day begins slowly. I have time to sit on my daughter's bed and embrace her. She is a teenager, and these moments don't avail themselves as often as they once did. I savour these moments.

In the last years, I have become more conscious about the work/life I am constructing. I want to bring my attention to what matters: To gestures, kind words, touch. I want to listen to my body and my feminine cycles and seasons. I have experienced the dis-ease of overwork in the academy, of competition, of distraction, of not listening to my inner compass.

Now I am more deliberate, more intentional. I still get stressed. My work is always demanding something of me. It will never be done. I see my psychologist once a month, a safety net. No longer on anti-depressants, I pay closer attention to what I am feeling. When I notice the ache in my neck and shoulders, and the sense of overwhelm creeping up my throat, I try to course-correct and practice self-care.

I choose to work with people I like and on projects I like. I like that I hear myself say 'no thanks' when this criterion is not met. I follow meaning and peace and interest and connection. My work/life feels different as a result.

I make time for a walk on the beach before my workday begins. A few years back, I couldn't seem to find a way to include exercise, nature and beauty into my working week. All I did was work. My Ofearth walking connects me to something bigger, to wonder and majesty. I love how my senses expand as I connect with the elements, the sand, the waves, the foam, the clouds, the birds, the dogs, the breeze. I return grounded, connected, even more awake to the preciousness and beauty of life. I want/walk/write to stay awake.

These women with whom I write connect me to hope, aliveness, and authenticity. With our projects and our writing, we are purposefully sharing our lived experiences and we are remembering who we are. We are beings Ofearth, Ofourselves, and Ofeachother.

My name is Janice, and I am more-than:

I sit with my 91-year old mother in the afternoon sun, sharing stories, surrounded by the potted plants she tends with caring hands. The hands and arms that held me as an infant, now almost transparent, her veins a roadmap of life. My first teacher.

A breath, a pause. We are both temporary. I have travelled back across the world to spend time with my mother, my daughter and her children. Since forever, my mind is not distracted by work: no more courses to write, deadlines

to meet, projects jostling for time and energy. It is time to sit and tell stories, to let the slow afternoon fade, and to water the plants – a silent sharing of time together. I am no longer the academic, the teacher, the wife. Quietly I wonder that just two years would see all the imagined futures fade.

Now I walk by the sea. I connect with The Women Who Write: we are story-weavers together and there is magic in our coming together. We are Ofearth, water, salt, fire and air and we create together. The Osprey circling, wheels above me, calling. The rare white Goshawk watches still and ghostly as I stand close. The other-world shimmers through the everyday, speaking through birds, through light. I pick up shells and pebbles, sea glass, wondering at the gorgeous colours and soft fading of each shape, holding them in my hand for just a little time. I dance barefoot, make art with sea-weed and shells, create a sea-witch, a womb, a love poem of silver words written on sea-glass and hidden in the red rocks, waiting for the high tide to wash it away. As we are all – all of us – washed away. Let me hold your hand.

Closing Scene: Writing to Create a Feminist Shelter

There is something subversive about this garden of Serena's, a sense of buried things bursting upwards, wordlessly, into the light, as if to point, to say, "Whatever is silenced will clamour to be heard". (Atwood 1985, pp. 161–162)

There is something subversive about women academics speaking of themselves, revealing injustices, making manifest their/our fully embodied-selves through autobiographies and social commentaries, and demonstrating their/our connection to each other and the Earth. These activities fly-in-the-face of the namelessness of women, the 'carelessness' of academia (Lynch 2010), and the individualising nature of neo-liberalist and masculinist regimes where numbers and weightings are valued over names.

We believe it *is* possible to live with/in the Ofuniversity in ways that are caring, open, and respectful. In telling our stories Ofuniversity, Ofearth, Ofourselves, and Ofeachother we are daring to imagine 'a

world in which our heartfelt, personal response to life, our deep listening to others and our careful observations and thoughts about the social, natural and physical world come together to create and recreate our institutions' (Harre et al. 2017, p. 5).

Sharing stories heightens our abilities to listen to our own internal dialogue and gives time to practices that support healing, listening, and responding—practices essential for hope and social justice (Black and Loch 2014) and capable of weaving 'lines of love and forgiveness – *philia*' (Henderson and Black 2018, original emphasis). As *The Women Who Write*, we are working/writing together to give time to contemplation and 'witness consciousness' (Walsh and Bai 2015), in order to 'be-with' our/each other's lived and storied experiences in acts of 'wit(h) nessing' (Snowber and Bickel 2015, pp. 76–77). We are writing to build 'a feminist shelter' (Ahmed 2015), writing in ways that 'create room for us to dwell' and where we can engage in deep listening and long conversations.

We believe in this work, this collective feminist writing that brings forth our voice, our fragility, and our affective experiences. It affords us the opportunity to expose the academic surrogacy/theft with which we have been involved and have suffered. We believe in this work because with it we are reconfiguring the university. We are creating spaces for messy, complex, vulnerable lives and resisting the 'overwhelming bureaucratic impulse to speed up academic production', the preoccupation with 'the game of professional standing' (Back 2016, p. 11). Our vision is one where we both expose injustice and realise our potential 'as people living together to be open and inclusive, and to promote the life, and growth, that helps us flourish as individuals and communities' (Harre et al. 2017, p. 5). Our hope is that our/others' vulnerable storying will inspire ongoing communication and activism, encouraging more women to unite—and write—*and touch each other's hands across space* to support one another in (and out) of academia. For we must remember we are *more-than*.

References

Ahmed, S. (2015, December 30). *Feminist shelters*. feministkilljoys. https://feministkilljoys.com/2015/12/30/feminist-shelters/. Last accessed August 2018.

Atwood, M. (1985). *The Handmaid's Tale*. Torronto, Canada: McClelland & Stewart.

Atwood, M. (1988). *The Handmaid's Tale*. London, UK: Vintage.

Atwood, M. (Writer), Skogland, K. (Director), & Miller, B. (Executive Producer). (2017). *The Handmaid's Tale—Series one*. SBS on demand. https://www.sbs.com.au/ondemand/program/the-handmaids-tale. Last accessed August 2018.

Atwood, M. (Writer), Miller, B. (Writer), & Morano, R. (Executive Producer). (2018). *The Handmaid's Tale—Series two*. SBS on demand. https://www.sbs.com.au/ondemand/program/the-handmaids-tale. Last accessed August 2018.

Back, L. (2016). *Academic diary: Or why higher education still matters*. London, UK: Goldsmiths Press.

Black, A. L., & Loch, S. (2014). Called to respond: The potential of unveiling hiddens. *Reconceptualizing Educational Research Methodology, 5*(2), 60–75. https://journals.hioa.no/index.php/rerm/index. Last accessed August 2018.

Gill, R. (2009). Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of neo-liberal academia. In R. Flood & R. Gill (Eds.), *Secrecy and silence in the research process: Feminist reflections*. London, UK: Routledge.

Grieshaber, S. (2016, June 15). *Women in the professoriate and the boys club in Australian universities*. Dean's lecture series [video]. Monash University, Victoria, Australia. http://www.monash.edu/education/non-cms/events/deans-lecture-series/sue-grieshaber.html. Last accessed August 2018.

Harre, N., Grant, B. M., Locke, K., & Sturm, S. (2017). The university as an infinite game [online]. *Australian Universities' Review, 59*(2), 5–13.

Henderson, L., & Black, A. L. (2018). Splitting the world open: Writing stories of mourning and loss. *Qualitative Inquiry, 24*(4), 260–269.

Kirby, K. M. (1996). *Indifferent boundaries: Spatial concepts of human subjectivity*. New York, NY: Guildford Press.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches*. Freedom, CA: Crossing Press.

