

ADVANCING GENDER EQUITY IN STEM: ANTENARRATIVES AND FEMINIST
LEADERSHIP PRACTICES IN POLICY WORK

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
North Dakota State University
of Agriculture and Applied Science

By

Ashleigh Ryann Petts

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Major Department:
English

November 2020

Fargo, North Dakota

North Dakota State University
Graduate School

Title

ADVANCING GENDER EQUITY IN STEM: ANTENARRATIVES AND
FEMINIST LEADERSHIP PRACTICES IN POLICY WORK

By

Ashleigh Ryann Petts

The Supervisory Committee certifies that this *disquisition* complies with North Dakota
State University's regulations and meets the accepted standards for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SUPERVISORY COMMITTEE:

Mary McCall

Chair

Holly Hassel

Lisa Arnold

Christina Weber

Approved:

11/20/2020

Date

Stephenson J. Beck

Department Chair

ABSTRACT

While the field technical and professional communication (TPC) has long been concerned with workplace writing and policy writing, few studies have addressed the process of policy writing within an academic context. Using antenarrative and apparent feminism methodologies, this dissertation explores the policy writing process and feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee, a group of women academics who worked to propose new policy to address gender inequity in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields for faculty working in their statewide educational system (SES). Employing methods of observation, participant observation, and semi-structured interviews, and artifact collection over a period of three years, the researcher sought to answer two research questions: What does the process of policy writing look like for the DESIGN Committee? In what ways do feminist leadership practices, as performed by the committee leader and other committee members, influence the work of the DESIGN Committee? Through the creation of an antenarrative of the DESIGN Committee's policy work, three important threads stand out: proximity, transparency, and accountability. These threads provide an alternative to the dominant narrative of the committee's work. In addition, the committee leader's use of feminist leadership practices such as creating community, encouraging self-empowerment, and fostering collaboration, impacted the efficiency of the policy writing process. These results point to important factors for future policy writers to consider when composing policy to address diversity, equity, and inclusion or when employing feminist leadership practices.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Mary McCall, for guiding me through the disquisition process under trying circumstances, which included a global pandemic and several other very 2020 events. Mary deserves a medal, truly. I would also like to thank my committee members, Lisa Arnold, Holly Hassel, and Christina Weber, for their contributions and feedback. In addition, I want to thank Betsy Birmingham for getting me started on this research thread and Rick Axelson for his insights during the research process.

A special thanks go to my parents, David and Louann Petts, and my sister, Dr. Rachel Petts Santer, for their unwavering support.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the women of the DESIGN Committee. Your hard work and dedication inspired me over the years. Thank you for letting me be a part of your lives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
DEDICATION.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	x
LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES.....	xi
CHAPTER 1: GATHERING RAW MATERIALS.....	1
Project Context.....	2
Defining Terms	6
Institution versus Organization.....	6
Rhetoric	7
Feminism(s), Woman/Women, and Gender	8
Reviewing the Literature in Technical and Professional Communication (TPC) and Organization Studies (OS)	9
Feminist Research in TPC.....	10
Feminist Research in OS	12
Institutions and Rhetoric in TPC.....	13
Institutions and Rhetoric in OS	14
Policy Work in TPC	16
Policy Work in OS.....	17
Looking Ahead.....	18
CHAPTER 2: COLLECTING TOOLS	19
Research Sites	20
Methodology	21
Antenarrative	22

Apparent Feminism	25
Methods	28
Participant Selection and Recruitment	29
Observation and Participant Observation	31
Semi-Structured Interviews	32
Artifact Collection	33
Coding Process	34
Reflexivity	35
Limitations	37
Putting My Tools to Use	37
CHAPTER 3: WARP AND WEFT: AN ANTENARRATIVE OF THE POLICY WRITING PROCESS	39
Narrative and Antenarrative in Organization Studies and Technical and Professional Communication	42
A Traditional Narrative Approach to Understanding the DESIGN Committee’s Work	45
Uncovering New Threads in the DESIGN Committee Tapestry	49
Proximity	51
Transparency	55
Accountability	59
Narrative and Antenarrative	62
Conclusion: The Process of Policy Writing	64
CHAPTER 4: WEAVING NEW THREADS FEMINIST LEADERSHIP PRACTICES IN THE DESIGN COMMITTEE	67
Defining Terms: Feminist/Feminism(s) and Leadership	69
Feminist Leadership Practices in Scholarship.....	70
Feminist Leadership in Organization Studies.....	71

Feminist Leadership in Technical and Professional Communication and Rhetoric and Composition	75
Apparent Feminism as an Interpretive Lens	77
Creating Community through Self-Empowerment and Collaboration.....	79
Hannah’s Conceptualization of her Leadership Practices	79
Collaboration, Self-Empowerment, and Community	83
Challenges to Enacting Feminist Leadership in the DESIGN Committee.....	85
Conclusion: Leadership Practices and the Writing Process	87
CHAPTER 5: TAKING A STEP BACK: IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH.....	92
The Policy Writing Process and Feminist Leadership Practices: New Understandings and Challenges	93
Further Research	97
REFERENCES	100
APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW GUIDE: DESIGN COMMITTEE LEADER.....	116
APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW GUIDE: DESIGN COMMITTEE MEMBERS	117
APPENDIX C. POLICY WRITING CODES	118
APPENDIX D. FEMINIST LEADERSHIP CODES.....	119

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Core Participants in my Research	30
2. Other Research Participants	30
3. Summary of Meetings Attended	31
4. Semi-Structured Interview Participants, Dates, and Contexts	33
5. Summary of Artifacts Collected	34

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

3Ps.....	Positionality, privilege, and power.
DOE	Department of Education.
FAR.....	Faculty annual review.
IT.....	Information technology.
NSF	National Science Foundation.
OS	Organization studies.
PDP	Professional development plan.
PI.....	Principal investigator.
OS	Organization studies.
SBOE	State Board of Education.
SES.....	Statewide Education System.
SIGGE.....	State Institutional Group for Gender Equity.
STEM.....	Science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.
TPC	Technical and professional communication.

LIST OF APPENDIX TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
C1. Proximity.....	118
C2. Transparency	118
C3. Accountability	118
D1. Feminist Leadership Codes.....	119

CHAPTER 1: GATHERING RAW MATERIALS

In August 2019, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that “women-only STEM programs” at several universities in the United States were being investigated by the Department of Education (DOE) for “sex discrimination against men” under the tenets of Title IX (Watanabe, 2019). The DOE had opened investigations at universities such as UCLA, USC, Harvard, Yale, and Rice for having “female-only scholarships, awards, professional development workshops and even science and engineering camps for middle and high school girls.” In the *Times* article, a leader of an advocacy group that works on behalf of university students accused of sexual misconduct was quoted as saying, “the pendulum has swung too far in the other direction” for programs that encourage women to pursue degrees in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. A law professor and Title IX expert argued against single-gender projects in part “because the risk of treating people unequally on the basis of sex is promoting stereotypes.” In other words, women-only STEM programs were outdated and unfair to men.

These universities, alongside many others across the country, had implemented women-only programs because of fears of a different kind of discrimination—that, in fact, women were discouraged from studying or staying in STEM fields because number of factors, including an unwelcoming, “chilly climate” (Walton, Logel, Peach, Spencer & Zanna, 2014). Indeed, even with efforts in higher education to increase women’s participation in STEM, such as those that came under investigation by the DOE in 2019, women remain woefully underrepresented in some STEM fields; in 2015, they earned 18% of undergraduate degrees in computer sciences and 20% in engineering, and they filled up only 28% of science and engineering jobs in the workforce in 2018, despite making up more than half of the population with a college education (Watanabe, 2019).

This chilly climate extends to women in the STEM fields working in the academy, where it is difficult to recruit and retain women in STEM at some universities. In a statewide education system (SES) in the Midwest, one group of women came together to apply for a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant to address gender inequity at their institutions. This project aims to tell the story of that group.

Project Context

The purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the policy writing process of a group of women academics seeking to improve gender equity in STEM in their university system. This group, known as the DESIGN committee¹, is comprised of six professors in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields at six colleges and universities in the Midwest. As of May 2020, the members of the DESIGN committee work across academic ranks—lecturer, associate professor, and professor—STEM and social science departments.

The DESIGN committee is working to establish new policies that promote gender equity in a statewide system of public higher education. These policies apply to faculty across the system, and they are related to hiring practices, salary, tenure and promotion (for example, faculty annual review and automatic stop-the-clock for faculty on the tenure track), and labor practices (such as modified duties).

The DESIGN committee itself forms a core component of the State Institutional Group for Gender Equity (SIGGE) project. The SIGGE project consists of the DESIGN Committee, a steering committee made up of provosts and other college and university administrators, internal and external evaluators, and other stakeholders. The goal of SIGGE is to implement the policy

¹ To protect participants' identities, I use pseudonyms for the names of working committees and projects, institutional stakeholders, and the participants themselves.

changes recommended by the DESIGN committee; evaluate the success of the new policies in promoting gender equity at individual colleges and universities and at the system-wide level; and create a model for policy innovation that can be taken up by other institutions and systems of higher education. In 2015, the SIGGE project received a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant through ADVANCE, the Organizational Change for Gender Equity in STEM Academic Professions program, to support this work. As of May 2020, SIGGE is in the fifth year of the five-year grant.

In this dissertation, I focus on the work of the DESIGN committee, which is where much of the policy writing process takes place. Informed by research on rhetoric, policy, and feminist leadership in technical and professional communication (TPC) and organization studies, and through antenarrative and apparent feminism methodologies that include methods of observation, participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and artifact analysis, I aim to investigate the process of creating new policy designed to improve gender equity in the STEM fields.

The primary objectives of my research are:

1. To investigate the process of writing and implementing policy in a public system of higher education; and
2. To explore the affordances and challenges of feminist leadership practices within the DESIGN committee.

Secondary objectives of my research are:

1. To contribute to existing conversations on feminisms and technical communication through antenarrative and apparent feminism methodologies; and
2. To connect research on policy work in technical and professional communication to larger conversations about policy creation and gender equity in higher education.

My objectives are in conversation with several existing research threads within technical and professional communication (TPC) and beyond. To begin, I situate my project in the social justice turn in TPC (Jones, Moore, & Walton, 2016; Walton, Moore, & Jones, 2019). Walton, Moore, and Jones (2019) call for scholars to take up research on social injustices in TPC, including a lack of inclusion and representation in the field and hesitance on the part of privileged scholars when it comes to saying or doing the wrong thing in social justice work. I hope that my dissertation contributes to their vision of TPC as a field that addresses injustices in particular contexts; in my work, I study the policy writing process of academics hoping to address gender inequity through new policy in a statewide education system (SES).

Within the context of social justice, my work follows in the footsteps of a long history of scholarship in feminisms and technical communication—at both the methodological level and in the content of the policy writing process I am studying. As Jones, Moore, and Walton (2016) demonstrate, feminist research is one of the oldest and most prominent strands of social justice research in TPC. While antenarrative can be used to uncover non-dominant narratives and address a variety of social injustices, including sexist oppression, the other methodology that guides my work, apparent feminism, is explicitly feminist in orientation. Apparent feminism calls attention to current feminist interventions in technical communication, works with non-feminist allies to get feminist work done, and redefines efficiency as a process for incorporating diverse voices into technical communication content.

In addition, my research contributes to existing conversations about policy work in TPC. As I discuss in my review of the literature later in this chapter, my dissertation builds on TPC's history of investigating policymaking, but it does so within a little-studied context in the field: the academy. Indeed, much of the work in TPC related to academic institutions and policy work

involves curriculum development and program concerns in TPC (e.g., Allen, 2004; Read & Michaud, 2018; Rodrigo & Ramirez, 2017; Spilka, 2009) or professional development and labor practices (Meloncon, 2017). Thus far, few TPC scholars have broadened their scope to include higher education itself as a rhetorical institution (see Kossek & Zonia, 1994). What's more, I have found little scholarship that addresses policy work promoting gender equity in the STEM fields within the field of TPC². Thus, my dissertation expands current TPC scholarship into a new context, one that I anticipate will be of interest to researchers involved with work on gender equity, institutional policy in higher education, and feminist approaches to technical communication.

My research also addresses a gap in research on leadership and feminist leadership in TPC. As I detail in Chapter 4, the field of organization studies has a long history of researching leadership and communication, while fewer scholarly works in TPC discuss connections among leadership and communication, rhetoric, or writing. Within the subcategory of feminist leadership, organization studies is well-defined research thread; however, scholars in TPC are just beginning to study approaches to feminist leadership.

Looking beyond TPC, the policy composed by the DESIGN committee affects the lives of faculty members across disciplines, academic rank, and gender. What's more, the DESIGN committee is doing work that speaks to current conversations in the academy and national media about the gender pay gap, underrepresentation of women in STEM, and the "motherhood penalty" (AAUW, 2020; Michelmore & Sassler, 2016). These conversations point to the potential larger relevance of this dissertation to women in the academy.

² Scholars outside TPC have done research in policy and women in STEM (Howe, Juhas, & Herbers, 2014) and institutional change (Jovanovic & Armstrong, 2014).

I refer to this introductory chapter as “gathering raw materials” because through the antenarrative methodology I use in Chapter 3, I aim to create a new picture of the policy writing process of the DESIGN group that privileges non-dominant narratives about their work. Following Jones, Walton, and Moore (2016), I view my antenarrative as a tapestry with many threads. In Chapter 4, I add a new story to the tapestry through an analysis of the feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee’s leader, Hannah, using the apparent feminist methodology. In Chapter 5, I take a step back to view the tapestry as a whole, as I discuss the implications of policy work to redress injustice alongside implications for using feminist leadership practices in policy work.

Defining Terms

To begin, I define several key terms that I use throughout the dissertation: institution, organization, rhetoric, feminism, woman/women, and gender. These terms are essential to both the contest of my research as well as the results I present in Chapters 3 and 4.

Institution versus Organization

The women of the DESIGN Committee are working at individual universities within a statewide education system (SES)—in other words, they are working within the context of an institution.

TPC and organization studies are both concerned with institutions and organizations, and I turn to existing definitions for my project. Sullivan (2015) and Mayr (2008) attest to the difficulty in defining these terms. Mayr notes that while institution and organization are often used interchangeably, the term *institution* refers to public entities, while *organization* most often refers to corporations. What’s more, Mayr notes that institutions are linked to power in ways that organizations are not.

Because the members of the DESIGN Committee are working in a public system, I place them with an institution. Agar (1985) provides a useful definition of institutions still in use today: institutions are “a socially legitimated expertise together with those persons authorized to implement it” (p. 4). Institutions, then, can refer to physical settings, an entity (e.g., the media), and the people authorized to advance the interests of the institution. In my project, the DESIGN Committee members are embedded in two institutions: the larger statewide education system (SES) and the individual universities at which they work. Some of the stakeholders, such as the State Board of Education (SBOE), can also be seen as an institution, since they are in a position of power to advance the SES’s interests. However, the members of the DESIGN Committee, who also work to advance the interests of the SES, do not have much power, despite being responsible for writing new policy; I therefore do not refer to them as an institution. This lack of power becomes especially apparent in the policy writing process, as described in Chapter 3.

Rhetoric

Rhetoric is a research thread in TPC and organization studies, but it is much more prominent in TPC. Given its thousands-year history and development across multiple academic disciplines, there is no single definition of rhetoric—nor is there agreement about what rhetoric means within the fields of TPC or organization studies themselves.

For my study, I use a definition of rhetoric articulated by Keller (2019) in her work on rhetoric and mentoring. Keller sees rhetoric as “the study of networks of meaning-making, and these meaning-making practices include writing, composing, and performing.” I chose this definition because of the similarities between Keller’s work in mentoring and rhetoric and mine in leadership practices. Keller’s pilot study of mentoring employs workday observation and interviews, similar to my own project, and her work mentions leadership as one component of

mentorship processes. In addition, this broad definition of rhetoric encompasses the variety of meaning-making practices in the work of the DESIGN Committee and the SIGGE project as a whole.

Feminism(s), Woman/Women, and Gender

Similar to rhetoric, there is no single definition of feminism. Regarding the term *feminism*, Tong and Botts (2017) identify a wide range of feminist thinking, from liberal, radical, Marxist, and socialist feminisms to post-structural, postmodern, queer, women-of-color, and third-wave feminisms, among others—all of which resist simplistic definition. It is better to speak of feminisms than a feminism.