Lynch, K. (2010). Carelessness: A hidden doxa of higher education. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 9*(1), 54–67.

Mihăilă, R. (2018). Universities as gendered organizations. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 50*(1), 1–4.

Scott, J. C. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Snowber, C., & Bickel, B. (2015). Companions with mystery: Arts, spirit, and the ecstatic. In C. Leggo, S. Walsh, & B. Bickel (Eds.), *Arts-based and contemplative practices in research and teaching: Honoring presence* (pp. 67–87). New York, NY: Routledge.

Spooner, M. (2015, September 1). Higher education's silent killer. *Briarpatch Magazine.* https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/higher-educations-silent-killer. Last accessed June 2018.

Walsh, S., & Bai, H. (2015). Writing witness consciousness. In C. Leggo, S. Walsh, & B. Bickel (Eds.), *Arts-based and contemplative practices in research and teaching: Honoring presence* (pp. 24–44). New York, NY: Routledge.

Wright, H. R., Cooper, L., & Luff, P. (2017). Woman's ways of working: Circumventing the masculine structures operating within and upon the University. *Women's Studies International Forum, 61,* 123–131.

Mobilising a Feminist Manifesta: Critical Reflections on Challenging and Being Challenged in the Neoliberal Academy

The Res-Sisters

Introduction

This chapter is written by 'The Res-Sisters': a collective of nine early career, UK-based feminist academics that came about as a way of surviving and resisting different aspects of the academy that we found troubling, exhausting and unjust. Our name emphasises our shared occupational and political identities: as feminist academics engaged in and committed to research, resistance and sisterhood. The collective was formed in 2015 when we wrote a chapter together for *Being an Early Career Feminist Academic: Global Perspectives, Experiences, and Challenges* entitled '"I'm an early career feminist academic: Get me out of here?" Encountering and resisting the neoliberal academy' (The Res-Sisters 2017). That chapter spoke to our experiences of both the pains and pleasures of being early career women in academia and sought to engage other early career and/or feminist academics in 'breaking the silence'

The Res-Sisters (✉)
e-mail: v.cann@uea.ac.uk

(Gill 2010) about the hidden injuries of academia. The chapter also presented our 'Manifesta': a five-point 'call to arms' for others to enact collective resistant strategies within higher education.

We use this current chapter as an opportunity to reflect upon the experiences and challenges of mobilising the Manifesta as a way of resisting sexism—and other, intersecting inequalities—within the neoliberal academy. This includes considering institutional structures that constrain women's participation and recognition as 'academics', as well as subtle microaggressions and other tacit forms of everyday sexism (and racism and classism) that we encounter. We draw on the histories of feminist literature and practice—including mentoring, activism and critical scholarship—which continue to inform our awareness of and response to inequality and injustice within higher education.

As we shall unpack throughout this chapter, while collective authorship and activism are nourishing, challenging and productive, collaborations are not always easy to arrange. In the process of writing this chapter, as a collective, a face-to-face meeting was conducted while also trying to look after a toddler; a Skype chat with other Res-Sisters was thwarted multiple times by technological problems. Some Res-Sisters took the 'lead', to organise our discussions and drive the work forward. Our commitment and trust mean that the 'leads' ensure our writing moves forward in the spirit of collectivity rather than ego or the need for recognition. Once we have gathered together our thoughts, we split into smaller groups to work on specific sections, sharing these when completed in a single document that is then collectively edited. Again, we need some Res-Sisters to organise this work, but the final piece is the product of our interwoven voices. Without overstating the ease with which the collective itself, and our writing processes, come about, or their inherent value in the current metric driven system in UK higher education systems, we hold that the very act of de-individualising writing, and engaging in collaborative forms of scholarship and action are political (Gillies and Lucey 2007; Mountz et al. 2015); necessary acts of resistance to hyper-individualising forces of academia.

Using this method of collaborative authorship, in the rest of this chapter we outline and reflect critically upon our attempts to enact the Manifesta and actioned its five points:

– Embrace collectivity and nurture allies
– Little acts of solidarity make a big difference
– Speak out
– Recognise your power and privilege
– Self-care is a must.

In doing so, we consider the possibilities and challenges of living out our political commitments to collectivity, care and resistance within university cultures of performativity, precarity and competition, which seek to individualise and isolate.

Embrace Collectivity and Nurture Allies

> Feminists are most powerful as a collective. We are stronger and louder together… We must recognise feminism as something you 'do', not just something you are, thus welcoming and nurturing allies and uniting across intersectionalities rather than pursuing divisive and separatist politics. (The Res-Sisters 2017, p. 279)

As The Res-Sisters, we have come together in a union built on friendship and trust. Through reflecting on our similar research interests, and lived experiences of the academy, the group formed in a somewhat 'organic' way. Although one of our main forms of collaboration comes through writing chapters such as this, co-authorship is but one aspect of our collective action. Collectivity has the power to disrupt; it provides networks and helps us organise against institutional pressures and wider injustices (Gillies and Lucey 2007; Mountz et al. 2015). Taking inspiration from fellow feminists, we aim to pursue knowledge and fight for a more just academia within and against the rise of neoliberalism and a landscape of rampant individualism. Our resistance to institutional pressures is about encouraging people not to see themselves as an individual 'academic star', but part of a bigger collective. And this very 'togetherness', not only in the practices of writing but also thinking, can make us feel more equipped to challenge injustices on both a structural and everyday level, giving us confidence to speak out (although this is

not without its own difficulties, as we discuss below). Our experiences of embracing sisterhood have given us profound emotional support and reassurance: that we don't have to follow the crowd, and that we are not alone. Although our collective, our friendship and the resistant powers afforded to us through these are important, we have also faced criticisms that we are an 'exclusive' group, which has prompted us to reflect on the tensions that come about as part of our collectivity.

When reflecting on the connotations of 'exclusivity' that come from being a 'collective', we thought about what the aim of The Res-Sisters was from the outset. We realised that our objective was not to *create* a collective. Instead, we wanted to demonstrate and promote the *value of* a collective. The Res-Sisters is not a club you can apply to 'join', when we write or present about our activities, we aim to make a case for the ethics and values around collectivity, and inspire others to enact practices of collective care and resistance within the academy. A key objective has been to facilitate spaces for others to talk and form their own collectivities. That said, there are also many challenges of attempting to build activist networks, which some of us have experienced in the past (not least because expressed interest does not always translate into action). In addition, this could institutionalise our practices into something more formal, which would be a different way of working that would alter the friendship, support and solidarity that we have nurtured.

Yet we still struggle with these contradictions, and with the idea of being a 'clique', despite what feels like a normal consequence of meeting and getting to know each other in 'hyper-academic' spaces. On the one hand, we wonder if such accusations are dismissive and belittling, a process of 'disarticulation' (McRobbie 2009) similar to when feminists are accused of complaining and 'whinging' (Savigny 2014). All the while, the 'old-boy' networks and social capital accumulation of male, white, middle-class academia are so well-established they go (almost) unnoticed (Gillies and Alldred 2007; Macoun and Miller 2014). On the other hand, our discomfort also lies in how peer networks, including our own, seem 'natural' but we must confront how they also mirror structured social interactions (Gillies and Alldred 2007; Macoun and Miller 2014; Murray et al. 2017). We are not a homogenous group, but some of us occupy positions of more privilege than others (something

we reflect upon below in more detail). Meanwhile, many of us have felt palpable discomfort with traditional or formal networking, particularly as postgraduate students. And most of us have had no experience of these settings, coming from non-traditional backgrounds and being the first in our families to attend university. That said, our relative positions of privilege, the permanency of our contracts (for some at least), and our institutional affiliations, enable and sustain us in being able us to come together as a collective. It is thus vitally important to us that we strive for alternative, more radical forms of 'doing academia' that focus on an ethos of collectivity (Gillies and Alldred 2007), and this has to be something bigger than just the intimate collective we have formed and enshrined in our everyday practice. We discuss the importance of such forms of solidarity below.

Little Acts of Solidarity Make a Big Difference

> Academia can be a lonely place, but it does not need to be. In the spirit of embracing collectivity we also call for embracing little acts of solidarity and everyday gestures of kindness that can contribute to big changes. (The Res-Sisters 2017, p. 279)

Surviving in academia is no mean feat, especially if you want to continue with your integrity intact. While many academics will extol the virtues of collaboration and solidarity, most will practice the art of competitive individualism. The Res-Sisters is committed to the idea of doing academia differently as a form of interruption and resistance, and this involves holding on to what can be seen by some within higher education as anachronistic notions of solidarity. Being kind is a radical practice that subverts the individual instrumentalism of the academy (Clegg and Rowland 2010).

Little acts of solidarity may include official and unofficial mentoring of more junior colleagues, within and across institutions. We have written about the importance of rejecting hierarchical mentorship (The Res-Sisters 2017), looking instead to feminist co-mentoring models that emphasise the sharing of experiences and emotional support

(McGuire and Reger 2003). Yet we also recognise that the longer we survive in academia, the more we are able to recognise the obstacles that we have had to overcome, the knowledge we have had to absorb, and the mistakes that we have made along the way. As such, we advocate for consciously passing on the 'tacit knowledge' of how to navigate and survive academia to others—particularly to those in marginalised positions. This is knowledge that cannot be gleaned from staff manuals or guides of 'how to be an academic'—instructions for 'being' that often reinforce normative notions of who and what the ideal academic is and what is required to 'reach the top'. Rather, this tacit knowledge is picked up through experience and immersion within the field of academia.

Of course, some forms of tacit or unspoken knowledge—and their circulation—can reproduce existing classed gendered and racialised hierarchies and exclusions within academia, such as the 'old boys network'—already mentioned in the previous section—in which prestigious careers are shored up through the passing and trading of insider knowledge (Kandiko-Howson et al. 2017). Such forms of knowledge could be aligned with the academic habitus, the 'feel for the [academic] game' (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). But as Diane Reay challenges us to consider, 'what if you despise the rules and want to play a different game?' (Reay 2004, p. 34). Rather than uncritically playing the game, we want to use our tacit knowledge to *disrupt the play*. Feminist academics can rewrite the rules of the game and nurture alternative networks and forms of knowledge-sharing about how to survive academia such as: what 'fights to pick'; when to say 'no'; and remembering 'you can't please everyone all the time' (Aisenberg and Harrington 1988, pp. 58–59).

We have benefited from being recipients of these valued forms of tacit knowledge through being mentored by other senior (feminist) academics early in our careers. Such knowledge is also generated through our lived experiences of suffering and struggling with/in academia. These include encountering what Sara Ahmed (2017) calls 'brick walls': the institutional or disciplinary walls that block or mis-recognise some bodies, knowledges and histories. Through solidarity and co-mentoring, we hope to pass on alternative knowledges and strategies in order to find ways to chip away at these walls. This includes ways of resisting and

challenging those norms and injunctions which exclude already marginalised subjects or make impossible demands upon us. Solidarity means providing the space and vocabulary that enables others to recognise and negotiate the exclusions and inequalities of academia, to make such 'unspeakable inequalities' (Gill 2014) speakable within safe, collective environments.

As The Res-Sisters we have engendered the creation of these spaces through events we have held with early career researchers and Ph.D. students, such as a zine-making session at the annual British Sociological Association's conference in 2017, in which postgraduate participants were encouraged to share and reflect on their experiences of belonging in the academy, including their own encounters with academia's 'brick walls'. We have also hosted virtual spaces for these conversations through our blog (https://ressisters.wordpress.com/), where we have provided a platform for other academics to speak out (anonymously if preferred) about the issues that affect them and others, such as sexual misconduct. In enabling others to share their experiences, these spaces not only open up opportunities to challenge oppressive structures but also to build a sense of community and solidarity among those who experience them. In doing so, we can make small inroads into opening up the academic game to change its rules.

Speak Out

> We may be in a position where we would not feel safe, physically or emotionally, to call out the injustices we observe. We may be employed so precariously that 'rocking the boat' is too costly. We may be unwell or be too tired to fight. It is not the job of one person to solve the problems of the world: this is what makes the strength of the collective so important. (The Res-Sisters 2017, p. 281)

The issue of speaking out against hostile or oppressive structures and practices within higher education is complex, tricky and contradictory. It may be both empowering and disempowering. Stage of career, status and conditions of contract can impact on the risks and consequences

of taking this step for many people. Through being part of a collective the risk of speaking out is minimised. As The Res-Sisters, we can add a voice to debates and critical analyses of contemporary academia without opening the possibility of reprimands and retribution to singled-out individuals. When the British Sociological Association advertised an unpaid post for an Early Career Researcher to take on a social media role for its flagship journal, *Sociology*, we wrote a collective letter outlining our concerns about the use of free labour and petitioning them to make it a paid position. Consequently, the advertisement was withdrawn.

Creating collective spaces of trust through small organic networks (on- or offline) can allow for a questioning of academic and organisational practices in a space that is removed from the gaze of the institution—a punitive gaze upon which contracts, promotions and careers depend. These collective spaces can allow for the practices of our institutions—and of the higher education sector more broadly—to be discussed and questioned confidentially and can help individuals to gain confidence in the legitimacy of their critique. For example, a mixed-race Ph.D. student shared her concerns with us about being given an unpaid 'opportunity' to teach undergraduate students about 'race' and ethnicity because the institution didn't have any lecturers with this expertise. Through conversations with a trusted group of colleagues she was able to confirm the legitimacy of her concerns and feel empowered to take action to speak out and challenge the institutional behaviour. Another junior colleague spoke about constantly being asked to be the 'face' of Widening Participation as she came from a working-class background. Concerns can be validated, and legitimised, enabling us to understand troubling and painful experiences not in terms of individual lack or failure, but as consequences of systematic inequalities and oppressive structures.

While having a support network can make it easier for individuals to speak out to challenge authority, we recognise that enacting forms of resistance are easier—or more specifically, 'safer'—when done as a collective, and when these challenge more general, cross-institutional policies, practices and cultures of academia. To challenge specific issues within our individual institutions, or if we do not express gratitude, there is a risk of being constructed by senior colleagues as

'troublemakers' or 'liabilities', and suffer the consequences of this. Our own position as 'token' 'Top Girls' (McRobbie 2009) within the academy is institutionally viewed as evidence of diversification and meritocracy but can be used to negate the validity of our resistance. Our critiques of institutional practices are easily dismissed as 'feminist' posturing, or having a chip on our shoulders because of our gender, class or ethnicity. Of course, our very presence within the academy may still be disruptive even if we do not speak out on an issue. Murray (2018) explores how feminists may be viewed as 'killjoys' (Ahmed 2017) even when they do not directly offer challenges, as they do not fit into institutional norms of the academic ideal worker.

The risks of 'speaking out' are unequally felt. We recognise that it is difficult to speak out within an institution as an ECR or precariously contracted worker. However, as some of us have moved through different career stages and reach the much desired but increasingly out-of-reach status of 'permanent staff', we have begun to realise that while this vulnerability diminishes it does not suddenly go away. We find that there are tensions in living out aspects of the Manifesta in conditions of institutionalised neoliberalism. Speaking out may impact contracts, career progression, support for visa renewal, working conditions and treatment, and we are left with the tension between the choice of challenging the academy or withdrawing completely (see Ahmed 2016). Resistance by speaking out against unethical practice may not always lead to a successful challenge but by making the comfortable white male space of academia a little less cosy we may just interrupt the status quo enough to begin to shift cultures.