For purposes of this dissertation, I take up the definition of feminism by” (p. viii). This well-known definition encompasses radical feminist work, but it is also broad enough to address the work of the DESIGN Committee in their aim to improve gender equity in the STEM fields. Interestingly, hooks’ approach to feminism is one which not all of committee members themselves likely subscribe to, as I detail in Chapter 4.

Turning to woman and women, gender studies theory has called into question defining woman or women in traditional, simplistic biological terms; it has prompted theorists to ask, what does it mean to be a woman? Who defines woman, women, or femininity, and who decides who is included or excluded in those categories? Throughout this dissertation, I use the term *woman* to encompass people who identify as women, whether they are assigned that sex and/or gender at birth or not. I follow TPC scholars White, Rumsey, and Amidon (2015) in defining *gender* as “traits or characteristics linked to maleness or femaleness, which are culturally rather than biologically determined” (p. 29).

I must note, however, that the common understanding of the term “woman” as a cis-gendered female is the working definition of woman used by most of the stakeholders in the SIGGE project. The policy work of the DESIGN Committee does not explicitly exclude multiple understandings of gender and identity, but the unstated faculty member for whom the new policy is designed to recruit and retain is a cisgender woman; gender inequity is understood to mean inequity related to cisgender women. Because of this, the experiences of people who do not identify as cisgender women are not adequately considered during the policy writing process; however, Hannah, the PI and leader of the DESIGN Committee, notes the limitations of their approach to policy.

Reviewing the Literature in Technical and Professional Communication (TPC) and Organization Studies (OS)

In the following sections, I review literature in the fields of TPC and organization studies (OS) that help me situate my dissertation in existing scholarship and answer my research questions. I look beyond TPC to OS because of its robust work in institutions and rhetoric, policy, and leadership. While TPC research is my foundation, scholarship in OS enriches my approach to understanding the policy writing process and the feminist leadership practices enacted by the DESIGN Committee. I begin by discussing feminist work in TPC and organization studies, as I see my dissertation as a whole as contributing to feminist research in TPC. Feminist work in both fields share common understandings in feminist theory as it has developed since the 1980s. Next, I move to discussions of institutions and rhetoric in TPC and OS; while there are some overlaps between the fields, the OS approaches to rhetoric are distinguished by its relatively recent turn to rhetoric. Finally, I discuss policy research in TPC

and OS. While both fields are interested in policy in both organizations and corporations, TPC takes a more public, institutional focus, while OS often deals with policy in the corporate world.

Feminist Research in TPC

Feminist research encompasses a rich body of scholarship in TPC from the 1980s onward, although as Frost (2016) points out, there are fewer researchers doing feminist work more recently. Several scholars have traced the history of gender and feminism in TPC (Flynn, 1997; Frost, 2016; Smith & Thompson, 2002; White, Rumsey, & Amidon, 2016). These scholars point to work of Lay (1989) on gender studies and collaboration as the beginning of feminist work in TPC scholarship. Below, I briefly outline the trajectory of foundational feminist work in TPC, connecting it to key issues in my dissertation.

Much of the early feminist work in TPC focuses on language and sexism. Hall and Nelson (1990) argue that sexist language is both unethical and unprofessional (p. 75), and they suggest that instructors teach students to make editing for sexist language a standard procedure in the composing process (p. 76). Allen (1991) reviews previous studies on language and gender in the discipline, arguing that “researchers need to investigate the particular qualities of women’s language and distinguish it from men’s” (p. 382). Allen also calls for revised pedagogical approaches that emphasize the complexities of gender dynamics in the workplace.

Brasseur (1993) and Bosley (1994) expand feminist work in TPC beyond concerns with sexist language. To begin, Brasseur outlines a course in gender issues in technical communication. One of the course goals maintains that “students should be introduced to the problems inherent in gendered assumptions about rationality and objectivity” (116). Brasseur’s work, like much research related to language and gender, focuses on challenging existing assumptions about how we think about gender in TPC.

Bosley, meanwhile, focuses on audience analysis and gender, dispelling stereotypes about women's perceived ability to understand audience needs better than men. Bosley finds that women and men's technical documents did not show statistical differences in addressing audience considerations (p. 302), and her research reminds us that even positive stereotypes deserve our critical attention. Of course, much of the conversation surrounding gender equity policy is plagued by both positive and negative stereotypes, which might inform how the DESIGN committee approaches its policy revision work.

Rehling (1996) takes up a key issue in TPC, and one central to the process of the DESIGN committee: collaboration. Her research demonstrates that in mixed-gendered collaborative contexts in professional writing classrooms, men are more likely to be stereotyped as "techies" or "computer jocks" (p. 171). Furthermore, mixed-gendered groups tend to self-segregate themselves by gender into smaller teams (p. 172). Rehling posits that such segregation "may work against personal expansion and developing mutual understandings for the long term" (p. 173). In other words, gender diversity positively impacts team outcomes. Although the DESIGN committee consists entirely of women, they collaborate with men and women in the SIGGE project.

Later, Barker and Zifcak (1999) challenge gender difference-based theories of communication. They propose that researchers adopt gender-integrated theories, which they argue are more valid and useful in empirical research (p. 343). More recently, however, Tong and Klecun (2004) return to a focus on perceived gender differences. In their research on gender and user requirements, they argue that documented gender differences do not need to be "narrowed or neutralized" but can instead be successfully addressed by designers (p. 124). Conversations about perceived gender differences—often not from feminist perspectives—

surround policy discussions on parental leave and the gender pay gap, two areas of focus for the DESIGN committee.

More recently, Frost (2016) proposed an apparent feminism methodology as a way to galvanize feminist research in TPC. Apparent feminism guides my research into feminist leadership practices, although it shares important characters with antenarrative, as I describe in Chapter 2.

Feminist Research in OS

Feminist research is a growing area of interest within the larger umbrella of critical organization studies. As early as 1987, Flax connected feminism and postmodernism to organization studies. By the mid-1990s, feminist organization studies is a well-established research thread; for example, Calás and Smircich (2006) review existing feminist analyses of organizations and highlight how such work ranges from calls for reform of organizations to structural changes in organizations and society in a SAGE handbook about organization studies as whole. These feminist approaches stem from the same variety of feminist theories that influence feminist research in TPC, ranging from liberal to radical to postmodern feminisms, among other approaches.

More recently, feminist scholars in OS have called for greater attention to intersectionality of race, gender, and class in organization studies (Holvino 2010). In addition, feminist research in OS has begun to address contemporary events, including the #MeToo movement, recent women's marches in response to the Trump administration, and other everyday experiences of people in organizations (Bell, Meriläinen, Taylor, & Tienari, 2018). Similar to Frost's analysis of the state of feminist research in TPC, Bell et al. see feminist work as sidelined within organization studies, and they call for additional empirical research and

theorizing of feminist activism in workplaces. Their call echoes Frost's argument for an apparent feminist methodology that includes feminist critique and interventions in technical communication.

Institutions and Rhetoric in TPC

As a field, technical and professional communication (TPC) has traditionally focused on writing in organizational and institutional contexts. Indeed, Kimball (2006) argues that the field of technical and professional communication (TPC) has historically been focused on rhetoric and communication in institutions and organizations (p. 68). TPC research can help make visible what Longo (2000) has identified as the "invisibility of technical writing," which functions as a "mechanism that controls systems of management and discipline, thereby organizing the operations of modern institutions and the people within them" (p. ix). As Conklin and Hayhoe note, qualitative research on technical writing in one modern institution, the workplace, began in earnest in the 1980s (p. vii). Britt (2006) provides a helpful summary of early TPC research in organizations (Dautermann, 1993; Doheny-Farina, 1986; Paradis, Dobrin, & Miller, 1985; Pare, 1993). Britt also notes that more recently, as researchers in TPC began to focus on institutions rather than organizations, analyses of the rhetorical work of institutions have become especially important to scholars working in the rhetorics of health and medicine (p. 133).

Additionally, Britt (2006) provides a useful framework for understanding the trajectory of research on institutional rhetorics within TPC. While early empirical work in TPC focused on organizations, Britt points to work by Longo (1998; 2000) and Porter, Sullivan, Blythe, Grabill, and Miles (2000) as instrumental in turning the field's focus to institutions. Indeed, investigating institutional rhetorics is valuable because ". . . institutional forces legitimate some types of knowledge at the expense of other types, simultaneously constructing a particular reality and

making this reality seem natural and inevitable” (Britt, 2006, p. 133). What’s more, within TPC, “Institutions are coming to be seen as more than the setting within which rhetoric occurs; they are themselves ‘orchestrated’ by rhetoric (Porter et al. 625)” (Britt, 2006, p. 133). This assertion helps bridge the gap between approaches to institutions in TPC and OS, as I describe below.

Institutions and Rhetoric in OS

Researchers in OS have also come to see institutions and organizations as rhetorical. In this section, I highlight the OS approach to organizations as rhetoric, focusing on common ground between OS and TPC. This common ground informs my approach to understanding the context of the policy writing process of the DESIGN Committee.

In his foundational article connecting organization studies to rhetoric, Alvesson (1993) describes the rhetorical strategies used by knowledge-intensive firms (KIFs). Already, we can see one clear connection to TPC; at KIFs, professionals perform the kind of symbolic-analytic work that Johnson-Eilola (1996) advocates for technical communicators.

After complicating characteristics of KIFs—traditionally defined as firms that have “the capacity to solve complex problems through creative and innovative solutions” (p. 1000)—Alvesson argues for a social constructionist approach to understanding these firms, asserting that their “successes are more contingent upon more-or-less loose *beliefs* about them being able to offer something specific to clients” (p. 1002). KIFs must persuade clients that they can offer them something valuable. Because of this, Alvesson argues that “the persuasive or rhetorical element . . . is vital. Being perceived as an expert is then more crucial than being one” (p. 1004). Furthermore, knowledge-intensive firms, organizations, and workers (KIFOWs) offer ambiguous work results to their clients. For these reasons, Alvesson asserts that rhetoric is the “core” of KIFOWs (p. 1007).

According to Green and Li (2011), Alvesson's article was the first to link rhetoric and institutional theory, and it inspired a new area of research within management, rhetorical institutionalism (p. 1662). Green and Li further develop Alvesson's work in explicitly rhetorical terms familiar to scholars in TPC. They summarize Alvesson's argument by appealing to Aristotle, stating that the article's central claim is that "knowledge was in fact ambiguous or what Aristotle would label as contingent (Aristotle, 1991), and thus open to rhetorical construction and interpretation" (p. 1662). (Interestingly, Alvesson himself does not refer to Aristotle in his article). Furthermore, they offer a lengthy explanation of classical and new rhetorics, citing Aristotle, Kenneth Burke, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, Bizzell and Herzberg, Lunsford and Ede, and Robert Scott, among others. The authors' reliance on rhetorical theory is not useful to TPC simply because it is familiar; rather, researchers in management offer a unique perspective on rhetorical theory, informed by the affordances and constraints of their discipline, and they develop that theory as a way to understand organizations, one of the primary sites of TPC research.

Relevant to the context of my dissertation, Jarzabkowski and Sillence (2007) study the rhetorical strategies of managers in universities. The authors focus on a context in which the aim is to inspire subordinates' commitment to multiple strategic goals. They take a "rhetoric in context" approach, which emphasizes how the rhetorical strategies of managers change across contexts, and they also emphasize that way that context itself becomes a source of future rhetorical strategy:

Rhetorics involved in shaping commitment to strategy are specific to the context of interaction *but are also involved in constructing a future strategic context*. Context is instantiated through the discursive interaction of actors *but has longer duration than any*

specific interaction. Thus, top managers may draw on context as a source of rhetorical influence but context also influences the way that top managers construct their agency. (p. 1643)

Their results focus on three rhetorical practices used by managers at the universities: authority rhetoric, reciprocity rhetoric, and synergy rhetoric.

While TPC is focused on rhetoric in institutions, and organization studies on rhetoric in organizations, both research ways that rhetoric works within their respective entities. Their differences stem from the fields' distinct epistemologies and scope of research. While many TPC scholars have conceived of TPC as a field within the humanistic and rhetorical traditions (Miller, 1979; Rutter, 1991), organization studies has more recently come to rhetoric; what's more, rhetoric is not foundational to OS. OS is broadly defined as an interdisciplinary field that "engages sociology, psychology, anthropology, history and political science (Organization Studies). Simply put, TPC and OS have asked different questions and taken different approaches to understanding institutions and organizations; rhetoric offers one way for bridging the gap between them.

Policy Work in TPC

Within TPC's work on institutions, policy is a primary concern. Beginning in the 1980s, researchers in TPC have researched a variety of institutional contexts, often emphasizing public policy. In particular, TPC scholars have focused on environmental policy (Graham & Lindemann, 2005; Rude, 1997; Spoel, Goforth, Cheu, & Pearson 2008; Waddell, 1995; Walker and Walsh, 2011); environmental policy and risk communication (Grabill & Simmons, 1998; Simmons, 2007); science policy (DeVasto, Graham, & Zamparutti, 2015); health and healthcare policy (Grabill, 2000; Schryer and Spoel, 2005); privacy policy in corporate and governmental

contexts (Markel, 2005; 2010); sexual harassment policy (Cook, 2000; Ranney, 2000); policy in nonprofit organizations (Thatcher, 1998); police policy (Knieval, 2008); and public policy in general (Coogan, 2002; Smart, 1999; Smith, 2000).

What these various approaches to policy have in common is an understanding of policy as rhetoric; that is, policy involves meaning-making for policy writers and stakeholders. And while studies of policy in TPC have covered a variety of institutions and organizations, scholars have paid less attention to policy work within academia. My dissertation aims to contribute to research on policy writing in this little-studied study context.

Policy Work in OS

As I argue above, one of the primary differences between TPC and OS is the focus on institutions versus organizations. As Kelman (2017) notes, OS has increasingly turned its attention away from studying public organizations (what Mayr would call institutions) to focus on work life in firms and corporations.

However, one research strand within the broader field of organization studies, administrative studies, offers research on policy in education—one that often includes a focus on gender. In a foundational edited collection on gender, educational administration, and policy, editors Blackmore and Kenway (1993) present research that challenges the traditional, masculinist bias in administration and education and highlights the gendered nature of organizations. Later, Blackmore (1999) discusses educational leadership and policy in Australia. Here, Blackmore connects gender, leadership, and the educational policies to describe the work life of women administrators.

While Blackmore (1999) defines policy as both text and discourse (p. 16), scholars in organization studies do not approach policy as rhetorical. Policy is one of many factors that work

life experiences. Policy research in TPC, on the other hand, tends to be more focused on policy in a rhetorical context (for example, studying rhetors, audiences, situations, and the written policy itself).

Looking Ahead

With these raw research materials gathered from TPC and OS studies, I can create the tapestry that tells the story of the policy writing process of the DESIGN Committee. In Chapter 2, I focus on methodologies and methods that guided my project: the tools I use to get the job done. In Chapter 3, I complete the first part of my tapestry. I focus on the DESIGN Committee's policy making process, creating an antenarrative with threads of proximity, transparency, and accountability that help us understand how the committee wrote and argued for policy on automatic-stop-the-clock and modified duties. In Chapter 4, I create the second part of the tapestry, turning to the feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee's leader, Hannah, and the ways her commitment to creating community through collaboration and self-empowerment affected the policy writing process. Finally, in Chapter 5, I offer an interpretation of the tapestry: the implications of proximity, transparency, and accountability for policy writers working in institutional contexts who are interested in social justice work. I also discuss the affordances and challenges of feminist leadership practices in policy writing work.

CHAPTER 2: COLLECTING TOOLS

My interest in policy writing stems from my desire to explore a larger research thread in technical and professional communication (TPC), what Longo (2000) has identified as the “invisibility of technical writing.” This invisibility functions as a “mechanism that controls systems of management and discipline, thereby organizing the operations of modern institutions and the people within them” (p. ix). Working as a technical communicator and user researcher at software companies in Ohio and North Dakota, I became increasingly aware of the many places where technical communication has an effect on people’s everyday lives, especially in online life. How many user agreements do we accept in order to use software and services? How do these agreements limit what users can do on platforms? And even though these agreements are visible, how many users actually read them?

After I returned to academia in 2015, the invisibility of some forms of technical writing became more noticeable as I signed forms and attended mandatory university trainings; in other words, as I became institutionalized. When the opportunity to study the process of creating the policy that guides academic life—policy that is often not visible until something goes wrong and a genre of technical writing that serves as a way to manage and discipline people—I jumped at the chance to get a behind-the-scenes look of an opaque writing process.

Although I began this research project in March 2017, I was not new to the DESIGN Committee or its work. In the fall of 2016, I joined the project as an assistant to one of its external evaluators. As an assistant, I attended one face-to-face meeting of the DESIGN Committee in October 2016. Alongside the external evaluator, I listened to the committee’s description of their writing process and offered recommendations for communication and project management software.

After that October 2016 meeting, the external evaluator suggested that I consider asking the committee for permission to study their work for my dissertation project. I agreed with the evaluator that the opportunity to understand the policy writing process as enacted by the DESIGN Committee could provide new understandings of how this work gets done.

In this chapter, I collect the tools that enable me to create the tapestry of my study: the research questions and methodologies that guided my work, along with the methods I used to analyze the data I collected. I begin with a description of the research site and research questions. Next, I describe the two methodologies I used in my project: antenarrative and apparent feminism. Both methodologies have been proposed by scholars in technical and professional and communication (TPC) to address issues of social justice in the field.

Next, I describe participant selection and the methods used to gather and analyze data: observation, participant observation, semi-structured interviews. I also discuss the written artifacts I collected and my method for coding artifacts and interview and meeting transcripts. Finally, I discuss my efforts to practice reflexivity throughout the research process and the limitations of my research design.

Research Sites

The work of the DESIGN Committee took place at multiple sites, as did my research. The committee's five-year process of creating policy to promote gender equity involved numerous online and face-to-face meetings among committee members and with stakeholders at individual universities, including provosts; meetings with the State Board of Education (SBOE); and years of subcommittee and individual writing—emails, surveys, presentations, articles, and, of course, policy. I received IRB approval to begin collecting data in March 2017, year two of the grant. Over the next three years, I observed and participated in DESIGN Committee meetings,

interviewed committee members, and collected and analyzed written artifacts created by the group alongside publicly available documents related to the study on the SBOE, National Science Foundation (NSF), and DESIGN Committee websites.

Most of the work of the DESIGN Committee took place remotely. To conduct remote meetings, the committee used an audioconferencing program for the first three years; in 2018, it switched to Zoom. Physical meetings took place at university campuses across the state as well as a hotel conference site in the state capital. Additionally, committee members completed work on their own time at offices and homes.

Research Questions

As I sought IRB approval for my research in March 2017, I knew I wanted to compose a research question centered on the policy writing process. Later, as I began observing the committee members' engagement with feminism and began reading about women and leadership, I developed a second research question related to feminist leadership practices:

1. What does the process of policy writing look like for the DESIGN Committee?
2. In what ways do feminist leadership practices, as performed by the committee leader and other committee members, influence the work of the DESIGN committee?

The first research question was a consistent factor in my data collection from IRB approval in March 2017 to May 2020. I began collecting data related to feminist leadership practices in August 2018.

Methodology

Given these research questions, I chose two methodologies to guide my project: antenarrative and apparent feminism. Each methodology offers unique affordances for understanding the policy writing process and feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN

Committee. In the two sections that follow, I explain these methodologies and how they informed my project.

Antenarrative

Antenarrative is a relatively new methodology in technical and professional communication (TPC). In their foundational article on antenarrative in TPC, Jones, Moore, and Walton (2016) propose antenarrative as a methodology and practice to uncover non-dominant narratives in the field and attend to issues of diversity equity, and inclusion. The authors' approach to antenarrative in TPC also includes a consideration of positionality, power, and privilege as additional research goals.

Antenarrative itself defies easy explanation. Jones, Moore, and Walton introduce it using a variety of terms, and their explanation is worth quoting in full. For TPC, specifically, they propose antenarrative as:

. . . a disruptive 'before' story that seeks to destabilize and unravel aspects of the tightly woven dominant narrative about who we are as a field, what we do, where our work occurs, and what we value. David Boje (2001) introduced the term *antenarrative* to describe 'fragmented, non-linear, incoherent, collective, unplotted, and improper storytelling' (p. 1). In contrast to narratives, which Boje (2011) conceived as characterized by 'stability and order and univocality' (p. 5), antenarratives are poly-vocal, dynamic, and fragmented—yet highly interconnected. They link the static dominant narrative of the past with the dynamic 'lived story' of the present to enable reflective (past oriented) and prospective (future oriented) sense making (Boje, 2008, pp. 6, 13). (Jones, Moore, & Walton 2016, p. 212)

Antenarrative, then, departs from traditional narrative and storytelling in a number of ways. In the description above, a few terms stand out to me: fragmented, non-linear, and poly-vocal. Antenarratives are parts of a whole; they don't have to go from A to B to C, and they include multiple voices. Perhaps most importantly, antenarratives challenge dominant stories; they expand our understanding of what happened, what's happening now, and what could happen in the future.

Jones, Moore, and Walton, posit that antenarratives can challenge dominant narratives about what's important to researchers in TPC; through the antenarrative they create in their article, they demonstrate that TPC is about more than efficiency and technical expertise. Using the metaphor of a tapestry of TPC, they unravel the dominant narratives (threads) that describe the research concerns in the field and weave in new threads that show how feminism, gender studies, race and ethnicity, disability and accessibility, and other research topics that address social justice have been important to TPC from the 1990s to today.

Based on their antenarrative of the field, Jones, Moore and Walton propose a heuristic for researchers to critically reflect on positionality, privilege, and power—what they call the 3Ps. By using this heuristic, TPC researchers can help to create a more inclusive field and redress social injustices they uncover in their research.

With this summary of the antenarrative methodology, I now turn to how I use it in my research. In this dissertation, I build on and expand the context of Jones, Moore, and Walton's approach to antenarrative. While Jones, Moore, and Walton create an antenarrative to uncover non-dominant narratives that influence how TPC researchers understand what's important in the field, I use the methodology and practice to compose an antenarrative to challenge the official narrative surrounding the work of the DESIGN Committee. This narrative is found in the yearly

reports the committee submits to the National Science Foundation (NSF), which document what happened that year and plans for the year to come. This official narrative does not sufficiently capture the policy writing work of the DESIGN Committee, as I explain in Chapter 3.

To create my antenarrative, I build on Jones, Walton, and Moore's metaphor of narrative and antenarrative as tapestry. I pull together three new threads drawn from my data analysis—proximity, transparency, and accountability—to create an antenarrative of the DESIGN Committee's policy writing process. My antenarrative emerges from codes I developed as I analyzed data (see the Coding Process section below), and the codes themselves are based on fragments or sections of data—paragraphs scattered across interview and meeting transcripts. These fragments contain the voices of multiple research participants, and they are ultimately filtered through my own voice as a researcher. Gathered over a period three years, the threads of proximity, transparency, and accountability are not presented in chronological order. In this way, my antenarrative is fragmented, poly-vocal, and non-linear: three of the characteristics of antenarrative highlighted by Jones, Walton, and Moore.

Within my antenarrative, I include short narratives that help describe what I mean by the threads of proximity, transparency, and accountability. These narratives are written in the first person, and they draw on both my data analysis and experiences as a researcher. Like antenarrative as a whole, they are not meant to be “proper” storytelling, but rather work to further illustrate the threads of proximity, transparency, and accountability that characterize the DESIGN Committee's policy making process.

In addition to expanding the process of creating antenarrative to data collection, I also use the 3Ps heuristic throughout the antenarrative. In each thread, I discuss positionality, power, and privilege as it relates to participants, other stakeholders, and me in role as researcher. Reflecting

on the 3Ps helps ensure that my work addresses Jones, Moore, and Walton's call to use to use antenarrative to attend to issues of social justice in TPC research.

In sum, antenarrative serves as a methodology and practice to help me uncover the non-dominant, unofficial story of the DESIGN Committee's policy writing process, one that exists before (the ante- in antenarrative) and alongside the official narrative represented by the reports the committee submits to the NSF. As I argue in Chapter 3, antenarrative reveals an alternative perspective on the policy writing process—one that I believe can complement and expand our understanding of the committee's work described in the NSF reports. Additionally, using the 3Ps helps my research contribute to current conversations about diversity, equity, and inclusion in TPC, which helps me reach a secondary research objective.

Apparent Feminism

The second methodology I used to guide my project, apparent feminism, helped me identify the feminist leadership practices enacted by the DESIGN Committee members, especially those employed by the committee leader, Hannah. The results of my analysis using the apparent feminism methodology form the basis of Chapter 4.

Frost (2016) proposes apparent feminist methodology for technical and professional communication (TPC) researchers and practitioners as one that “. . . seeks to recognize and make apparent the urgent and sometimes hidden exigencies for feminist critique of contemporary technical rhetorics” (Frost, p. 5). This definition leads Frost to propose three major goals for apparent feminist methodology: (1) calling attention (“making more apparent”) the need for feminist perspectives and action in technical communication; (2) working with non-feminist allies to achieve feminist goals; and (3) emphasizing how the input of diverse audiences leads to efficient work (p. 5).

Apparent feminism is rooted in current social and political contexts. Frost explains that she proposed apparent feminism in response to recent legislation in several states that sought to undermine reproductive rights. Apparent feminist methodology gives researchers and practitioners a way to call attention to and intervene in what she deems “contemporary, oppressive situations,” which she notes can also be found in business and education, through making apparent feminist perspectives in TPC work (pp. 4-5).

Apparent feminism also resonates with contemporary conversations about feminism itself. Frost proposes apparent feminism to address negative responses to the term “feminism,” and to make apparent the ways that feminist work in TPC is often hidden (or considered “not feminist”). In addition, apparent feminism is designed to address the marked decrease in feminist technical communication scholarship since the 1990s. Frost positions apparent feminism as a way to recover and promote feminist thought in TPC research, and she calls on TPC scholars and practitioners to take up apparent feminism “to address a wide range of social injustices in a wide range of arenas all bearing on technical communication” (p. 21). This dissertation project is, in part, a response to Frost’s call.

In my research, apparent feminism serves as both a methodology and framework for analyzing the work of the DESIGN Committee. Drawing on the apparent feminism methodology, I enacted its three goals as a researcher:

- My project as a whole calls attention to the need for feminist work in policy writing. This need is especially apparent in the context of the work of the DESIGN Committee, which is attempting to address gender inequity in a university system in the Midwest.

- I worked with non-feminist allies to achieve the goals of my project: analyzing the policy writing process and feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee. As I discuss in Chapter 4, my participants and allies in the committee had varying degrees of identification with and commitment to feminism, from embracing radical feminist to not identifying as a feminist at all.
- My research provides an example of Frost's proposed new approach to efficiency, which involves incorporating diverse voices in the final technical communication product—in this case, policy. Both Chapters 3 and 4 demonstrate how this kind of efficiency works in the policy writing process.

However, through my reflective writing in research memos and mulling over the codes I created during the analysis phase of my research, I realized that the DESIGN Committee, too, practiced apparent feminism:

- The purpose of the SIGGE project, and the work of the DESIGN Committee itself, demonstrates a need for feminist approaches to creating policy in higher education. The project's primary goal was to create and implement policy to address gender inequity in STEM fields in the statewide education system (SES). In particular, the project was proposed and funded to recruit and retain women faculty in STEM.
- The DESIGN Committee likely worked with a variety of non-feminist allies who were stakeholders in the project. While stakeholders such as provosts, human resources managers, and State Board of Education (SBOE) members were not involved in my research project, and I therefore did not interview them, it is quite likely that these stakeholders share varying levels of commitment to feminism, from

enthusiastic endorsement to not identifying with feminism—or perhaps even viewing feminism in a negative light.

- Hannah’s feminist leadership practices, described in Chapter 4, show Frost’s proposed approach to efficiency in action. Through Hannah’s efforts to create community through collaboration and self-empowerment, the DESIGN Committee incorporates what they learned from diverse voices, including the voices of fellow faculty members in the SES, into the final drafts of policy.

Apparent feminism, then, serves as both an approach to my work in the project and an analytical framework for understanding the policy and leadership work of the DESIGN Committee. I further develop the bullet points above, which are based on the three goals of apparent feminism, in Chapter 3 and 4.

Methods

Guided by my research questions, antenarrative methodology and practice, and apparent feminism methodology, I elected to use multiple methods to collect data: observation and participant observation, semi-structured interviews, and artifact collection.

I knew from the beginning of my project that I would likely have access to documents from throughout the lifecycle of the grant. What’s more, I planned to interview participants, if they were open to speaking with me; I also hoped to be able to directly participate in the work of the DESIGN Committee, as I had done as the assistant to one of the external evaluators. I knew that even if I didn’t participate directly, I would likely have the chance to observe DESIGN Committee meetings.

In the sections that follow, I describe participant selection and recruitment, and I detail the observation, participant observation, interview, and artifact collection methods I used

throughout the project. Next, I describe the coding process I used to analyze meeting and interview transcripts. Finally, I discuss the limitations of my research.

Participant Selection and Recruitment

After I received IRB approval for my project, I introduced the project and my research goals at the March 2017 in-person meeting. I explained that the purpose of my research was to study communication and leadership practices in the committee and the policy writing process. I chose not to use the word “rhetoric” because of its often negative connotation outside of rhetorical scholarship. In addition, I presented updates on my research and dissertation writing in person and during online meetings throughout the data collection process. All DESIGN committee members and a graduate student signed consent forms. As new faculty and graduate students joined the committee, I explained my research and gained consent for participation.

The DESIGN Committee members were the sole participants in my research; I did not seek permission to work with other stakeholders in the SIGGE Project. The committee members included the grant’s Principal Investigator (PI), who also served as the de facto committee leader, and five campus representatives from across the SES. These six committee members form the core participants of the DESIGN Committee, and their policy writing efforts and leadership practices are the focus of my research.

It is important to note that the members with the DESIGN Committee fluctuated over time; five committee members left after they accepted new positions outside the statewide education system (SES). In addition, one committee member left after she took on an administrative role at her university. However, these changes did not disrupt my research process; the data I collected from working with the core participants listed in Table 1 form the basis of my results. All names are pseudonyms.

Table 1. Core Participants in my Research

Participant	Field	Institutional Status
Hannah	Sociology	Tenured; principal investigator and de facto committee leader
Beth	Computer science	Tenure-track
Heidi	Natural sciences	Tenured
Melanie	Natural sciences	Tenured
Natalie	Engineering	Non tenure-track researcher
Sarah	Natural sciences	Tenured

The six core participants were all faculty members at institutions in the statewide university system (SES). All were white women, and they ranged from approximately 40 to 65 years of age. I did not ask about gender identification during data collection, but it is probable that most of the committee are cisgender. I All but one were tenure-track or tenured faculty; the one exception had left a tenure-track job and now worked as a researcher and instructor. Finally, all worked in departments in the STEM fields or social sciences.

In addition to the core participants, I also interacted with one internal evaluator, also a faculty member in the SES; two external evaluators from outside the SES; three graduate students; and two members of the State Board of Education (SBOE). Note that because I did not seek IRB approval to conduct research with the external evaluators or State Board of Education members, I did not interview them for this study. See Table 2 for a list of additional research participants. All names are pseudonyms.

Table 2. Other Research Participants

Participant	Field	Institutional Status
Kathy	Social sciences	Tenured
Rachel	Social sciences	Graduate student
Fay	Social sciences	Graduate student
Terri	Social sciences	Graduate student

Observation and Participant Observation

Observation comprised one of the most valuable ways to understand the policy writing process and feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee. With participants' permission, I observed and took field notes at four in-person DESIGN Committee meetings. Davy and Valecillos (2010) define observation in technical communication as "the observation and recording of behaviors, actions, or preferences within clearly defined criteria by the researcher or their representatives" (p. 349). I wrote field notes on a variety of topics, including the policy writing process, feminist leadership practices, challenges experienced by the committee, communication practices, and group interactions, among others.

I also attended seven online meetings in which I collected data. With participants' permission, I recorded three of the online meetings and used the automated transcriber at Rev.com to transcribe them. September 2018. I also recorded a two-day, in person meeting in September 2019. See Table 3 for a summary of meetings I attended and the methods I used to collect data.

Table 3. Summary of Meetings Attended

Meeting Date	Type	Methods
March 2017	In person	Observation, participant observation, field notes
September 2017	Online with audioconferencing	Observation and field notes
November 2017	Online with audioconferencing	Observation and field notes
January 2018	Online with audioconferencing	Observation and field notes
March 2018	Online with audioconferencing	Observation and field notes
May 2018	In person	Observation, participant observation, field notes
September 2018	Online with videoconferencing	Observation, field notes, recording
December 2018	Online with videoconferencing	Observation, field notes, recording
February 2019	Online with videoconferencing	Observation, field notes, recording
September 2019	In person	Observation, participant observation, field notes, recording

In addition to observation, I engaged in a form of participant observation. In their foundational work on qualitative research in technical and professional communication, Sullivan

and Spilka (2011) note that the participant observation method, also known as ethnography, comes from the field of anthropology and involves being both a participant and observer who is focused primarily on culture at a site for a long period of time—often one to two years. What’s more, the participant researcher or ethnographer is involved with participants’ day-to-day lives (p. 22). While I engaged with my participants for over three years, I was not primarily focused on the culture, nor was I continuously embedded with participants in their daily lives over an extended period of time. For this reason, I did not engage in pure participant observation, although I borrowed extensively from this approach when I participated in DESIGN Committee activities.