Recognising Our Power and Privilege?

We are fortunate in many ways as feminist academics. Unlike many of our sisters we have the privilege of a platform from which to speak. Some of us are privileged because of our whiteness, our class capital or by virtue of the institutions we work in. It is vital that we recognise the power and privilege we have, and use it to more egalitarian ends. (The Res-Sisters 2017, pp. 280–281)

Recognising our power and privilege and using it to help others are necessary tasks. Enacting these—and in truly intersectional ways—is complex however. In the time before and after writing the Manifesta, members of the collective have been confronted with the tough reality of how to put this part of the Manifesta into practice. Necessary questions arise: What does it actually mean to recognise one's privilege and power? How can we do this in our daily practice and interactions? To what extent do our individual experiences of marginalisation blind us from acknowledging our structural privilege? This final question is centred largely on issues of whiteness. The majority of The Res-Sisters possess the privilege of whiteness. We have had 'difficult conversations' (Watt 2017) with each other; others have had them with us in conferences and in our everyday lives. By drawing on Critical Race and Disability scholars, we have tried to unpack and challenge our own positions of privilege within the academy, acknowledging that while we have and do draw advantage from these structures, we also think it necessary to outline some of the different ways to challenge them.

Earlier in this chapter, we considered how The Res-Sisters collective came together somewhat organically, built on trust and mutuality. As well as our research interests, we formed the collective as a way to talk and write about our own experiences of disadvantage in the academy, of being a woman, or—as a good number of us are—being from a working-class background and the first in our families to enter higher education as a student let alone to become an academic. Whilst we centred our conversation on the commonalities between us in the first instance, more latterly we have reflected on the differences within the group. The institution of higher education privileges a particular subject: white, male and middle-class. This is something we actively seek to resist. But to have resistance, we must continuously work to centre the acknowledgement of privileges that are structurally afforded to us within the academy. This extends to 'race' but also other privileges, particularly the 'able-bodied privilege' (Inckle 2015) we all hold in the collective. Secondly, and learning from Roman (1993) and more recently Eddo-Lodge (2017), when confronted by others who question our privileges, we need to forgo defensiveness. In some circumstances recognising one's privilege and power requires us to be silent and listen. It means not

trying to equate our own disadvantage in order to empathise. Taking these steps outside of our comfort zones to engage in ways we might find uncomfortable or unfamiliar.

Our third point relates back to the quote from our previous chapter that opened this section. Reading on, the rest of the paragraph states:

> We must create spaces for marginalised colleagues to talk. If we are organising conferences we must be sure to provide a platform for those voices too infrequently heard. When we are speaking and writing we must acknowledge and accredit the voices of others. We must 'take people with us'…. creating opportunities for marginalised people(s) to be heard and valued. (The Res-Sisters 2017, pp. 280–281)

While it is important to listen to those marginalised voices, we cannot leave the burden of responsibility to those most vulnerable. As The Res-Sisters, we hold some power even within our marginalised positions and some more than others. We must work to 'give a space' for other marginalised voices to be heard. This means finding 'marginalised voices' within and importantly, beyond our own networks. In doing so, we refer to Emejulu and Bassel's (2017) vital reminder that we must not be 'ignorant' of the ground-breaking, grassroots activism many marginalised people, especially women of colour, do. As well as 'taking people with us', we need to recognise, create space for, support and advocate for people to 'take each other' with them too (Blackwell 2010).

Self-care Is a Must

> Feminism needs feminists with the strength to fight. We should strive to live by our principles and politics, but this must not come at the cost of our health and well-being… the feminist ethics of care applies to how we treat ourselves as well as others. (The Res-Sisters 2017, p. 281)

Drawing on a rich history of Black feminist writing and activism, we wrote in our previous chapter that 'self-care is a must'. Since writing the chapter, self-care has become even more of a buzzword, often framed as

an imperative of neoliberal selfhood (Barker 2017). Self-care should not be another measure against which we can fail, but rather something that we do not just to survive but rather thrive in our lives. When we say this we recognise that survival itself is an act of political warfare, especially for folks of colour (Ahmed 2017; Lorde 1988).

A collective sense of self-care always necessarily involves the individual and their relationship with the collective. Writing about Black feminist education for critical consciousness, bell hooks (1989, pp. 30–31) reflects on

> … the way of knowing I had learned from unschooled southern black folks. We learned that the self existed in relation, was dependent for its very being on the lives and experiences of everyone, the self not as signifier of one "I" but the coming together of many "I"s, the self as embodying collective reality past and present, family and community.

Building on collective feminist histories, for The Res-Sisters, self-care is a relational practice; one that involves finding ways to support each other and allow for wider practices of self-care across the community. In practice, this has involved acting as a sounding board when one of us needs to offload; mentoring; providing practical solidarity for colleagues; making each other laugh; encouraging 'down-time' and insisting that this should not be experienced with guilt or shame; as well as celebrating individual and collective successes. In presenting and writing collectively, we are able to create spaces and reclaim time through which we are able to take care of each other. This in turn helps us to take these practices of collective care into our workplaces and enact a feminist ethics of care (Mountz et al. 2015).

In seeing self-care as a collective activity, we are building on a long tradition of feminist consciousness-raising that sees our individual struggles as always connected. For example, during the recent USS pension dispute in the UK (see https://medium.com/ussbriefs), in undertaking strike action we have been taking care not only of our individual futures, but also the futures of our colleagues across higher education (those we know and those we don't). The picket lines created spaces for conversations and practical acts of solidarity with one another that

moved beyond the pensions issue to a wider critique of the marketisation and neoliberalism of the academy, including the growing issue of casualisation. This ethics of care then is one that necessarily extends far beyond the individual but nevertheless does require the individual person not only to act but also to care.

There is a risk that the increasing calls to engage in self-care could function as a requirement to learn to cope better and develop 'resilience' and 'grit' rather than enact resistance to the neoliberal academy (Gill and Donaghue 2016). We are faced with the conundrum of how to prioritise and promote self-care without it becoming an individualised practice of self-work and self-management or a duty of the 'caring feminist' that is then capitalised on by institutions. How to practice care for others, whilst navigating and resisting gendered allocations of pastoral work and other vital forms of 'academic housework' that go unrecognised in promotion processes (Kandiko-Howson et al. 2017). While it is important to be mindful of the responsibilising potential of ideas of self-care within the contexts of neoliberalism, 'care' is nonetheless a crucial aspect of feminist political organising and consciousness-raising (Michaeli 2017). We can be connected in relations of responsibility, without this necessarily meaning that we accept the 'responsibilisation' of neoliberalism (McLeod 2017). Self-care is not a retreat from challenges to structural inequalities, but part of the tools that we use, collectively, to undo them.

We are routinely directed to Audre Lorde's (1988) statement that self-care 'is not self-indulgence, it is self-preservation, and that is an act of political warfare'. As we have discussed throughout this chapter, within The Res-Sisters collective we recognise that we are differently positioned to each other in terms of our relationship to different forms of privilege. The labour of caring is classed, racialised and gendered, as well as devalued in our workplaces and wider society. As Sara Ahmed (2014) puts it:

> In queer, feminist and anti-racist work self-care is about the creation of community, fragile communities, assembled out of the experience of being shattered. We reassemble ourselves through the ordinary, everyday and often painstaking work of looking after ourselves; looking after each other.