As a participant observer, I participated in breakout groups during in-person meetings; gave my opinions on the policy work of the committee when asked; and helped to edit and proofread journal articles. Working as a participant observant helped me feel I was a part of the community that Hannah strived to create through her leadership practices.

Semi-Structured Interviews

To gain insight into the process of writing policy and the groups’ leadership practices, I conducted six semi-structured interviews, one with each core member of the DESIGN Committee, between October 2018 and April 2019. In semi-structured interviews, the researcher prepares a limited number of questions in advance related to the topic at hand and asks follow-up questions based on participant responses (Rubin & Rubin, 2015, p. 31). I used my research questions as a starting point for developing interview questions; in this way, I ensured by interview guide would help me meet the goals of my study. In addition, I listened carefully during interviews so that I could ask follow-up questions related to those goals. For the interview

guides I employed for the committee leader and its members, see Appendix A and Appendix B, respectively.

I conducted two interviews in person, which took place in a common dining area of the university and the participant’s office, respectively. I conducted the remaining four interviews using Skype or Skype for Business. I used Rev.com to transcribe the interview recordings, and I submitted transcriptions to each committee to review the transcriptions to ensure the content represented what they wanted to say—a common practice in feminist research (Kirsch, 2009, p. 59). Each participant either reviewed and approved the transcript or opted not to review the transcript but consented to my using the transcript for my research. See Table 4 for a summary of the interviewees, dates, and context. All names are pseudonyms.

Table 4. Semi-Structured Interview Participants, Dates, and Contexts

Interviewee	Date	Interview Context
Hannah	October 2018	Skype
Beth	January 2019	In-person (campus food court)
Heidi	January 2019	In-person (interviewee’s office)
Melanie	February 2019	Skype for Business
Natalie	March 2019	Skype for Business
Sarah	April 2019	Skype for Business

Artifact Collection

After I received IRB approval for my research, I began collecting written artifacts produced by the DESIGN Committee. These artifacts included emails and attachments; meeting notes and agendas; policy drafts; policy proposals; reports to the NSF; and drafts of manuscripts committee members were preparing for publication. I also collected artifacts produced by stakeholders connected to the committee, including publicly-available agendas and meeting notes from the State Board of Education meetings. See Table 5 for a summary of the artifacts I collected, the locations I collected them, authors, and collection dates.

Table 5. Summary of Artifacts Collected

Type of artifact	Location(s)	Author(s)	Collection dates
Email	Email server	DESIGN Committee	March 2017-May 2020
Meeting notes and agenda	Email server, in-person meetings	DESIGN Committee	March 2017-May 2020
Policy drafts	Google Drive, emails, in-person meetings	DESIGN Committee	March 2017-May 2020
Policy proposals	Google Drive, emails	DESIGN Committee	March 2017-May 2020
Reports to the National Science Foundation	Google Drive, emails	PI (with input from other DESIGN Committee members)	March 2017-May 2020
Manuscript drafts	Google Drive, emails	DESIGN Committee	March 2017-May 2020
State Board of Education agendas and meeting notes	SBOE website	SBOE	March 2017-May 2020

Coding Process

While I gathered data from a variety of sources using the methods described above, I decided to code only meeting transcripts and interview transcripts. The codes I developed ultimately became the three threads of the antenarrative tapestry I present in Chapter 3: threads of proximity, transparency, and accountability. They also helped me recognize the leadership practices Hannah revealed in her interview with me, and they formed the basis of my analysis of feminist leadership practices in Chapter 4.

I coded in multiple steps using First Cycle and Second Cycle coding (Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña 2014). In First Cycle coding, the researcher completes a first pass at coding to detect patterns (p. 73); in the Second Cycle, the researcher consolidates the First Cycle codes into larger patterns or themes (p. 86). I used NVivo software for both First Cycle and Second Cycle coding.

During First Cycle coding, I used descriptive and process coding to create preliminary codes. Descriptive codes summarize the topic of a section of data, while process coding focuses on gerunds to capture actions (Patel 2014). Guided by my research questions, I coded by paragraph, focusing on topics and processes related to policy writing and leadership practices.

I used my preliminary codes to create larger pattern codes in the Second Cycle. Patel (2014) defines pattern coding as “a way of grouping summaries into a smaller number of sets, themes, or constructs.” During this cycle, I began grouping my preliminary codes into sets related to policy writing and leadership practices. For policy writing, I created several preliminary codes before settling on three sets that encompassed what I saw as most important to the policy writing process and the eventual antenarrative that appears in Chapter 3: proximity, transparency, and accountability. For leadership practices, I created sets based on the contents of Hannah’s interview: community, collaboration, and self-empowerment.

I used data I left uncoded to triangulate my findings. For example, I used my field notes from observations and emails written by the DESIGN Committee to ensure that proximity, transparency, and accountability were indeed important aspects of the policy writing process. I also looked at meeting notes and agendas and reports to the NSF to strengthen my findings.

For the feminist leadership codes, I turned to my field notes from observations and emails from the DESIGN Committee, alongside interviews I conducted with the other members of the DESIGN Committee, to corroborate my findings related to Hannah’s leadership practices. See Appendix C and Appendix D for code sets for policy writing and feminist leadership practices, respectively.

Reflexivity

Finally, I used an additional method to reflect on the research process itself. Throughout the process of collecting and analyzing data for the case, I practiced reflexivity. In her foundational article on feminism and technical communication, Lay (1991) points to the importance of taking a researcher’s background (positionality) and values into account during a feminist research process. Without using the term, Lay points to the process of *reflexivity*. While

reflexivity (also known as *reflectivity* and *critical reflection*) can be defined in multiple ways, I drew primarily on a definition of reflexivity outlined by Kirsch (1999) to guide my approach. Building on the work of Fonow and Cook (1991), Kirsch describes reflexivity as a method that “enables researchers to be introspective, to analyze the research process in response to participants, and to adjust and refine their research goals as they learn more about those they study” (p. 3). I saw reflexivity as a way to critically reflect on my work as a researcher, and in the process, do better research. I also saw it as a way to strengthen the apparent feminist methodology that guided my work.

I practiced reflexivity by keeping a research journal in which I recorded thoughts, feelings, and observations about my work. At first, I used the journal to help me write about my values as a researcher and think through the ways my previous experiences as a researcher, graduate student, and woman in academia influenced my approach and data analysis. Later, the journal helped me reflect on my positionality, especially my role as a researcher and a graduate student working with accomplished researchers, most of whom are tenured faculty. In addition, it helped me rethink my approaches to interviews after I hit a roadblock in collecting data. In short, the research journal gave me a space for critically reflecting on all aspects of my research, including the ways my positionality impacted my work.

In addition to its connections to feminist research, practicing reflexivity goes hand in hand with the antenarrative methodology I used in my project. In their approach to antenarrative, Jones, Moore, and Walton (2016) offer a heuristic for inclusive research in TPC. This heuristic involves reflection on positionality, privilege, and power in the research process. One goal of the heuristic is to help a researcher reflect on the ways her own positionality, privilege, and power impact the research; a second goal is to reflect on positionality, privilege, and power among

participants, in methodological approaches and methods, and in findings. I enacted this first goal in my research journal, while the second goal is displayed in my results.

Limitations

Despite any researcher's efforts to create as robust a research design as possible, limitations are unavoidable in qualitative research. One limitation of this dissertation is the time period for data collection. Because I began collecting data near the end of the second year of the grant, I could not observe or participate in DESIGN Committee meetings prior the process of applying to the grant or during the first year of the committee's work. For work done prior to March 2017, I relied on emails and Google Drive artifacts, although participants sometimes described work from that period in interviews. Because of this limitation, I could not triangulate data from before March 2017.

A second limitation is the types of participants. For a fuller picture of the policy writing process, I could have interviewed provosts, human resources managers, and members of the State Board of Education (SBOE)—all important stakeholders in the project. Indeed, the SBOE acted as a gatekeeper, ultimately deciding to approve or deny the policy proposals offered by the DESIGN Committee. Including these stakeholders would have led to a more detailed antenarrative of the policy writing process.

Putting My Tools to Use

With the approach I outlined above—antenarrative and apparent feminism methodologies alongside methods of observation, participant observation, semi-structured interviews, artifact collection, coding processes, and reflexivity—I gathered the tools necessary to create a tapestry to tell the story of the DESIGN Committee. My tapestry focuses on an antenarrative of the policy writing process and an analysis, guided by apparent feminism, of the feminist leadership

practices enacted during that process. In Chapters 3 and 4, I put these tools to use as I report the results of my research.

CHAPTER 3: WARP AND WEFT: AN ANTENARRATIVE OF THE POLICY WRITING PROCESS

I began this research project with a large, overarching question: what does the policy writing process look like in the context of the work of the DESIGN Committee? In the process of understanding how the policy writing process worked, my understanding of the project began to take the form of a narrative—a story about the DESIGN Committee. I attempted to organize my notes about the committee’s work chronologically, paying particular attention to when the group met, what writing they produced, and what they were able to accomplish.

This traditional, chronological narrative approach to my research made intuitive sense. As a participant researcher, I experienced the work of the DESIGN Committee from 2016-2020, and I had documents dating to 2015. The NSF Advance Grant itself was demarcated by years, and reports chronicling the committee’s accomplishments were submitted to the NSF at the end of each year. In my mind, organizing the DESIGN Committee’s work by year was a sensible approach.

However, as my research progressed, I found that the narrative I was constructing—a story about the main events in the policy writing process, described year after year—obscured some of the most important aspects of the policy writing process. For example, it did not adequately convey the difficulties that physical distance played in impeding the committee’s work. In addition, it did not capture the ways that stakeholders acted as gatekeepers to accepting and implementing new policy. Finally, it did not adequately capture the fact that the group’s policy writing process mostly consisted of collecting data and preparing arguments for implementation; the actual writing of new policy was only a small part of the process. Because of these shortcomings, I turned to the antenarrative methodology and practice proposed by Jones, Moore,

and Walton (2016), which offered a more productive approach to understanding the DESIGN Committee's policy writing process. I first introduced Jones, Moore, and Walton's work in Chapter 2, and I return to it below.

As Jones, Moore, and Walton (2016) point out, antenarrative destabilizes dominant narratives, uncovering fragments of stories that display alternative understandings to dominant narratives' official accounts of what happened. In my interpretation of the antenarrative methodology and practice, antenarrative complicates the official story; it can give that story shades of nuance, or it can argue against it entirely, or make any number of revisions that alter the dominant story's narrative elements, such as plot, character, or setting. Antenarrative does not result in a complete story, but it certainly results in a *different* story.

Yet even with the antenarrative methodology in hand, I found myself returning to the idea of a "traditional" narrative, which I define as a chronological chronicle of what happened in the DESIGN Committee. This traditional narrative, which I consider the dominant narrative of the DESIGN Committee, is found in the NSF reports submitted each year. These reports serve as an "official" record of the work of the DESIGN Committee, and taken together, they tell the story of the DESIGN Committee year by year. In addition to those reports, I had constructed my own chronological account of the DESIGN Committee's work. At one point in the middle of my data collection. I even tried to create a detailed timeline of the policy writing process. Despite looking to the antenarrative methodology, I couldn't help but ask myself: why was I so reluctant to let go of my own traditional narrative around the DESIGN Committee? What did a traditional narrative offer that antenarrative didn't, and vice versa? I believe that the antenarrative that I construct in this chapter can begin to answer these questions.

In this chapter, I address my first research question: what does the process of policy writing look like for the DESIGN Committee? To answer that question, I compose an antenarrative of the policy writing process of the DESIGN Committee. I argue that the antenarrative approach uncovers essential aspects of the policy writing process unavailable in the official, dominant narrative. First, I present an analysis of what studying narrative and antenarrative means in organization studies and technical and professional communication studies, respectfully. To demonstrate the limits of narrative in investigating the policy writing process, I offer a brief traditional narrative of the policy writing work of the DESIGN Committee.

After laying the theoretical groundwork for an antenarrative approach to understanding the policy writing process, I offer an antenarrative of the DESIGN Committee's work, in contrast to the official, dominant narrative provided by the yearly NSF reports. This antenarrative is divided into three themes, or threads: proximity, transparency, and accountability. Within these threads, I offer an illustrative story and an analysis of positionality, power, and privilege (the 3Ps), and I discuss the affordances and challenges of using an antenarrative approach to understand writing processes. Finally, I discuss the implications of the DESIGN Committee's policy writing process, highlighting how the antenarrative reveals how the group's process consisted of data collection and discussion more than composing new policy itself.

I title this chapter warp and weft because these terms refer to the orientation of threads in weaving a tapestry: warp threads are vertical, while weft threads are horizontal (Terry 2020). The warp and weft threads here are proximity, transparency, and accountability; woven together, they help compose my antenarrative of the DESIGN Committee's policy writing process.

Narrative and Antenarrative in Organization Studies and Technical and Professional Communication

Antenarrative is a relatively new methodology to technical and professional communication (TPC). Because there is not much antenarrative scholarship in TPC, I looked to organization studies to enhance my understanding of the methodology. In both fields, considerations of narrative precede the use of antenarrative methodology. However, narrative and antenarrative are more commonly explored in organization studies; indeed, antenarrative itself originated in organization studies.

Following the narrative turn in social sciences in the 1970s and 1980s, researchers in organization studies began to seriously consider narrative in the 1990s. Perhaps the most prominent of these researchers is Czarniawska, whose 1997 edited collection, *A narrative approach to organization studies*, lays the foundation for narrative in the field. For Czarniawska, a narrative approach can help make sense of organizations because “. . . narratives—that is, texts that present events in time according to (impersonal) causes or (human) intentions—[...] are the main carriers of knowledge in modern societies toward the end of the 20th century” (p. vii). From there, scholars in organization studies explored narrative as an alternative way of knowledge-making apart from objectivist or positivistic approaches, including organizational storytelling, or the study of the stories people in an organization tell to understand and relate to other people and the organization itself (Brown, Denning, Groh & Prusak, 2005).

Building on organizational storytelling, Boje (2001) proposed antenarrative as a new method for investigating stories in organization studies and management. While his 2001 work is important for introducing the antenarrative concept, Boje subsequently developed his theory and

methodology of antenarrative. His later approaches resonate with work done in TPC, and one revised definition is worth quoting in full:

Antenarrative becomes accessible by its attributes: fragmented, non-linear, collective incoherence that is pre-narrative, beneath the entities dominant narrative and living stories, the between these entities, speculative bets on the future, the becoming of fore-care. In short, antenarrative is constitutive of the totality of storytelling, including its entities, narrative and living story. (2015)

Antenarrative contrasts with narrative; where narrative is complete (with a plot and story arc that includes a middle, beginning, and end), coherent and chronological, antenarrative is incomplete, disjointed, and non-linear. In other words, antenarrative can help us uncover the beginnings of story beneath the story. In organization studies, antenarrative is used to investigate topics ranging from the Damore memo at Google (Sandham and Fuller 2020) to organizational change at Burger King (Boje, Haley, & Saylor 2015).

Unlike in organization studies, narrative has not been a dominant preoccupation in technical and professional communication (TPC) research. Indeed, in the first edited collection on narrative and professional communication, editors Perkins and Blyer (1999) convincingly argue that narrative has been devalued in both pedagogy and scholarship. While highlighting a narrative turn and a focus on the narrative construction of self in fields such as anthropology and sociology, Perkins and Blyer lament the dearth of work on narrative in TPC, pointing to the field's privileging of objectivist, scientific, and Aristotelian rhetoric as key factors in ignoring narrative. However, they also point to ways that narrative can benefit TPC research. Relevant to my work with the DESIGN Committee, the authors underscore the ways narrative can be used in

feminist research, such as considering excluded topics (the kinds of writing produced by women) and becoming sensitive to the imbalance of power inherent in telling others' stories.