Creating collective spaces can be one way to do this work, with an awareness that self-care looks different for different people and that we can use our different privileges to support each other. These collective supports can empower and embolden us as individuals to fight injustices in our separate institutions—to put ourselves back together or hold on to others who are shattered.

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter we have attempted to draw out, complicate and speak back to our 'Manifesta' (The Res-Sisters 2017). We have also considered some of the pragmatic ways in which we build and carry out strategies for challenging inequitable practices and structures within the neoliberal academy. As a commitment to reflexively complicating 'resistance', we have discussed the challenges that have arisen since coming together as a collective. We have raised questions about what we consider the strengths of a collective to be, as an aid to surviving the academy and chipping away at the unequal landscapes in higher education. We have also reflected on our positions of privilege and have argued that we must continue to do so as we move forward.

A running theme throughout this chapter is the way we straddle uncomfortable, complex and conflicting positions within the academy. Being part of this collective means occupying a position that can be productively disruptive. We also recognise that being part of the collective is something we can and have capitalised on: gaining recognition from peers, feeling valued by other ECRs who find refuge or hope in our stories of resistance and refusal. And yet in other ways, this collective work and identity is often dismissed and devalued as a way of 'doing' and 'being' within academia; considered by some as nothing but trouble making, a frivolous luxury and a distraction from the 'real' work of the 'proper' academic. The most obvious example here, as we lead up to the next Research Excellence Framework exercise (REF), is the way in which, despite the steady stream of conference, plenary and keynote invitations to talk about our work as The Res-Sisters, this work is not

seen as 'legitimate', or 'REF-able' by our own respective institutions. In this context, our work as a collective can be felt as incompatible with our desires to forge and sustain academic careers.

In the UK, Liz Moorish has recently reflected on the growing area of scholarship called 'Critical University Studies' (CUS)—an interdisciplinary field committed to interrogating and critiquing the neoliberalisation of higher education institutions. Against the backdrop of the ongoing pension dispute in the UK, increasing casualisation, unsustainable cultures of overwork, and a growing mental health crisis among academics *and* students, CUS is vitally important. Yet, as Moorish reflects, in the context of a creeping erosion of academic freedom across higher education, CUS is confronted by an 'unhelpful paradox':

> Even if making a general observation about universities, the [CUS] scholar seems to imply criticism of the institution in which they work…. The academic wishing to draw on expertise and knowledge must, it seems, be pitted at odds with their employer and exposed to considerable personal risk. (Moorish 2018)

This paradox is one we feel acutely. Our work as The Res-Sisters is rarely, if at all, valued and recognised by our employers. Indeed, we might ask how, in annual review meetings or promotions panels, we explain The Res-Sisters publications and conference presentations listed on our CVs (indeed, do we even include them?). How do we justify our time spent on activities such as these? Will university management tell us there is no time in the 'workload allocation model' to be spent writing chapters critiquing the neoliberal university?

Yet the work we do as The Res-Sisters is vital to sustaining us, and—we hope—provide tools and spaces that might help sustain others. Despite warnings to 'be quiet', to 'stop complaining', to 'be grateful' (to be academia's 'good girls') we insist on the importance of continuing efforts to challenge the inequalities and injustices of higher education, even if this must happen at the margins. Indeed, as Stuart Hall reminds us, 'The University is a critical institution or it is nothing' (cited in Giroux 2016, p. 3).

References

Ahmed, A. (2014, August 25). *Selfcare as warfare*. feministkilljoys. https://feministkilljoys.com/2014/08/25/selfcare-as-warfare/. Last accessed June 2018.

Ahmed, S. (2016, August 27). *Resignation is a feminist issue.* feministkilljoys. https://feministkilljoys.com/2016/08/27/resignation-is-a-feminist-issue/. Last accessed June 2018.

Ahmed, S. (2017). *Living a feminist life*. London, UK: Duke University Press.

Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). *Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Barker, M.-J. (2017). *Hell yeah self care*. https://rewriting-the-rules.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/HellYeahSelfCare.pdf. Last accessed June 2018.

Blackwell, D. M. (2010). Sidelines and separate spaces: Making education anti-racist for students of color. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 13*(4), 473–494.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Clegg, S., & Rowland, S. (2010). Kindness in pedagogical practice and academic life. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 31*(6), 719–735.

Eddo-Lodge, R. (2017). *Why I'm no longer talking to white people about race*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Emejulu, A., & Bassel, L. (2017). Whose crisis counts? Minority women, austerity and activism in France and Britain. In J. Kantola & E. Lombardo (Eds.), *Gender and the economic crisis in Europe* (pp. 185–208). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gill, R. (2010). Breaking the silence: The hidden injuries of the neoliberal university. In R. Ryan-Flood & R. Gill (Eds.), *Secrecy and silence in the research process: Feminist reflections* (pp. 228–244). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.

Gill, R. (2014). Unspeakable inequalities: Post feminism, entrepreneurial subjectivity, and the repudiation of sexism among cultural workers. *Social Politics, 21*(4), 509–528.

Gill, R., & Donaghue, N. (2016). Resilience, apps and reluctant individualism: Technologies of self in the neoliberal academy. *Women's Studies International Forum, 54*(1), 91–99.

Gillies, V., & Alldred, P. (2007). Making the right connections: 'Knowledge' and power in academic networking. *Power, knowledge and the academy: The institutional is political* (pp. 105–121). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gillies, V., & Lucey, H. (Eds.). (2007). *Power, knowledge and the academy: The institutional is political*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Giroux, H. A. (2016). Writing the public good back into education: Reclaiming the role of the public Intellectual. In J. R. Di Leo & P. Hitchcock (Eds.), *The new public Intellectual* (pp. 3–28). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Inckle, K. (2015). Debilitating times: Compulsory ablebodiedness and white privilege in theory and practice. *Feminist Review, 111*(1), 42–58.

Kandiko-Howson, C. B., Coate, K. L., & de St Croix, T. (2017). Mid-career academic women and the prestige economy. *Higher Education Research & Development, 37*(3), 533–548.

Lorde, A. (1988). *A burst of light: Essays*. London: Sheba Feminist Publishers.

Macoun, A., & Miller, D. (2014). Surviving (thriving) in academia: Feminist support networks and women ECRs. *Journal of Gender Studies, 23*(3), 287–301.

McGuire, G. M., & Reger, J. (2003). Feminist co-mentoring: A model for academic professional development. *National Women's Studies Association Journal, 15*(1), 54–72.

McLeod, J. (2017). Reframing responsibility in an era of responsibilisation: Education, feminist ethics. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 38*(1), 43–56.

McRobbie, A. (2009). *The aftermath of feminism: Gender, culture and social change*. London, UK: Sage.

Michaeli, I. (2017). Self-care: An act of political warfare or a neoliberal trap? *Development, 60*(1–2), 50–56.

Moorish, L. (2018). *Can critical university studies survive the toxic university?* https://academicirregularities.wordpress.com/2018/06/08/can-critical-uni-versity-studies-survive-the-toxic-university/. Last accessed June 2018.

Mountz, A., Bonds, A., Mansfield, B., Loyd, J., Hyndman, J., Walton-Roberts, M., et al. (2015). For slow scholarship: A feminist politics of resistance through collective action in the neoliberal university. *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies, 14*(4), 1235–1259.

Murray, Ó. M. (2018). Feel the fear and killjoy anyway: Being a challenging feminist presence in precarious academia. In Y. Taylor & K. Lahad (Eds.), *Feeling academic in the neoliberal university: Feminist flights, fights and failures* (pp. 163–189). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Murray, Ó. M., Crowley, M., & Wånggren, L. (2017). Feminist work in academia and beyond. In R. Thwaites & A. Pressland (Eds.), *Being an early-career feminist academic: Global perspectives, experiences, and challenges* (pp. 215–235). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Reay, D. (2004). Cultural capitalists and academic habitus: Classed and gendered labour in UK higher education. *Women's Studies International Forum, 27*(1), 31–39.

Roman, L. G. (1993). White is a color! White defensiveness, postmodernism, and anti-racist pedagogy. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity and representation in education.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Savigny, H. (2014). Women, know your limits: Cultural sexism in academia. *Gender and Education, 26*(7), 794–809.

The Res-Sisters. (2017). "I'm an early career feminist academic: Get me out of here?": Encountering and resisting the neoliberal academy. In R. Thwaites & A. Godoy-Pressland (Eds.), *Being an early career feminist academic: Global perspectives, experiences and challenges* (pp. 267–284). London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Watt, D. (2017). Dealing with difficult conversations: Anti-racism in youth & community work training. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 20*(3), 401–413.

Part V

Concluding Considerations

18

Strategies to 'Slay the Dragon'—One Head at a Time

Gail Crimmins

As established in the first chapter in this collection, bringing about gender equity and eradicating sexism in academia is like attempting to slay the Seven-Headed Dragon (van den Brink and Benschop 2012)—it takes a multi-pronged approach. Sexism, like patriarchy, is dynamic and malleable, it keeps adopting new shapes and forms. It sometimes comes in the guise of a 'motherhood penalty' (Cuddy et al. 2004) where employers are less likely to recruit or promote or pay equally mothers, whilst fathers are paid the same as nonfathers (Correll et al. 2007). It can be cloaked in the expectation that women academics should engage in more service and afford more student favours than men (Guarino and Borden 2017; El-Alayli et al. 2018), and in the unequal distribution of teaching and teaching support roles to women to male academics (Gibney 2017)—all of which make it more difficult for women to undertake research and

G. Crimmins (✉)
School of Communication and Creative Industries,
University of the Sunshine Coast, Maroochydore, QLD, Australia
e-mail: gcrimmin@usc.edu.au

325

fulfil (male-constructed) promotion application criteria. Other forms of sexism include the gender bias embedded in student evaluations of teaching (Wagner et al. 2016), the way males are far more likely to be invited as keynote speakers than women academics (Walters 2018), and the longer and more stringent peer review process inflicted on women in the academy (Hengel 2017). Or sexism might be disguised as a joke (Savigny 2014) or as benevolence (Kuchynka et al. 2018) that turns women into punchlines or feminist killjoys (Ahmed 2017) and depletes women's self-efficacy. There are so many sexist dis/guises it makes me wonder how any woman manages to succeed in academia.

Sexism is insidious and although it's presence is often hidden behind discourses of merit and equity (Powell et al. 2018), international statistics tell a different story. It is made manifest in the under-representation of women in the professoriate which serves to perpetuate inequity and reinforce notions of men's 'genius' and women's 'feistiness' or 'shrillness' (Bartlett 2015). Sexism is the silent partner of racism and casteism, illuminated by the fact that just 2% of Black Women in the UK are professors (Solanke 2017) a percentage matched for Asian/Pacific Islander women (U.S. Department of Education 2017). Yet perhaps more shocking is the lack of specific statistics on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women in the academy, though it's known that the number of all Indigenous academics at both Level A and E are lower per capita in 2018 than they were in 2001 (O'Sullivan 2019). Similarly, sexism is identifiable in the disproportionate percentage of women from lower castes in India. As Tambe (2019) notes, whilst women constitute 39% of faculty 78% of them are from 'upper castes' and 93% of Professors come from privileged castes. Sexism appearance may alter in different contexts, it perpetually seeks to disrupt or eliminate women's agency, power and opportunity. Statistics like these might belie the social constructivist nature of gender identity/identifies (and it's not my intention to brush aside the problematics of 'easy' gender classification systems), but they offer a snapshot of the landscape and highlight an international map of sexism and gender bias and a reckless waste of women's talent.

The Chapters in This Collection

The essays in this collection describe a complex, interrelated and diverse arrangement of strategies of resistance which can be deployed by organisations, collectives and individuals to recognise and combat sexual inequality within universities. The book is therefore designed to motivate direct action against the propagation of sexism and gender disadvantage in the academy by harnessing the expertise of women academics who work (fiercely) towards gender e/quality.

In particular, the book features: initiatives and practices of resistance that support institutions, as well as individual academics, to identify and address gender disadvantage in the academy; an examination of feminist and critical pedagogies that contest the reproduction of masculine knowledge systems; approaches to research that counter androcentric scholarship; and case studies of women collectives which expose, satirise and subvert sexism in the academy. It harnesses the expertise of women academics who create and employ innovative approaches to challenging existing sexual and intersectional disadvantage in the academy.

The diversity of strategies offered is deliberate—bringing about gender change in the academy is like attempting to slay the Seven-Headed Dragon (van den Brink and Benschop 2012)—it will take a multi-pronged approach. Also, as sexism is dynamic and malleable, and keeps taking new shapes and forms, women in the academy, and those that support inclusive and fair organisational structures and cultures, need to adopt strategies of resistance that contextually suit the situated form/s of oppression made manifest in the context of one's sphere of influence. I thus offer a summary of the range of strategies created and employed by the women contributors to this book to resist sexism in the contemporary academy so that you can choose the strategy/strategies which best suit you and your role and context.

Part I: Initiatives and Practices of Resistance That Support Institutions, as Well as Individual Academics, to Identify and Address Sexual Disadvantage in the Academy

In Chapter 1, the collection offers a structural account of inequality in the international academy to establish why resistance to sexism remains urgent and necessary. Galvanised by Ahmed's (2015) refusal to allow the term 'sexism' to slip out of focus or usage (as if it somehow belongs to the 'back then' or the 'over there') Crimmins (2019) both affirms Ahmed's claim that sexism is prevalent in the twenty-first-century academy and illuminates the need for our resistance. This introductory chapter thus lays a foundation for a detailed exploration of the myriad of strategies women academics design to slay 'the seven-headed dragon' of sexism (van den Brink and Benschop 2012) in the international academy.

In Chapter 2, Pearce (2019) exposes that the category of womanhood is often under-analysed within academic 'gender equality' schemes, which can lead to the implicit exclusion of women who experience multiple intersecting forms of marginalisation from anti-sexist campaigns. She also offers an exploration of what it might mean to be (or not be) a woman, drawing on the author's own experiences whilst also centring perspectives from black, disabled and trans writers. Reading across critical theory and feminist philosophy, Chapter 2 accounts both for the instability and incoherency of 'womanhood', and its continuing importance as a category for the conceptualisation of inequality and oppression. The chapter concludes by proposing the notion of 'moving through the world' as a model for conceptualising experiences of womanhood.

In Chapter 3, Tsouroufli (2019) presents an overview of the Athena SWAN initiative (an equality charter for universities and colleges) and discusses the evolution and development of the scheme since its inception, its execution across universities in the UK as well as some of its successes and challenges within the neoliberal and misogynistic context of higher education. Tsouroufli also offers a critical examination of the

scheme to expose a persistent lack of attention to gender (rather than women) and intersecting inequalities of sexual orientation, migration, motherhood/caring, disability, creed and class.

In Chapter 4, which explores a sector-wide initiative, argues that resisting the gender bias evident in research-focused tenure or promotion requires women to proclaim their specific successes as educators. In the chapter, Beckmann (2019) identifies that the internationally benchmarked Higher Education Academy (HEA) fellowship scheme is a possible avenue for women to earn professional recognition for their university teaching, and that teaching award schemes more generally offer an unheralded gender equity initiative in the academy.