Narrative continued to be a minor scholarly concern in TPC research through the 2000s to present. Small (2017) traces the history of narrative research in TPC, from foundational articles by Barton and Barton (1988) and Rentz (1992) to recent articles on the story of a NASA anniversary (Williams 2012) and data visualization as story (Wolfe 2015). Still, Small points to a blatant contrast between what TPC researchers value and what they publish on: "As a discipline, we *use* stories and yet we seem to continue our indifference toward or even denial of acknowledging *storytelling* as a legitimate tool of the trade" (p. 238). To help narrative achieve legitimacy in TPC research, Small introduces antenarrative as a productive theory and methodology for the field. Like Jones, Moore, and Walton (2016), Small points to Boje as the creator of antenarrative methodology.

Because antenarrative is relatively new—and newer still to TPC—few scholars have engaged with it. Beyond Small (2017) and the Jones, Moore, and Walton (2016) article I used to guide my approach to antenarrative, a recent publication by Petersen and Moeller (2016) uses antenarrative as a method of feminist historiography to tell the stories of women at IBM. Like Petersen and Moeller, I see antenarrative as way to conduct feminist research and uncover hidden stories. While my research is most indebted to TPC scholars' approaches to understanding, I recognize the foundational work by Boje and others in organization studies in bringing us these approaches. In what follows, I aim to expand on the antenarrative methodology in TPC specifically. First, however, I begin where I truly began in my research—with a chronological story of what happened with the DESIGN Committee.

A Traditional Narrative Approach to Understanding the DESIGN Committee's Work

How might we begin to understand the DESIGN Committee's policy work? One way is to take the traditional narrative, chronological approach, highlighting important events and accomplishments. In the beginning stages of my research, I organized a traditional narrative in my research notes and revised it over time. Here, I offer a condensed version of that traditional narrative.

In 2015, the SIGGE Project began. In September 2016, I joined the grant as an assistant to an external evaluator. By March 2017, I had received permission from the DESIGN Committee as well as IRB approval from my institution to research the process of writing new policy in the State Educational System.

I begin with this context to highlight the fact that I was not there for the beginning of the SIGGE Project—as I discuss in Chapter 2. The story I tell arises not just from observation and personal experience, then, but also from analyzing documents—annual reports to the National Science Foundation (NSF), emails the committee members shared with me after the principal investigator of the NSF grant added me to the email list, and notes the committee members took during face-to-face and online meetings and shared through email or placed in the DESIGN Google Drive, among other documents.

The SIGGE Project began with an application for an NSF ADVANCE grant in 2015. The project had three main goals. First, it sought to make gender equity a priority through the implementation of top-down, statewide policy to improve gender equity for faculty in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. Alongside policy, the project would also work to distribute information about best practices related to gender equity. The second goal of the project was document the effects of policy change through data collected at

individual SES institutions. Finally, the project's third goal was to publish research on their efforts to create policy change from the top-down level.

Within SIGGE, the DESIGN Committee was responsible for creating the new policy and sharing it with State Board of Education (SBOE) members for approval. At first, the Committee consisted of four faculty members at one institution. During that first year, however, the Committee added representatives from five other SES universities, and although these institutional representatives changed over the next five years of the project, the core components of the DESIGN Committee were set.

Progress was slow. In years one and two of the grant, committee members focused on gathering data, including salary information and professional development plans (PDPs), from their individual universities. Alongside the committee's extensive research into best practices and policies to address gender equity implemented at other universities, the committee planned to use the data to help determine the direction policy should take.

However, the data collection process was challenging. Committee members faced resistance from Human Resources departments at several institutions who were hesitant to release data about faculty annual reviews (FARs)—even though that faculty data was anonymized and the FARs were part of the grant proposal. Committee members were able to collect salary data across the system, and they conducted and analyzed a faculty climate survey distributed to all tenure-track or tenured faculty. Data collection was especially important to the writing process because the committee used data to argue for policy change.

In addition, each of the Provosts who signed off on the SIGGE project eventually left their positions and were replaced—and at some institutions, the Provost was replaced more than once. Understandably, this change in institutional personnel affected the DESIGN Committee's

work, as the new Provosts were tasked with learning about the SIGGE project, among their other responsibilities. What's more, the new Provosts' willingness to participate and support in the project varied by institutions.

Indeed, as the project progressed, the DESIGN Committee continued to face both internal and external roadblocks to writing policy. Internally, the makeup of the DESIGN Committee changed several times over the life of the grant as members accepted new jobs or moved out of state, and by 2020, only three of the original members of the committee were left—the principal investigator, internal evaluator and one institutional representative. With each committee member's departure, valuable project knowledge and experience was lost. Additionally, each new committee member had to learn about the project, what work was already completed, and make sense of and take on work left behind by previous committee members. Understandably, the onboarding process for each new member took time.

Despite these roadblocks, the DESIGN Committee submitted two policy proposals to the SBOE. The committee proposed the first policy, an automatic stop-the-clock policy for faculty on the tenure track who experience certain qualifying life events. The committee first proposed the policy to the grant's steering committee in June 2018. The State Board of Education (SBOE) gave the policy a first reading during its October 2018 meeting, and it was approved by the SBOE at its December 2018 meeting. The six universities of the SES began implementing the new policy in the spring 2019 semester.

Work on the second policy, involving modified duties after certain life events, did not go as smoothly as the first policy. While the modified duties policy was approved by the steering committee, which includes members of the SBOE, in 2018, the SBOE turned around and rejected it in 2019. The committee members viewed the SBOE's action as a recension of earlier

approval. By the committee's September 2019 face-to-face meeting, the DESIGN Committee had not heard any feedback on why the policy was rejected or how to revise it for a second reading. Eventually, the committee received feedback from members of the SBOE and revised the modified duties policy into what they called an "alternative work schedule" policy. However, as of spring 2020, the alternative work schedule policy had not been approved by SBOE.

Concurrent to the policy writing process outlined above, the committee continued to develop two additional policy proposals: policy three related to transparency in the promotion and tenure process, while policy four involved implementing inclusive hiring practices. In addition, the DESIGN Committee moved forward with other activities related to developing policy drafts: faculty satisfaction surveys at each SES institution; collection and analysis of FARs and professional development plans; collection of national data related to transparency in promotion and tenure as well as inclusive hiring practices; and analyzing STEM faculty salaries across SES institutions.

In sum, the DESIGN Committee successfully submitted one policy related to automatic-stop-the-clock. It submitted a second policy on alternative work schedules for faculty, but that policy had not been approved by spring 2020. As of early 2020, the DESIGN Committee had not yet met the goals it had set for itself, three policies implemented by the end of the grant, even as it continued to a variety of intensive research activities to support the grant writing process.

I could continue my traditional narrative, but I'll stop here. Despite what I hoped would be a straightforward, mostly chronological, and easy to understand story about the work of the committee, the process of writing this traditional narrative was much more difficult than I expected. The complexity of the project, the changing personnel within the committee and among the Provosts, and the distance between meetings meant that committee members and I

spent a lot of time catching up on progress and getting our bearings during Zoom and face-to-face meetings, and these factors are reflected in my narrative.

In addition, even with my inclination to hold onto traditional narratives, I can't help but feel the story above is inadequate. Yes, it covers the major events outlined in the official NSF narrative with a few events and observations added from my experience. My narrative fails at objectivity before I even type the first word, as I can construct it only from partial knowledge and with my own value judgments ("progress was slow"). And yes, I could map these events onto a timeline to tell a linear, chronological story of the DESIGN Committee's work. But a traditional narrative in itself is incomplete, even if I had the time and space for additional details. It presents the official face of the project to the NSF and project stakeholders. To really get at the policy writing process, I must deemphasize aspects of the official or traditional narrative and emphasize the antenarrative hidden underneath and between it.

Uncovering New Threads in the DESIGN Committee Tapestry

In their foundational article on antenarrative in technical communication, Jones, Moore, and Walton (2016) describe the process of creating an antenarrative through analogy. If a completed tapestry represents the dominant narrative of technical communication, then unraveling that tapestry, and adding new threads, incorporates antenarrative into the tapestry's story.

I extend Jones, Moore, and Walton's analogy here. Imagine we are standing in front of a tapestry—a work of art that tells the story of the DESIGN Committee, the SIGGE Project, and its stakeholders. Standing a few feet back, we can see what we believe to be is the "full" or "official" narrative of the policy writing process.

After we move closer, though, we begin to pick apart individual threads within the tapestry—blues, yellows, reds. If we focus on one thread, our view—and our understanding—of the tapestry changes completely. Now, instead of seeing the “full” and “official” story, we can concentrate on its details, and as a result, see the tapestry—and the project—in an entirely new way.

Building upon the antenarrative methodology presented by Jones, Moore, and Walton (2016), the threads in my tapestry consist of themes uncovered during my coding of interviews and artifacts as well as the notes I took during observation and participant observation. These threads are: proximity, transparency, and accountability. In addition, following antenarrative methodology’s emphasis on diverse voices, the threads are composed of multiple voices involved with the DESIGN Committee. These voices include committee members, stakeholders in the project, and me.

By focusing on the threads of proximity, transparency, and accountability, I uncover the nondominant narrative of the DESIGN Committee’s work hidden beneath the dominant narrative presented in the yearly National Science Foundation (NSF) reports. As I argue below, this nondominant narrative reveals important aspects of the policy making process and focuses our attention on what would otherwise be hidden in the official reports.

To illustrate the threads of my antenarrative, I rely on story fragments gleaned from my research. To continue my extension of the tapestry analogy proposed by Jones, Walton, and Moore (2016), these story fragments comprise the materials of the antenarrative threads, the wools, linens, or silks that make up the threads. While Jones, Moore, and Walton refer to threads of an antenarrative tapestry, they do not extend the tapestry analogy to include the physical

materials tapestries are made of. I chose to call the story fragments “materials” because they build the threads of the antenarrative.

Furthermore, while I delineate threads using headings and subheadings, they are ultimately intertwined. I recognize that dividing these threads is perhaps an artificial solution for understanding them, and one that relies on the logical and linear structure of traditional narrative.

Proximity

Proximity is a measure of distance. Distance can be gauged physically (e.g., how near or far individuals are in space or geographically), ideologically, and across time, among other aspects. In the context of the policy writing process of the DESIGN Committee, physical and ideological proximity plays a prominent role and offers unique challenges to the committee. The thread of physical proximity is a prominent one in my antenarrative, as physical distance impacted the work of the committee throughout the lifecycle of the grant.

The members of the DESIGN Committee were located at six institutions across the state, and the committee shared a commitment to hosting a face-to-face meeting at each university at least once a year. While some of the universities were within a one- or two-hour drive of one another, others were located on the other side of the state—over 430 miles away from their counterparts. What’s more, weather and driving conditions hindered the committee’s ability to meet. One December, a face-to-face meeting was canceled because of a blizzard. A few months later, driving to and from a meeting in March was made more difficult due to flooding.

Given the members’ physical distance, the DESIGN committee understandably relied on remote working methods and technology to get the job done. The primary tools for remote working included phone meetings (for the first three years of the grant), Zoom meetings, emails (with attachments), and Google Drive. The use of these tools led to several challenges in

organization and communication—challenges which might have been less daunting, or resolved more quickly, if physical distance had not impeded the committee from meeting more often in person.

While the DESIGN Committee primarily used email to communicate updates and distribute policy drafts and other documents, the volume of email and attachments over a five-year period was quite large; as of spring 2020, the committee had sent over 700 emails. It is possible that the committee sent even more than 700, as this figure represents only those emails that I was sent directly or copied on. To help organize their work, the committee, the committee also used Google Drive as a repository for documents related to the project.

A story of Google Drive illustrates one challenge of physical distance and remote work. I build this story fragment from my own observations, while the quotations I use are direct quotations taken from meeting transcriptions and spoken by the DESIGN Committee members themselves.

It is January 2018, and our Zoom meeting is about to wrap up. Hannah is discussing an updated version of the automatic stop-the-clock policy. Suddenly, Sarah interrupts her: “Is it in the Google Drive?”

“No,” Hannah replies. “It’s in the email I sent to everybody.”

Two months later, March 2018. Again, we are discussing the automatic stop-the-clock policy. I feel a sense of déjà vu as Sarah asks, “Is the current, up-to-date version in the Google Drive?”

Hannah doesn’t even pause. “We do not. That’s one thing I’m always trying to track down. I will send that to everybody, and I’ll create a new folder in Google Drive that’s going to be on policy drafts, so that way we can find them easier.

While the volume of email and attachments led committee members to use Google Drive as a second tool for housing documents, keeping the Google Drive itself updated and organized was a challenge. Over five years, twelve people had access to the drive, which included committee members who left and students who graduated and moved on from the project. Each of those twelve members added folders and documents without making use of a shared organizational scheme, and by the fifth year of the project, it was difficult for committee members (and this researcher) to locate documents, even when using the search function. In short, using Google Drive became frustrating and ineffective. Without an explicit organization scheme guiding their work, committee members created folders and uploaded documents in an unsystematic way. Committee members created new folders and subfolders when using existing folders might have been more appropriate, and they added new documents in what seemed like arbitrary places. In short, using Google Drive became frustrating and ineffective.

The physical distance between committee members meant that they had to rely almost exclusively on online tools to get their work done. Would face-to-face meetings have solved the problem of using Google Drive ineffectively? Not entirely. However, consistently meeting in person would almost certainly have lessened the volume of emails. Fewer emails and attachments, alongside the practice of projecting the committee's Google Drive during meetings, likely could have helped members find information faster.

Eventually, the DESIGN Committee decided that they'd had enough of their Google Drive, and in 2019, Hannah tasked a graduate student with organizing it. After the student finished reorganizing it, she explained the organization scheme to committee members. Furthermore, as the project progressed, and especially in the years 2019 and 2020, the committee actively sought to address communication and organization challenges that stemmed from

physical distance and remote work. After Melanie suggested a different approach to meeting and working between meetings, the group agreed to meet multiple times a month, and Hannah committed to sending meeting agendas in advance and sticking to the agenda. Before that change, the committee did not have a set schedule for meetings, and they often went several months without a videoconference.

The DESIGN Committee's challenges related to physical distance and remote work are especially relevant in the age of COVID. Many workers have suddenly transitioned to remote work. In both industry and academia, people are working with minimal resources and developing "Zoom fatigue"—a phenomenon of feeling tired after attending Zoom meetings day after day, week after week (Jiang, 2020). The implications of the DESIGN Committee's struggles with mostly remote work may prompt us to consider: do complex projects suffer from being online only? Alternatively, are there any advantages to collaborating on complex projects remotely? I return to these implications in the final chapter of this dissertation.

Despite these challenges, however, the circumstances that led to physical distance among committee members had one important crucial benefit: it ensured that the DESIGN Committee included diverse voices across institutions, thereby providing a more expansive perspective than would have been otherwise possible. For example, the DESIGN Committee could have consisted solely of members from the PI's institution. Doing so would have eliminated the need for phone and videoconference meetings, as the committee members could have met face-to-face and worked side-by-side. However, limiting committee members to one university would have also limited the knowledge and capabilities that members at the other universities could have provided. Because the SIGGE project focused on policy change across the entire statewide

system, I believe that it was essential for the policy writers of the DESIGN Committee to consist of representatives from each university.

Transparency

Transparency is the quality of making something clear. It comes from a sense of openness, of sharing motivations and explanations for one's words. Within organization studies, transparency has several definitions. In her work on organizational transparency on pay decisions, Castilla (2015) defines transparency as "...a set of procedures making relevant, accessible, and accurate [...] information available to certain individuals (or groups of individuals)." Transparency, or a lack of transparency, had a significant effect on the policy writing process of the DESIGN Committee.

This transparency thread does not stand on its own, however; it partially stems from the previous thread of proximity. Ideological proximity is a term I developed to describe the differences in ideology that divided the policy writers (the DESIGN Committee) from the gatekeepers who decided the fate of the policy (the State Board of Education). I discuss ideological proximity here, rather than in the previous section, because I believe this concept is essential to understanding the thread of transparency. Like a true tapestry, the threads of my antenarrative are woven together to create a bigger picture.

In a project with individuals of diverse backgrounds and goals, differences of beliefs are to be expected. A significant challenge for the DESIGN Committee was the ideological distance among committee members and key stakeholders in the SIGGE project, including the State Board of Education (SBOE) and Provosts. In a project dedicated to creating new policy to increase gender equity in STEM and positively impact faculty members—especially women—both members of the DESIGN Committee and other stakeholders understandably approached the

project from varying perspectives. These perspectives stemmed from members and stakeholders' ideological commitments, both explicit and implicit, and evident in the data I collected.