In Chapter 5, Lewis and Anitha (2019) explore a series of resistances in relation to gender-based violence in universities. They present a 'resistance' dialectic in relation to work designed to prevent GBV, to hold institutions to account and to change university cultures so that they no longer invisibilise or condone GBV. In addition, strategies of resistance by those whose actions can be characterised as comprising a 'backlash' to (perceived) feminist gains and an attempt to retain a gendered status quo, and those critical of the framing of anti-GBV campaigns, is also examined.

The complexity of regimes of resistance and the opportunity for nuanced and contextually specific response to gender inequity in the academy is likewise explored by Laube (2019). In Chapter 6, Laube specifically identifies three positionalities: the supportive outsider within academia, the feminist outsider, and the feminist outsider within, and the opportunities and constraints described by these differently situated scholars for resistance, in the context of institutional constraints. Laube (2019) finally suggests that mindfully constructed mentoring programmes can support the inclusion of diverse individuals and thus challenge false borders, affect the structures of institutions, unsettle assumptions about who belongs, and strengthen institutions across difference.

Chapters 7 and 8 explore resistance to the compounded marginalisation of womanhood with indigeneity of low-caste belonging in the academy. In Chapter 7, O'Sullivan (2019) exposes how across colonised countries, the academy has been an instrument of the state and has collaborated in the project of colonial suppression of First Nations'[1]

communities and peoples. She further explores how First Nations' women in the academy disrupt and displace the white male gaze, specifically demonstrating how Bronwyn Carlson's Forum for Indigenous Research Excellence has centralised the First Nations' experience, and that the Australian Research Council's Discovery Indigenous programme has prioritised Indigenous women researchers. O'Sullivan (2019) presents a roadmap of current practice, contributions, and speculates on potential strategies across research, teaching and engagement in the academy that transform how and why First Nations' women are achieving through disruption and the displacement of power in the academy.

In Chapter 8, Tambe (2019) exposes how contemporary Indian universities present a complex mosaic of seeming 'inclusion' where the exclusion of Dalit Bahujan Adivasi rural and Muslim women gets buried under a narrative of gender inclusivity. This paradox of the gender-inclusive Indian university masks the fact that women are segregated both vertically and horizontally. Yet Tambe (2019) identifies that in resistance student protests erupting across India challenge this politics of hypervisibility/invisibility. Through the campaigns of *Pinjra Tod* and *LoSHA*, students are not just asserting their more substantive access to education in everyday terms, but rather claiming as political subjects their right to determine what education ought to be.

Part II: An Examination of Feminist and Critical Pedagogies That Resist the Reproduction of Masculine Knowledge Systems

Chapter 9 provides a rationale for the development of the (x) MOOC n.paradoxa, http://nparadoxa.com as a form of resistance to the reduction of feminist-orientated courses in art education. As author and publisher of this course, Deepwell (2019) explores the capacity of MOOCs to offer open access forms of feminist self-education which can intervene in the dominant paradigms of education. She also demonstrates

that, despite the risk of MOOCs becoming a neoliberal replica of profit-maximisation and instrumental learning, they can, when designed with feminist principles, support connectivity and generate new ways of working promoting lifelong learning and socialist educational goals.

Chapter 10 explores how harnessing student-authored or previously published poetry and theatre can engage students in feminist political and social activism as a foray into civic engagement. Siebler (2019) explores the capacity of the border-crossing of academic work/research with public performance to support student empowerment and civic engagement. By drawing on, highlighting, and critiquing issues and experience of sexism/race/class/gender/sexuality/ability in community/academy, performance-making as pedagogy is presented as a strategy for students to engage in political conversation and feminist action.

Part III: Approaches to Research That Offer an Alternative to Androcentric Research Practices

Chapter 11 presents a series of 'stories so far' that have emerged from Carruthers Thomas' research project *Gender(s) at Work*. The research project investigates how gender operates as a geography of power in the contemporary academy, particularly in relation to notions of 'career'. Within the intertwining contexts of higher education (HE) and the Athena SWAN Charter, Thomas (2019) illustrates the complexity and dimensionality of lived, gendered experiences in the academy. Throughout and in conclusion, she reflects upon the alignments and tensions of researching geographies of power and her role as a university's Project Manager for the Athena SWAN Charter work and the opportunities these afford to resist sexism in the academy.

Also exploring atypical forms of academic research, Chapter 12 explicates how collective biography operates as a feminist methodology. Gannon and Gonick (2019) explicate that their process of collective biography is inspired by the collaborative strategy of memory work developed by Haug and her colleagues and informed by

the poststructural direction of interrogating and unpicking singular truths of remembered events as movements, forces, energies, affective and materials conditions within which sense is made. In the chapter, Gannon and Gonick consider the extent to which Haug's claims that memory work as inherently feminist (2008) remain true. Given that collective biography has become a remarkably elastic method for investigating lived experience and interrogating the utility of theory in the everyday, this critical investigation of the feminist underpinnings and aspirations of the method is timely and useful to researchers interested in adapting it for their own work.

In Chapter 13, Lipton and Crimmins (2019) establish that academic knowledge is predicated upon a masculine legacy of science which renders the feminine, as well as the sexual and racial 'other', outside of institutionalised sites of intellectual practice, and arts-based knowledge as trivial and relegated to the feminine realm. Women's marginalisation in academia is directly related to the production of scholarly knowledge, particularly in terms of what counts as knowledge, who gets counted, and how it is produced. In resistance and drawing on Cixous' *ecriture feminine*; a bodily and experimental form of writing that challenges the androcentrism of scholarship, this chapter sifts, stirs and combines a mixture of feminist theories and methods to explore the potentiality of a feminine modality in collaborative arts-based research practice.

Chapter 14 explores the process of working with feminist, new materialist and post-humanist theories and philosophies to address the onto-epistemological uncertainty of academic research. Using excerpts from her previous writing, Moxnes (2019) engages with SF philosophy (Haraway 1997, 2004, 2016), specifically employing the process of bag-lady storytelling, to juxtapose irreducible details and stories about writing feminist texts created within and designed to meet academic demands. The chapter queries if and how it is possible to transcend or unsettle imposed structures and make space for difference, diffractions, affects and embodied experiences in academic research.

Part IV: Case Studies of Women Collectives Which Expose, Satirise and Subvert Sexism in the Academy

In Chapter 15, #FEAS (Blaise et al. 2019), an Australian-based collective, reflect on several arts-based 'pop-up' interventions that were created and performed at educational conferences by #FEAS—Feminist Educators Against Sexism—to protest the everyday sexism that women face in the university workplace. Connections are made between these interventions and with a feminist punk ethos and a do-it-yourself (DIY) attitude that characterised the 1990s feminist punk music scene. These connections make visible traces of punk feminism in #FEAS interventions and argue they provide an important mode to mobilise and connect feminists to resist sexism in the academy.

Chapter 16, also created collaboratively (by The Women Who Write—Henderson et al. 2019) speak of their experiences as female academics to resist and offer a counternarrative to the masculinised, disaffected audit culture of academia. Drawing upon the symbolic language and dystopic narratives of creative surrogacy in Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*, the chapter is shaped as a performative narrative. By speaking/sharing their names and human stories, The Women Who Write repositions themselves not as the public persona of academia, school, faculty or corporate ID, but as beings Ofearth, Ofourselves, and Ofeachother.