SIGGE can be understood as a “liberal feminist project” (Tong and Botts, 2018, p. 29) because of its emphasis on policy that would allow women in to complete equally with men – despite the fact that the grant application itself never mentions feminism. However, the DESIGN Committee members brought with them varying levels of committee to feminism and understandings of equity and equality. Likewise, other SIGGE stakeholders brought their own perspectives on gender and equity. I see the differences in perspectives as a kind of ideological distance, which led to differing levels of commitment to adopting and implementing new policy. In addition, ideological distance worked as contributing factor in the lack of transparency in the policy acceptance and implementation process.

From the very beginning of the grant, the DESIGN Committee faced an uphill battle. Although Provosts at each institution and the SBOE signed off on the grant, indicating agreement with the grant's goals and methods, committee members quickly became frustrated with what they saw as a lackluster level of commitment from stakeholders outside of the DESIGN Committee to the grant's primary goal of implementing new policy to address gender equity at the system-wide level. Some of this less-than-enthusiastic commitment took the form of obstructing data collection, which I discuss in the subsequent accountability thread.

The story of modified duties perhaps best illustrates the role of transparency in the grant writing process. If transparency is a set of procedures that make relevant information available to stakeholders (Castilla 2015), then what happened with modified duties represents a lack of transparency. Similar to the proximity story fragment, I write from my own perspective as a researcher. My take on modified duties is influenced by my years of work with committee

members as well as my decidedly non-objective stance of wanting the committee to succeed in their goals. I hope this fragment does justice to the sense of frustration felt by committee members.

As the grant nears its end, there is a palpable sense of disappointment among DESIGN Committee members. I notice that Hannah, especially, makes a point to discuss how frustrated she is by their lack of process during Zoom meetings. Sure, the automatic stop-the-clock was a success. But the goal was to implement three new policies in five years. With only stop-the-clock under their belts, the committee members discuss applying for a grant extension or continuing the work unpaid.

In early 2019, however, things are looking up. The DESIGN Committee submits a policy for modified duties, which are assigned when faculty members experience life events that prevent them from their usual teaching and research duties. The committee members feel confident; after all, they modeled their policy after examples they found in other university systems. And, indeed, the SBOE accepts the policy. Another victory!

Summer is a slow time for the DESIGN Committee, and the summer of 2019 is no different. Instead of meeting at a committee member's home institution, the DESIGN Committee decides to meet in the state capital and invite SBOE members to the meeting to discuss progress on the grant.

That decision proves fortuitous. During the summer, Hannah learns that the SBOE has rejected the modified duties policy, even though it had been accepted before. The board offers no explanation, even after Hannah reaches out to them. Although Hannah asks for feedback on the policy multiple times, she doesn't hear anything. Complete radio silence. As we meet in the capital in September, I can't help but notice how disheartened—and perhaps a little angry—some

of the committee members are. Two SBOE members come to the meeting, and because they asked me not to share the contents of their presentation, I cannot go into detail here. I can say that the explanation the SBOE members provided for the rejection of the modified duties did spark ideas for revision, including reframing the policy as an “alternative work schedule,” the terminology used in policy that applies to state government position outside of the university system. Still, as of spring 2020, when I stopped collecting data on the group, the modified duties/alternative work schedule policy had not been approved by the SBOE.

The lack of transparency on the part of the SBOE reasonably makes the policy writing process more difficult. Had the SBOE notified the DESIGN Committee about their objections to the modified duties policy—either earlier in the spring or even during the summer, when Hannah specifically asked for feedback—the committee could have begun to revise the policy before meeting with SBOE members at the state capital. Additionally, the board’s process for accepting or rejecting policy was not transparent. In many ways, the DESIGN Committee worked in the dark.

Of course, the SBOE was not obligated to be transparent with the DESIGN Committee. According to the board’s website³, its purpose is to govern the state educational system, and it has the “full power” to do so. The board’s manual of policies and procedures does not address the kinds of information it must share with the people in the system working under its mandate. In addition, the board may have been entirely justified in its actions—for example, perhaps there are limitations to what they can legally share. Perhaps the board members didn’t have time or didn’t see the value in explaining themselves. Using the 3Ps heuristic proposed by Jones, Moore,

³ To protect the identity of my research participants, I do not include the SBOE website in my list of references.

and Walton (2016), the SBOE is exercising power over the DESIGN Committee with detrimental results for the committee's goals. While the DESIGN Committee was responsible for creating the policy, the SBOE acted as gatekeeper, and the board's lack of transparency in decision making meant that the DESIGN Committee worked on individual policy proposals for years without knowing whether their work would be accepted by the board. Ultimately, in a complex project with multiple stakeholders who are physically and ideologically distance from one another, I argue that transparency could have helped the policy writers do their job more efficiently and effectively. If the DESIGN Committee member had access to the relevant information about why their modified duties project proposal was rejected at the time it was rejected, then they could have addressed the SBOE's concerns more quickly and moved on to other policy proposals. Instead, the committee was left in the dark.

Accountability

The final thread in my antenarrative tapestry is accountability. Accountability means taking responsibility and being responsible to other stakeholders. As Castilla (2015) notes, accountability has been widely studied in social psychology, and it can be defined as "...being answerable to audiences in terms of performing up to certain standards, thereby fulfilling responsibilities and expectations (Weigold and Schlenker 1991)." Within the SIGGE project, accountability was important both within the DESIGN Committee and in the DESIGN Committee's work with other stakeholders. The members of the SIGGE project were accountable to the National Science Foundation (NSF) who funded them, but also to the faculty members who were affected by SES policy. By agreeing to implement policy to increase gender equity across the system, the main goal of the project's ADVANCE grant, the members of the SIGGE project were agreeing to address shortcomings in current policy that had contributed to

STEM faculty leaving the system. The SIGGE project explicitly promised to make gender equity a priority in policy and best practices, making them accountable to faculty.

I'll begin weaving the accountability thread by looking at it within the DESIGN Committee. As I have discussed previously, the threads of this antenarrative tapestry are not easily disentangled from one another. The combination of physical proximity (distance) and lack of transparency led to committee members not being accountable to one another like they could (or perhaps even should) have been.

When DESIGN Committee members did not see or communicate with one another often, when they were not sure what other committee members are working, and when the DESIGN Committee work was just one responsibility among many as faculty members in the SES, it is perhaps understandable how committee members did not always meet their responsibilities. Members forgot about tasks. They forgot about deadlines. They experienced illness or needed to take care of their kids. In the DESIGN Committee, members valued transparency, and they apologized for not getting their work done; they didn't make excuses or ignore their responsibilities. Eventually, the committee members complete their work.

While accountability issues with the DESIGN Committee may have had a small impact on the efficiency and effectiveness of the policy writing process, a lack of accountability outside of the committee highly impacted the committee's work. This is where the policy writing process really began to break down.

A story fragment of obstruction in data collection perhaps best illustrates the ways a lack of accountability impeded the writing process:

Another meeting. Another time Hannah is frustrated that they haven't received any data about faculty retention from HR departments. And the data we have received isn't helpful. I

don't understand. The DESIGN Committee has reasonable research goals. The goals were listed in the original grant proposal and approved by the NSF. Each Provost signed off on these goals, too. Along with the SBOE. And yet, many universities have refused to cooperate. Or even made the process harder!

We're sitting in the basement at one of the universities. I'm still fairly new to the project, trying to get my head around things. All of a sudden, Hannah starts talking about a PDF emailed to her. One HR department sent the data as an image PDF, and Hannah is pretty sure that that the data exported from the HR software doesn't start out as an image PDF. The PDF is unusable. None of us can believe it. I later learn that the committee hires someone to painstakingly type out all the data in an Excel file so that the committee can analyze it.

Working with the SBOE is even harder. Hannah has asked for data that only the SBOE has—for four years! As of spring 2020, Hannah is still waiting. And we're not exactly sure why.

Throughout the SIGGE project, some stakeholders demonstrated little to no accountability for their actions. Of course, I am writing from my own perspective, which is heavily influenced by members of the DESIGN Committee. Similar to the reasoning behind not providing feedback on the modified duties policy, stakeholders may have had valid reasons for their actions that the Committee members and I were not aware of. It's quite likely that SBOE policy hampered the DESIGN Committee's ability to successfully propose new policy. However, after searching the SBOE's own policies and procedures manual, I could not find any policy discussing how the board must handle sharing information about its decisions. While this may be seen as a gap in policy on the one hand, it can also be considered a way for the SBOE to conduct its business efficiently.

The problem with the lack of accountability comes down to this: The DESIGN committee couldn't get the work done it promised to do for the grant. The committee depended on other stakeholders in the project for much of the numerical data. A lack of accountability meant a lack of support for the policy writers. Returning to the 3Ps heuristic proposed by Jones, Moore, and Walton's (2016), the accountability thread points to a power differential among stakeholders; the DESIGN Committee, which also had the most responsibility, was at the bottom of the hierarchy. At the end of the day, some stakeholders in the SIGGE project, including the SBOE and institutional HR departments, showed a lack of accountability not only to the DESIGN Committee, but also to the NSF.

I do not believe that there could have been a simple solution to a lack of accountability in the SIGGE project. No one can force a stakeholder to be on the same page—even if they agreed to conditions on a literal page of a grant application. The implication here is simple, but powerful: if stakeholders don't agree to the goals of a policy writing project, then it's that much harder to get the work done.

Narrative and Antenarrative

Now the first section of the tapestry is complete. In weaving the unofficial, non-dominant story of the DESIGN Committee process, I highlight not traditional aspects of narrative, such as plot, setting, characters, or a discernible story arc. Instead, I focus on three threads gleaned from my coding data: proximity, transparency, and accountability.

The threads of proximity, transparency, and accountability lend themselves to the kind of fragmented, polyvocal, and non-linear story progress characterized by antenarrative (Boje, 2015; Jones, Moore, and Walton, 2016). In my antenarrative, I deemphasize aspects of the official narrative found in the NSF reports, such as a chronological listing of events and plans for the

next year's grant activity. Rather than presenting a chronological description of the policy writing process, I have instead presented threads that I believe illustrate the most revealing aspects of that process: the ways physical and ideological distance impeded the committee's work; how a lack of transparency in the process of accepting new policy made the writing process less efficient; and the importance of accountability among stakeholders for reaching writing goals.

However, as Czarniawska (1997) reminds us, "narratives are the main carriers of knowledge in the late twentieth century" (p. vii). I'd argue that not much has changed in the early twenty-first. At the beginning of this chapter, I offered a traditional, mostly chronological narrative of the DESIGN Committee's writing process, focusing on what I consider to be the main events in that process, such as challenges and successes in reaching committee policy goals. This traditional narrative focused on what the characters (the DESIGN Committee) did over time.

I return now to the questions I posed at the beginning of this chapter: why was I so reluctant to let go of my own traditional narrative around the DESIGN Committee? What did a traditional narrative offer that antenarrative didn't, and vice versa? First, I believe I was hesitant to let go because of Czarniawska's observation: narrative is one of the main ways I make sense of the world. Second, as a former technical communicator, I am trained to present information in a step-by-step, chronological manner. As I wrote instructions for using software, for example, I could not instruct users to do required actions out of order without leaving my readers frustrated (and perhaps leaving myself out of a job).

Ultimately, I believe both a traditional, dominant, or official narrative of the DESIGN Committee's policy writing process—best exemplified by yearly reports to the NSF—can

complement an antenarrative of that process, or vice versa. We are enculturated into making meaning through narrative, and dominant narratives by definition take up the most space. Antenarratives draw our attention away from the dominant narrative and emphasize different aspects of the story. However, the antenarrative practice as proposed by Jones, Moore, and Walton (2016) offers something beyond what dominant narratives can tell us; by interrogating power, positionality, and privilege, and including diverse voices, antenarratives can begin to address social injustices—injustices that are often reinforced by the dominant narrative. As long as the dominant narrative results in oppression, antenarratives will always be necessary.

Conclusion: The Process of Policy Writing

In addition to helping weave an antenarrative of the policy writing process, the threads of proximity, transparency, and accountability represent three barriers the DESIGN Committee faced while composing new policy. A lack of proximity (both physical and ideological), transparency, and accountability hindered the committee's efforts to propose new policy. In addition, the threads highlight how activities other than writing new policy documents comprised the key components of the committee's process. Indeed, two elements characterized its writing process: (1) data collection and analysis and (2) group discussion in meetings and emails.

This result was surprising to me. As a researcher coming into this project, I expected that much of the committee's work would consist of drafting new policy. Instead, almost all of the committee's time was spent trying to collect data (such as FARs, PDPs, salary data, survey data, and data about gender equity policy implemented at other universities), analyzing that data, and discussing how what the committee learned could contribute to new policy. The time spent drafting policy was minimal. For example, the one successful policy proposed by the DESIGN

Committee, an automatic stop-the-clock policy, consisted of a few sentences added to the existing stop-the-clock policy⁴.

My antenarrative, then, calls attention to what was most important for the DESIGN Committee's process: research. The NSF reports address the project's three goals: making and implementing policy and best practices; collecting data about the effects of new policy; and publishing research on their top-down approach to policy implementation. However, they do not adequately capture the barriers faced by the committee nor the amount of time the committee spent on research.

As my antenarrative suggests, the committee's research process was impacted by a lack of accountability among some stakeholders; the committee simply did not receive data from other stakeholders (such as the SBOE and members of Human Resources departments) that were necessary to do the work of the project. What's more, because of the ways the committee used Google Drive and email to distribute and discuss research, as I discussed in the proximity thread, committee members (and this researcher) found it difficult to keep track of the data the committee had collected and the research projects they had completed.

For the DESIGN Committee, the policy writing process was not really about *policy writing* itself. Instead, the process consisted mainly of research and discussion—work that was obscured in the official narrative of the NSF reports. Although my research project was not designed to offer generalizable conclusions, I believe my analysis of the committee's policy writing process suggests that other policy writing work in academic contexts could also rely

⁴ I do not use specific text from the policy to protect the identity of project participants. Searching for specific text online leads to the SBOE's website. For the same reason, I do not include the policy document in my references.

heavily on research. Certainly, my analysis calls attention to the need for more research within the field of TPC about the policy writing process in academia.

Additionally, the project's focus on gender equity raises some interesting questions. Did the SIGGE's project goal of addressing gender inequity within the system impact stakeholders' willingness to share data, an important part of being accountable to the DESIGN Committee? Did it impact the SBOE's decision to not offer initially offer an explanation for rejecting the modified duties policy, or even the rejection of the policy itself, stem from a resistance to the project's goals? Without including these stakeholders in my project or having access to their perceptions of the projects, goals, and events described in the official narrative and antenarrative, I cannot say for sure. However, I suspect that the ultimate goal of addressing gender inequity in the system did impact the ways SIGGE members, apart from the DESIGN Committee, approached their work on the project. As Frost (2016) notes, responses to feminism often are tied up in rhetoric about bias; that is, "people seem to believe that feminism is a particularly biased perspective," which suggests "an implied belief in objectivity" (p. 12). It is possible that some stakeholders saw the project's work on gender equity as being "biased" in favor of women, which could explain their resistance to contributing to the project's success. If stakeholders' reaction to gender equity policy stems from a reaction to "bias," then an implicit belief that SES policy should be "objective" could be an important factor in explaining the ways stakeholders obstructed the policy writing process. Regardless of the circumstances the DESIGN Committee's case, my project points to the need for additional research on the ways that the success of policy work perceived as "biased," or perhaps even "activist" or "political," is impeded by these beliefs.

CHAPTER 4: WEAVING NEW THREADS FEMINIST LEADERSHIP PRACTICES IN THE DESIGN COMMITTEE

I think it's important to let people be where they find their skills. When people feel like they can pull on their strengths, and the communication lines are open, it helps our connections with one another. And feeling like our work is worthwhile. Because if we have those kinds of intangible benefits being together, and working, and this is ours—that can propel the work.

--Hannah, principal investigator of the SIGGE project

As the principal investigator of the SIGGE project and leader of the DESIGN Committee, Hannah had a central role in guiding the committee's writing process. Hannah not only set the agenda for committee meetings, but she also guided the overall direction of the committee's work: what research should be done, what policies to propose when, and how to enact the goals SIGGE project members committed themselves to when they submitted the grant proposal to the National Science Foundation.

“Guided” is key here. In the quotation above, taken from a one-on-one Skype interview, Hannah described why she thought self-empowerment was critical to her leadership practices. As a self-identified radical feminist, Hannah was acutely aware of the power dynamics at play among members of the committee; indeed, she told me that addressing power is “paramount” in feminism. As committee leader, Hannah was sensitive to her place in the group's hierarchy.

At first glance, a focus on leadership practices does not seem to have a direct connection to analyzing the DESIGN Committee's writing process. After all, TPC scholarship rarely discusses leadership, and what does leadership have to do with writing, anyway? However, even

the brief description of Hannah's leadership practices above opens up avenues for exploring the ways that leadership impacts the writing work of the committee.

Accordingly, this chapter is driven by my second research question: in what ways to feminist leadership practices influence the work of the DESIGN Committee? I use the apparent feminism methodology proposed by Frost (2016) to analyze committee leadership practices of community, self-empowerment, and collaboration. Ultimately, I argue that the feminist leadership practices enacted by the DESIGN Committee's de facto leader, Hannah, were central to the committee's writing process. In addition, these leadership practices illustrates Frost's new approach efficiency to technical communication, one rooted in diversity and inclusion.

To begin, I evaluate literature on feminist leadership practices in organization studies—a discipline where approaches to feminist leadership are highly developed. Next, I discuss the literature on feminist leadership in TPC and rhetoric and composition more broadly. This review of scholarship provides a set of feminist leadership principles and approaches that situate my analysis of feminist leadership practices in the DESIGN Committee.

Next, I review the apparent feminism methodology I introduced in Chapter 2. Here, I focus on the three goals of apparent feminism as outlined by Frost (2016)—goals which help me further situate feminist leadership practices enacted by the committee: calling attention to places where feminist interventions are needed, working with non-feminists to achieve feminist goals, and approaching efficiency as a way to incorporate diverse voices into technical communication.

With these theoretical and methodological foundations in hand, I address the ways feminist leadership practices of creating community, encouraging self-empowerment, and fostering collaboration impact the DESIGN Committee's writing process in both positive and negative ways. While empowerment and collaboration are two common approaches to feminist

leadership discussed in the literature, I highlight Hannah's unique approach as a self-described radical feminist, and following Frost (2016), the need to make more apparent feminist interventions in policy—as well as the policy writing process itself.

I title this chapter “Weaving New Threads” because I see the committee's feminist leadership practices as additional threads that help compose the story, the tapestry, of the DESIGN Committee. Similar to the warp and weft threads of my antenarrative, these new feminist leadership threads add to our understanding of the DESIGN Committee's writing process.

Defining Terms: Feminist/Feminism(s) and Leadership

Before I discuss scholarship on feminist leadership practices, I first want to define “feminist/feminism(s)” and “leadership.” Feminist scholarship speaks not of feminism but of feminisms, emphasizing the wide range of feminist thought. Tong and Botts (2018) identify liberal, radical, Marxist and socialist, women-of-color, third-wave, and queer feminisms, among others. For purposes of understanding the leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee, however, a single label or two is not illuminating. Therefore, I have opted to use hooks' (2000) definition of feminism as a movement “to end sexism, sexist exploitation, and oppression.” As revealed through their interviews with me, however, the members of the DESIGN Committee display varying understandings of what feminism means and varying identifications with feminism, from not identifying with feminism at all to self-describing as a radical feminist. It is likely that many of the DESIGN Committee members would not identify with hooks' approach to feminism.

In a similar way, there are multitudinous ways of understanding “leadership.” Two descriptions of leadership from organization studies are especially helpful here. In their work on

gender and management in higher education, Bagilhole and White (2011) offer a broad definition of leadership, characterizing it as “a process for influencing decisions and guiding people” (p. 7). Blackmore (1999) opts for a definition that considers leadership an “everyday practice” (p. 6). Blackmore, working in education and management, theorizes leadership “. . .in its most inclusive sense based on the view that leadership is practised by many teachers, principals, and parents in a range of educational sites and in a number of informal and formal administrative positions” (p.6). Adapting these two conceptualizations of leadership to the work of the DESIGN Committee, I see leadership as an everyday activity practiced by all members of the DESIGN Committee in their efforts to influence decisions and guide people. In other words, the DESIGN Committee leader is not the only member of the committee to practice leadership.

Feminist Leadership Practices in Scholarship

As a technical and professional communication (TPC) researcher studying the policy writing process of the DESIGN Committee, studying leadership practices enacted by committee members was not an obvious choice. I am indebted to conversations with one of the grant’s external evaluators, Sally, for pointing me in this direction. As I discussed in a section providing context for my research in Chapter 2, my first encounters with the DESIGN Committee were not as a researcher but rather as an assistant to the external evaluator. As assistant, I was mostly concerned with observing the group’s communication practices and providing advice on using communications and project management software.

However, my conversations with Sally eventually expanded into other considerations of the policy writing process. In one particularly memorable conversation after a phone meeting with the DESIGN Committee, Sally and I discussed Hannah’s feminist approach to leading the

committee, and the ways that approach affected committee members' understanding of the goals of the project and their progress with research and writing.

After I transitioned to research, my conversations with Sally stayed with me. Hannah was a self-identified feminist, sure, but what did it mean to practice feminist leadership, exactly? And what were those practices doing for the group? I am indebted to these discussions with Sally, as they led to a fruitful research question and an exploration of feminisms, leadership, and policy writing.

Feminist Leadership in Organization Studies

To begin my inquiry into feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee, I reviewed existing literature for fundamental definitions or concepts. While I began in my own field of TPC, I quickly turned elsewhere to gain a preliminary understanding. Similar to my dive to organization studies to investigate antenarrative and how it is used for Chapter 3, I looked to organization studies and management as a jumping off point for understanding feminist leadership. In this section, I highlight some of the foundational texts of feminist leadership in organization studies. Much of the initial research on feminist leadership took place in the 1990s, while more recent research on feminisms and organizations has highlighted activism and intersectionality.

Similar to the development of feminist research in TPC, feminist work in organization studies and management has slowly widened its purview from investigations of gender to feminisms (sometimes placed under the mantle of critical management studies). As Alvesson and Billing (2009), organization studies has not traditionally been interested in questions of gender (p. 4). In a groundbreaking article for gender and organization studies, Acker (1990) first proposes a systematic study of gender and organizations, theorizing that organization itself is

gendered. As she argues, “To say that an organization, or any other analytic unit, is gendered means that advantage and disadvantage, exploitation and control, action and emotion, meaning and identity, are patterned through and in terms of a distinction between male and female, masculine and feminine” (p. 146). Acker’s insight laid the groundwork for a growing body of research into gender and feminisms in organizations in the 1990s.

Feminist leadership descended from organization studies’ newer focus on gender and organizations in that time period. Here are a few highlights from the scholarship. Iannello (1992) offers a second foundational work on feminist research in organization studies in her monograph, *Decisions without hierarchy: Feminist interventions in organization theory and practice*. Iannello’s work contributes to what she calls “the convergence of feminist theory and organization theory,” and her research focuses particularly on power and hierarchy within organizations. Additionally, her work outlines many of the key practices of feminist leadership developed in later scholarship: consensus, empowerment, and non-hierarchical decision making.

Grundy (1993) offers another early approach to theorizing feminist leadership. In “Educational leadership as emancipatory praxis,” Grundy builds on what she identifies as “practical action” taken by educational leaders to describe an “emancipatory praxis” that is a feminist alternative to the “hierarchical, bureaucratic approaches” often experienced in educational organizations (p. 165). This emancipatory praxis is grounded in critical consciousness. Although not a set a behaviors or a checklist for leaders, it may include:

- Involving all stakeholders who are affected by an action, including students, in decision-making;
- Negotiating goals and institutional plans among stakeholders;
- Planning that encompasses goals of social justice and equality;

- Collaborative action that may not be problem-solving but rather problem-posing;
- Evaluation of actions through critical self-reflection. (p. 172)

Grundy goes on to argue that “the notion of the leader being ‘above’ or ‘in front’ of the practitioners who comprise the organizational unit is anathema to emancipation. The emancipatory educational leader will see her work as being enabling and supportive of the action of the practitioners” (p. 173). Grundy concludes by noting that emancipatory praxis may cause conflict in organizations, and may specifically produce resistance to collaborative work.

Later approaches to feminist leadership build on the key concepts proposed by Iannello (1992), Grundy (1993), and others. Fine and Buzzanell (2000), for example, reframe the servant leadership approach through a feminist lens. Serving becomes “. . . a form of resistance . . . to creatively incorporate the multiple commitments to self, others, community, and principles so that we serve *ourselves* with and through our connections with others” (p. 152). Feminist servant leadership means considering whose needs are served, who is empowered or made vulnerable through serving, and whether serving results in more equitable outcomes for women (p. 153).

Although it is important not to conflate “women’s leadership” with “feminist leadership,” the collection *Women and leadership: Transforming visions and diverse voices* offers an entire text devoted to feminist analyses of leadership. In a chapter devoted to leadership and feminist policy development, Johnson, Denmark, Cantor, Halpern, and Keita (2007) identify collaboration, improving women’s lives, empowerment, and multiculturalism as key components of feminist leadership that aims to promote feminist policy (p. 154).

To summarize my review thus far, collaboration and empowerment stand out as two of the key components of feminist leadership practices identified in the literature. And indeed, these components are essential to my analysis of the leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee.

More recent scholarship on feminist leadership, however, has developed from larger movements in feminist thought and activism. For example, Holvino (2010) argues that intersectionality has been largely ignored in the field of organization studies, despite its prevalence in gender studies, feminist theory, and literary criticism, among others areas. Holvino calls for researchers in organization studies to address the “simultaneity of race, class, and gender” in organizations through a variety of feminist interventions, including uncovering the stories or narratives of “organizational actors across different axes of power and identity practices” and studying the relationships between organizations and broader social and material contexts.

What’s more, the recent *Handbook of research on gender and leadership* discusses several newer approaches to feminist leadership informed by renewed attention to identities among feminist thinkers. Pick (2017) focuses on power inequities and the ways gendered stereotypes about women’s beliefs and abilities harm women employees. Bligh and Ito (2017), meanwhile, discuss how organizations are not only gendered (as Acker argued back in 1990), but also grounded in heteronormativity. They propose a series of gender-inclusive leadership practices to benefit women. Interestingly, although they mention a “more complex silencing process for under-represented minorities,” their solutions focus on gender exclusively. The aforementioned edited collection *Women and leadership* better addresses complex identities, with chapters devoted to feminist leadership among Latinas, Black feminist leaders, Asian American women leaders, feminist leadership among American Indian women, and leadership and collaboration practices among women with disabilities.

Feminist Leadership in Technical and Professional Communication and Rhetoric and Composition

While feminist leadership is an active area of inquiry in organization studies, it is far less prevalent in TPC. Therefore, I begin with a brief overview of the literature on research on leadership in TPC before turning to the relatively newer area of feminist leadership in TPC and rhetoric and composition.

Leadership in TPC scholarship is often discussed as a quality of collaborative work. For example, Ingram and Parker (2002) point to the ways that both men and women rely on leadership styles in successful collaborations. Robinson (2016) analyzes leadership in virtual teams of *World of Warcraft* using behavior complexity and emerging leadership theories. More recently, Cleary, Slatterly, Flammia, and Minacori (2019) discuss leadership as a strategy for success in virtual student collaborations among writers and translators.

TPC scholarship also discusses leadership outside of collaborative contexts. These other contexts cover everything from management and TPC research to the role of leadership in crisis communication. Here are a few selected examples from the scholarship. Wick (2001) proposes that technical communicators are in a prime position to take on leadership positions within knowledge management, while Carlson (2001) makes a case for strategic leadership practices for IT managers. Starke-Meyerring, Duin, and Palvetzian (2007) argue for the need for distributed leadership roles among faculty building global partnerships for student learning and research. Yim and Park (2019) discuss a failure of leadership within the context of crisis communication during the Korean air “nut rage” incident.

In both the TPC scholarship on leadership and collaboration as well as scholarship on leadership in other contexts, however, leadership is not the main focus of investigation, but

rather discussed as one component of an overall argument the authors make. However, some research in TPC does put leadership itself in the spotlight. Gellis (2002) theorizes connections between leadership, rhetoric, and the *polis*, arguing that leadership “depends on” (p. 200) and is “closely tied to” (p. 201) rhetoric. Fatt (2004) uses the path-goal leadership model to analyze the leadership styles of technical and non-technical managers and their effects on subordinates. Meanwhile, Olson (2009) theorizes rhetorical leadership, focusing on invention, *loci communes*, and transcendence within the context of AirTran’s attempted takeover of Midwest Airlines. Mehlenbacher, Kelly, Kampe, and Kittle Autry (2018) focus on leadership as a topic concern for students collaborating in virtual environments such as Google Docs; their results suggest that “. . .the practical desires of students for clearer organizational structures and leadership roles seem at odds with more idealized views collaborative work” (p. 205). Finally, Koerber, Provencher, and Starkey (2020), building on existing leadership orientations identified in research on engineers and their own interviews with professionals, developed ten communication skills professionals considered most important for effective leadership in STEM.

While scholarship on leadership represents a small but solid area of inquiry within TPC, research on feminist leadership practices in TPC is rare. Within the decades-long exploration of feminisms and technical communication that I highlighted in Chapter 1, leadership is not a common concern. However, the publication of a recent interdisciplinary edited collection does begin to address feminist leadership in TPC. In *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership*, contributors from a variety of disciplines offer what editors Cole and Hassel (2017) call “part storytelling, part autoethnography, [and] part action plan” (p. xx). For example, a contribution by Moore, Meloncon, and Sullivan addresses feminist leadership in technical communication specifically, outlining one approach to participatory and effective mentoring.

While TPC scholarship is not heavily represented in the collection, scholars in rhetoric and composition highlight feminist leadership approaches that connect rhetoric to leadership more broadly. For example, Hill-Vásquez and Britt-Smith critique the feminine (not feminist), corporate rhetoric of *Lean in*, while Hurley, Wray, and Cirillo-McCarthy offer rhetorics of interruption, which include tactical interruptions such as silence and individually speaking back alongside strategic interruptions such as building coalitions. Other scholars in rhetoric and composition discuss shared governance (Cole, Hassel, and Schell); surviving the tenure track as mothers (Nora, Gregory, Lopez, and Williams); a feminist model of organic mentorship (Almjeld, McGuire, and Blair); and sexism and the politics of clothing choices (Manthey). All in all, the feminist leadership strategies in *Surviving sexism in academia* echo many of the leadership practices prevalent in organization studies research, such as collaboration and consensus.

Even so, this review of feminist leadership in TPC, along with some of the research done by scholars in rhetoric and composition, underscores the need for additional research on feminist leadership in the contexts of rhetoric and writing. I hope that this chapter serves to make a contribution to this promising area of TPC scholarship.

Apparent Feminism as an Interpretive Lens

With the groundwork laid by research on feminist leadership practices in organization studies and TPC research, I now turn to a review of the apparent feminism methodology. While I outlined this methodology in more detail in Chapter 2, I review the three goals of apparent feminist methodology here, as these goals contribute to my analysis of the DESIGN Committee's leadership practices.

Writing from a social justice perspective, Frost (2016) proposes a new apparent feminism methodology for technical communication to respond to oppressive exigencies affecting women, such as legislation to restrict reproductive rights. Frost argues that “technical communication scholars and practitioners need an apparent feminist methodology in order to intervene in situations in which technical documentation unfairly and uncritically engages in oppression while feigning objectivity” (p. 4). In addition, Frost posits that “. . . apparent feminism can be used to leverage new understandings of gendered relations in business, education, and social structures” (p.5. The term apparent, then, means making apparent—or visible—the unremarked upon “objectivity” of technical documents as well as the ways institutions and social structures are gendered. Frost points specifically to legal documents as one avenue of apparent feminist research; I see policy work as another.

Alongside this rationale for an apparent feminism methodology, Frost proposes that apparent feminism works towards three goals:

- “It encourages a response to social justice exigencies;
- Invites participation from allies who do not explicitly identify as feminist but do work that complements feminist goals;
- and makes apparent the ways in which efficient work actually depends on the existence and input of diverse audiences.” (p. 5)

Each of these goals plays a key in my analysis of the feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee. Indeed, the ways in which committee members practice feminist leadership enable them to perform a kind of apparent feminism themselves—regardless of their identification with (or lack of identification with) feminist thought.

In the section that follows, I provide an analysis of the feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee through the apparent feminism methodology. My results rely on my analysis of interviews and meeting transcriptions using the coding process I outline in Chapter 2. While highlighting community, self-empowerment, collaboration, I highlight how Hannah's leadership practices align with the first two goals of Frost's (2016) apparent feminism: calling attention to the need for feminist intervention and working with people who do not identify as feminist to achieve feminist goals. Indeed, Hannah's central leadership role means that the committee itself practiced these first two goals of apparent feminism through their policy work. Ultimately, the feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee lead to a more people-focused approach to efficiency in the policy writing process—one that accounts for the diverse voices of people impacted by institutional policy.