Finally, Chapter 17 reflects upon The Res-Sisters' (2016) experiences of forming a feminist academic collective as a way of surviving and resisting different aspects of the academy that they found troubling, exhausting and unjust. The chapter also considers the histories of feminist literature and practice—including mentoring, activism and critical scholarship—which informs their awareness of and response to inequality and injustice within higher education and presents the women's 'Manifesta' (The Res-Sisters 2016)—a five-point 'call to arms' for others to enact collective resistant strategies—and discusses their engagement

with, and action through, these points. Finally, a critical reflection on the possibilities and challenges to living political commitments to collectively and care within university cultures of performativity, precarity, competition which seek to individualise and isolate academics, is presented.

Closing Thoughts and a Call to Action

In offering the above overview of a range of strategies created and employed by the women contributors to this book that can be employed to 'slay the dragon' of sexism in the academy, I suggest that one of these strategies alone, deployed just once, is likely to be insufficient. Just as Strachan et al. (2016) observe, because of the complexity and varied workforce in universities, '…there is no single policy change that can be nominated to "fix" gender inequity' (p. 8), so there is no simple strategy that can be used to resist sexism in the academy. Also, achieving gender equality in the academy, as elsewhere, requires not only a diversity of approaches, but also relentless persistence. We must channel Elizabeth Warren's level of persistence—when she repeatedly objected to the confirmation of Senator Jeff Sessions as US Attorney General in 2017—and adopt, adapt and extend the strategies for resisting sexism in the academy designed and delivered by the creative, brave and persistent women who contributed to this book. This book offers some strategies to assist us, but we must operationalise them to slay the dragon, one head at a time.

Note

1. Indigenous, First Nations'—and in the context of Australia—Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, are terms that are used interchangeably throughout this chapter to adequately reflect the various ways in which First Nations' Peoples identify themselves. These terms are always capitalised out of both respect, and because they operate as a short form for a proper noun. Named individual Nation status or localised collective terms are also used where appropriate, following the person's name.

References

Ahmed, S. (2015). Sexism—A problem with a name. *New Formations: A Journal of Culture/Theory/Politics, 86,* 5–13.

Ahmed, S. (2017). *feminist killjoys*. feministkilljoys. https://feministkilljoys.com/. Last accessed March 2018.

Bartlett, A. (2015, February 10). *Rate my professor's gender?* The Conversation. Retrieved from https://theconversation.com/rate-my-professors-gender-37370. Last accessed September 2018.

Beckmann, E. (2019). Fellowship as resistance: How women educators benefit from international professional recognition. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Blaise, M., Gray, E., & Knight, L. (2019). #FEAS: Curating punk interventions as a tactic for doing more. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Correll, S. J., Benard, S., & Paik, I. (2007). Getting a job: Is there a motherhood penalty? *American Journal of Sociology, 112,* 1297–1338.

Crimmins, G. (2019). A structural account of inequality in the international academy: Why resistance to sexism remains urgent and necessary. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Cuddy, A. J. C., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2004). When professionals become mothers, warmth doesn't cut the ice. *Journal of Social Issues, 60,* 701–718.

Deepwell, K. (2019). n. paradoxa's MOOC (mass open online course): An intervention in feminist thought and pedagogy on feminism and contemporary art. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

El-Alayli, A., Hansen-Brown, A. A., & Ceynar, M. (2018). Dancing backwards in high heels: Female professors experience more work demands and special favor requests, particularly from academically entitled students. *Sex Roles, 79*(3–4), 136–150. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0872-6.

Gannon, S., & Gonick, M. (2019). Collective biography as a feminist methodology. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Gibney, E. (2017, April 13). Teaching load could put female scientists at career disadvantage. *Nature*. https://www.nature.com/news/teachingload-could-put-female-scientists-at-career-disadvantage-1.21839. Last accessed September 2018.

Guarino, C. M., & Borden, V. M. H. (2017). Faculty service loads and gender: Are women taking care of the academic family? *Research in Higher Education, 58*(6), 672–694.

Haraway, D. J. (1997). *Modest_Witness@ Second_Millennium. FemaleMan_ Meets_OncoMouse^{TM}: Feminism and technoscience*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Haraway, D. J. (2004). *The Haraway reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Haraway, D. J. (2016). *Staying with the trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Haug, F. (2008). Memory work. *Australian Feminist Studies, 23*(58), 537–541.

Haug, F., Andresen, S., Bünz-Elfferding, A., Hauser, C., Lang, U., Laudan, M., et al. (1987). *Female sexualization: A collective work of memory* (E. Carter, Trans.). New York, NY: Verso.

Henderson, L., Black, A., Crimmins, G., & Jones, J. K. (2019). Sharing our names and remembering our her-stories: Resisting Ofuniversity. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Hengel, E. (2017). *Publishing while female. Are women held to higher standards? Evidence from peer review* (Cambridge Working Paper Economics: 1753). University of Cambridge. https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.17548. Last accessed September 2018.

Kuchynka, S. L., Salomon, K., Bosson, J. K., El-Hout, M., Kiebel, E., Cooperman, C., et al. (2018). Hostile and benevolent sexism and college women's STEM outcomes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 42,* 72–87.

Laube, H. (2019). Disrupting borders to shift the centre: The role of gender change agents. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Lewis, R., & Anitha, S. (2019). 'Resistance' and gender-based violence in universities. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Lipton, B., & Crimmins, G. (2019). New bottles for new wine: Arts based research as a form of feminist resistance to masculine discourse in form and content. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Moxnes, A. R. (2019). Working across/within/through academic conventions of writing a PhD: The risks of daring to write a feminist thesis. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

O'Sullivan, S. (2019). First nations' women in the academy: Disrupting and displacing the white male gaze. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Pearce, R. (2019). Moving through the world as a woman. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Powell, S., Ah-King, M., & Hussénius, A. (2018). 'Are we to become a gender university?' Facets of resistance to a gender equality project. *Gender, Work & Organization, 25*(2), 127–143.

Savigny, H. (2014). Women, know your limits: Cultural sexism in academia. *Gender and Education, 26*(7), 794–809.

Siebler, K. (2019). Performance as empowerment: Using staged readings and theatrical performance as tools for critical thinking/social activism. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Solanke, I. (2017). *Black female professors in the UK (March 2017).* https://www.runnymedetrust.org/uploads/BlackFemaleProfessorsMarch2017.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Strachan, G., Peetz, D., Whitehouse, G., Bailey, J., Broadbent, K., May, R., et al. (2016). *Women, careers and universities: Where to from here?* Griffith University. http://mams.rmit.edu.au/lhvav5jjgt4t.pdf. Last accessed September 2018.

Tambe, A. (2019). Struggles on the 'margins': Women re-imagining the Academy. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

The Res-Sisters. (2016). 'I'm an early career feminist academic: Get me out of here?' Encountering and resisting the neoliberal academy. In R. Thwaites & A. Godoy-Pressland (Eds.), *Being an early career feminist academic: Global perspectives, experiences and challenges* (pp. 267–284). Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. London: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-54325-7.

Thomas, K. (2019). Genders at work: Gender as a geography of power in the academy. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Tsouroufli, M. (2019). An examination of the Athena SWAN initiative, its breath, focus, successes and execution. In G. Crimmins (Ed.), *Strategies for resisting sexism in the academy.* Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

U.S. Department of Education. (2017). *The condition of education.* Characteristics of postsecondary faculty. The National Center fro Education Statistics (NCES). https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_csc.asp. Last accessed September 2018.

van den Brink, M., & Benschop, Y. (2012). Slaying the seven-headed dragon: The quest for gender change in academia. *Gender, Work and Organization, 19*(1), 71–92.

Wagner, N., Rieger, M., & Voorvelt, K. (2016). Gender, ethnicity and teaching evaluations: Evidence from mixed teaching teams. *Economics of Education Review, 54,* 79–94.

Walters, T. (2018). Gender equality in academic tourism, hospitality, leisure and events conferences. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events, 10*(1), 17–32.

Index

339