Creating Community through Self-Empowerment and Collaboration

I begin by turning my attention to Hannah, principal investigator of the SIGGE project grant and leader of the DESIGN Committee. As I argue below, Hannah embodied many of the practices of feminist leadership theorized by researchers such as Iannello (1992) and Grundy (1993), and her approach to feminist leadership strongly guided the DESIGN Committee's policy writing process. In addition, Hannah's leadership practices intersected with the first goal of apparent feminism, responding to social justice inequities.

Hannah's Conceptualization of her Leadership Practices

In October 2018, I spoke with Hannah in a one-on-one Skype interview. The interview guide I developed (see Appendix A) focused on Hannah's relationship to feminism and feminism leadership practices along with the skills or knowledge she felt would be most beneficial to the project.

From that interview, I gleaned several key insights to the ways Hannah approaches feminism itself. To summarize these findings:

- Hannah thinks about feminism in “two different tracks”
 - The first track is when she teaches feminism, she focuses on feminist theory and social action
 - The second action is feminism in her own life and practices
- Hannah’s defines her lived feminism as:
 - Inclusive
 - Focused on collaboration
 - Aware of power
 - Recognizing hierarchies

Hannah’s feminist leadership practices stem from her lived experiences with feminism rather than the academic feminisms she discusses in her teaching. Indeed, Hannah notes that she was an activist in the 1970s, and she considers herself to be a radical feminist. While teaching academic feminisms, on the other hand, Hannah and her students discusses additional feminist theories that do not resonate with her. I believe this explains the discrepancy between Hannah’s “academic” feminisms and her lived feminism.

Interestingly, however, despite the importance to feminism in her life–“it’s just something I do,” she notes–Hannah does not explicitly describe her leadership as “feminist.”

When asked about what feminist leadership means to her, Hannah builds on her previous definition of feminism:

It’s an inclusive interaction. It’s a collaborative process. But it certainly keeps an eye open to inequities, particular in relation to power: in members of the team, in the broader

context in which the team is working, or in our case, within the [state university] system as a whole.

Here, Hannah turns the focus away from herself—she does not use “I” statements to talk about feminist leadership—but instead theorizes feminist leadership in general as inclusive, collaborative, and aware of inequities and power relations.

Later, when I press Hannah about why she uses a feminist approach to leadership in her work with the DESIGN Committee, she reiterates that she does not advertise her leadership in that way:

Like I said, it’s just part of how I approach life in general. There really wasn’t a question of what [feminist leadership] form I would bring to this research. I will say that if you talk to other committee members, you won’t find them saying, “Oh, Hannah, yeah, she’s using a feminist approach.” That wouldn’t necessarily be accepted.

As Hannah points out here, members of the DESIGN Committee display varying commitments to and identifications with feminism. I corroborated Hannah’s perspective on the other committee members during my one-on-one interviews with them. When I asked the other five committee members if they identified as feminist, Beth, Heidi, and Sarah expressed that they considered themselves to be feminists; Natalie identified as feminist with qualifications, remarking that she felt she was “walking on eggshells” by calling herself a feminist and relied on “data rather than emotions;” and Melanie stated that she “does not identify myself that way [as feminist]” and that she is “always cautions when it comes to things that are overtly feminist.” In sum, three members embraced the identity of “feminist,” one embraced the identity but was uncomfortable with the term, and one did not see herself as feminist at all.

Here, though, I think it's important to highlight Hannah's decision to downplay her feminism. She goes on to say: "It's not that there aren't feminist interests throughout our committee, but for many of our committee members, and this is where I come into my academic stuff about feminism, many of them are what would fall into the school of liberal feminists, right?" In other words, Hannah is aware of the philosophical differences between her radical approach and the committee members who have a more liberal understanding of feminism.

Still, Hannah is quick to assert that she does not hide her feminism, either. In discussing feminist approaches to the DESIGN Committee's goals of creating policy to improve gender equity, Hannah notes that the group works with ". . . the idea of equity, but without a critical viewpoint of structures. We do address the pro-woman concern [of liberal feminism], but often without the context, which to me is paramount. And [we don't discuss] the reasons for that inequity in a more critical fashion." Hannah asserts that the feminist thought behind the work of the DESIGN Committee is "very deliberate on my part," but that it's "communicated more through the process than through the statement." From Hannah's perspective, the DESIGN Committee's policy writing contributions to feminist work come not through explicit statements about its feminist credentials, but rather through its policy writing actions.

Hannah's conceptualization of the policy writing goals of the DESIGN Committee aligns with Frost's first goal of apparent feminism: calling attention to social justice exigencies. In this case, as principal investigator (PI) of the SIGGE grant, Hannah and her co-PIs identified the necessity of responding to harmful existing policy in the statewide university system. In particular, the existing policy impeded institutional efforts to recruit and retain women faculty in STEM. To address this exigency, Hannah and her co-PIs applied for and received a grant. The

work of the grant–composing new policy–is feminist work, whether or not it is characterized as such by other committee members or stakeholders.

In addition, Hannah’s feminist leadership practices enact the second goal of Frost’s apparent feminism: hailing nonfeminists as allies. Frost (2016) defines an ally as a person “...who might appear to be feminist in their activism or ideological perspectives but do not embrace that label” (p. 14). Within the DESIGN Committee, Hannah successfully collaborates with women who have varying levels of commitment of feminism, as described above. Indeed, the DESIGN Committee as a whole can be seen as doing the work of apparent feminism; to implement new policy, they work with stakeholders such as Provosts, members of the State Board of Education, some of whom likely identify as nonfeminists.

Collaboration, Self-Empowerment, and Community

Later in her interview with me, Hannah elaborates on her feminist leadership practices. In addition to collaboration, first identified by Iannello (1992) and Grundy (1993) as a key feminist leadership practice, Hannah articulates self-empowerment as a deliberate practice she brings to the committee. Both Iannello (1992) and Johnson et al. (2007) identify empowerment as a leadership practice, but neither address self-empowerment.

Hannah describes self-empowerment as a way in which committee members “take more responsibility for particular elements of the research.” In addition, it is a practice that moves the work of the committee forward:

The more they [committee members] connect to something that they have an interest in, ideally, the more they’ll follow through with that component. Now, it also shows their kind of self-assessment of skills and what skills they have to bring to the work. I think it’s important to let people be where they find their skills. When people feel like they can pull

on their strengths, and the communications lines are open, it helps our connections with one another. And feeling like our work is worthwhile. Because if we have those kinds of intangible benefits being together, and working, and this is ours—that can propel the work. Here, Hannah combines an established practice of feminist leadership, collaboration, with her desire to create an atmosphere of self-empowerment. The end result, she believes, is a community, which she sees as essential to the policy writing process. “I’m very attuned to that sense of collectivity,” she notes. “If we don’t have that, we’re kind of lost.”

In sum, Hannah envisions collaboration and self-empowerment as a way to build community, which she sees as foundational to doing the policy work of the DESIGN Committee. Without consciously adopting practices she’s read about feminist leadership practices—indeed, she notes that she is unfamiliar with the literature on leadership—Hannah’s approach utilizes what scholarship in organization studies identifies as one of its most common components, collaboration. In addition, while Ionnello (1992) and Johnson et al. (2007) focus on empowerment, Hannah’s feminist leadership practices emphasize self-empowerment for committee members. True to her feminist convictions, Hannah hopes that her leadership practices result in empowerment of committee members, but she does not try to impose or enforce empowerment on anyone.

Returning to Frost’s (2016) first goal of apparent feminism, Hannah’s feminist leadership practices contribute to the larger project of addressing a social justice exigency in the statewide university system. Through the process of researching, drafting, and proposing new policy, the DESIGN Committee draws attention—makes apparent—the need to address inequities resulting from existing policy. And that attention has a wide audience: Provosts, human resources professionals, and members of the State Board of Education are stakeholders in the SIGGE

project, but the ultimate stakeholders are the people of the statewide university system living with the effects of the existing, and revised, policy.

It is important to note that although the policy writing work of the DESIGN Committee addresses one social justice exigency, it ignores others. With the “critical eye” Hannah employs in her life as a feminist, she realizes the limitations of the feminist policy work of the DESIGN Committee. In multiple meetings over three years, Hannah reminds the committee that their policy does not explicitly address race or sexuality. What’s more, the committee is working with a narrow definition of “woman” based on biological sex. Transgender or non-binary identities are not addressed. I believe that Hannah’s awareness of these limitations stems from her personal commitment to intersectionality and radical feminism.

Challenges to Enacting Feminist Leadership in the DESIGN Committee

Having described Hannah’s approach to feminist leadership and providing examples gleaned from observations, I now turn to some of the challenges arising from this leadership approach. While Hannah’s emphasis on self-empowerment benefitted the writing process by encouraging members to choose their own paths to their projects, it also led to challenges related to understanding project goals and productivity. Early in my research, the external evaluator Sally and I discussed the possibility that some committee members did not feel “authorized” to take on work in the committee. By not “authorized,” we were referring to our observations that some committee members felt unsure when and how to assign work to themselves or move forward in their research. We speculated that they were waiting for authorization, or permission, from Hannah to move forward.

However, as I demonstrated above, Hannah consciously chose to encourage an environment where individual committee members could decide what to work on themselves.

For new committee members, especially, this approach sometimes led to confusion and stagnation. In interviews with two of the newest committee members, Melanie and Beth, in early 2019, both expressed uncertainty about their roles and responsibilities on the committee. For example, both members told me that they weren't sure what they were supposed to be working on at the time of the interview. In addition, they had difficulty articulating the goals of the DESIGN Committee's work while speaking with me.

I attribute some of this uncertainty to being new to the DESIGN Committee. After all, the committee's work was part of a complex, years-long grant project, and it takes some time to review and digest project materials. At the same time, however, I believe that the feminist leadership practice of self-empowerment may have contributed to committee members' confusion and uncertainty. For Hannah, self-empowerment involves taking responsibility for oneself: choosing the research or policy work one is interested in and getting it done. In my observation, self-empowerment also means taking initiative and being self-directed.

In my analysis of meeting transcripts, Hannah did not emphasize her expectations for self-empowerment. (It is possible that she discussed it before I officially joined the project in March 2017.) For newer committee members unaware of Hannah's emphasis on self-empowerment, however, finding their footing in the DESIGN Committee was difficult. If Melanie and Beth did not know that they could take initiative for themselves, they were likely waiting for direction from Hannah. After all, the leadership styles Melanie and Beth had most likely encountered throughout their careers in academia would have been more hierarchical, with leaders taking a more commanding role in the work of the group.

A little over a year into her membership on the DESIGN Committee, however, Melanie did practice self-empowerment in a way that altered the committee's policy writing process.

Melanie suggested that the DESIGN Committee adopt a meeting schedule she experienced on a previous grant. Instead of meeting once or month or whenever the need arose, Melanie proposed meeting once a week with each meeting dedicated to a different process: one meeting for catching up on progress with the whole group, one meeting for working in subgroups, and one meeting for discussing research. Interestingly, Melanie's suggestion began to address the challenges of physical proximity, transparency, and accountability I highlighted in Chapter 2.

As a feminist leader, Hannah did not impose the new meeting schedule on the committee, but rather left the suggestion open for consideration by all. The committee adopted Melanie's proposal for a new meeting schedule in the fall of 2019, and the frequency of the meetings, as well as the committee members' reports on their progress, positively impacted the productivity of the group. Perhaps more importantly from a feminist leadership standpoint, the new meeting structure helped build the sense of community that Hannah sees as necessary for getting the job done.

Conclusion: Leadership Practices and the Writing Process

In the section above, I identified three important components of Hannah's feminist leadership practices: community, self-empowerment, and collaboration. I noted that while community and collaboration are common elements of feminist leadership practices described in the scholarship, Hannah's emphasis on self-empowerment expands on the practice of empowerment in the literature. Additionally, I highlighted several challenges to encouraging self-empowerment on committee members. Finally, I interpreted these feminist leadership practices through the lens of apparent feminism, highlighting how they meet the first and second goals of the apparent feminism project: calling attention to the need for feminist work in technical communication and collaborating with nonfeminist allies.

To finish weaving these new threads of feminist leadership practices, I turn now to the impact these practices had on the DESIGN Committee's writing process. As I argued in Chapter 3, the committee's process mostly consisted of data collection and analysis and discussion. The committee spent little time drafting policy documents; instead, they did most of their writing in emails and work related to research, such as manuscript drafts. Because of this, Hannah's leadership practices, which helped direct the committee's research goals, had a large impact on the writing process. In addition, Hannah's attempts to create a community characterized by collaboration and self-empowerment affected the ways in which that research and discussion work was done. By way of contrast, if most of the writing process had consisted of members working on drafts individually, then Hannah's feminist leadership practices would not have had as much influence over the committee's writing process.

Interestingly, while Hannah attempted to avoid being seen as "the" leader of the committee, her de facto status leader influenced the committee's the direction of the policy work and how quickly that work was accomplished. By emphasizing collaboration, committee members were encouraged to work together; indeed, many formed subcommittees to address tasks such as statistical analysis or writing journal articles; indeed, committee members worked on three manuscripts that they discussed during meetings, although none of those manuscripts had been published as of spring 2020. As I described in the antenarrative in Chapter 3, however, because of the physical distance between committee members, most committee work was done remotely. Over the course of several years' worth of online meetings, the committee members themselves, however, expressed how much more they accomplished during face-to-face meetings. In this case, the feminist leadership practice of fostering collaboration helped to incorporate multiple voices into the policy writing process—no one member's voice dominated

the policy proposals—thereby providing an example of the third goal of apparent feminism.

Through collaboration, the DESIGN Committee’s work begins to address Frost’s re-definition of efficiency as including the input of diverse audiences.

However, as Melanie and Beth’s experiences on the committee show, Hannah’s encouragement of self-empowerment led to decreases in the traditional definition of efficiency in technical communication rooted in productivity, time, and resources. One way Hannah could have addressed this lack of efficiency would have been to explicitly describe her leadership practices, including her goal of encouraging of self-empowerment, from the beginning of the project. Additionally, she could have reminded committee members of these practices throughout the lifecycle of the grant. While Hannah was hesitant to draw attention to her radical feminist beliefs, she could have framed self-empowerment using more neutral language; for example, she could have described her leadership style as more “hands-off” and reminded committee members they had the opportunity to choose to work on the aspects of the policy writing process that most interested them.

However, it is important to note that a lack of efficiency in a traditional sense is not necessarily an entirely negative outcome. Even though Hannah was unaware of Frost’s research, she took up Frost’s call for approaching efficiency as incorporating diverse voices in her leadership practices. By doing so, Hannah helped ensure that the policy writing process incorporated diverse perspectives; for a feminist leader, this kind of efficiency may be more important or rewarding than efficiency based on time or productivity.

Together, Hannah’s leadership practices of fostering collaboration and encouraging self-empowerment successfully helped to create a sense of community among DESIGN Committee members. Returning to the threads of the antenarrative in Chapter 3, committee members

commiserated about the bad weather that prevented them from meeting; expressed frustration when they were unable to meet self-imposed deadlines; and dedicated significant time and effort to problem-solving the challenge of collecting data from stakeholders. All in all, the DESIGN Committee members were all in together, through successes and setbacks, over five years. Although rotating membership meant that new committee members had to quickly catch up on the project when they joined, I believe that Hannah's leadership practices successfully created an environment in which even newer members felt like they were part of the committee community.

This sense of community extended beyond the DESIGN Committee itself, however. As part of the data collection process, committee members collected stories of faculty members affected—often negatively—by current system policy. Through these stories, the committee created a larger, more diverse community of people in the statewide education system, and these stories influenced both the kinds of policies the committee decided to implement and the ways they presented these policies to the SBOE. The feminist leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee as a whole led to a more people-focused approach to efficiency in the policy writing process—one that accounted for the diverse voices of people affected by institutional policy.

Ultimately, Hannah's leadership practices both benefitted and challenged the DESIGN Committee's writing process. I believe the benefits of Hannah's focus on community, collaboration, and self-empowerment outweighed the drawbacks of her approach. While Melanie and Beth's did not understand Hannah's focus on self-empowerment—most likely because this expectation was not explicitly stated to them when they joined the committee—Melanie and Beth were ultimately fully integrated into the community and took responsibility for their work.

In sum, my research demonstrates that Hannah's feminist leadership practices had an outsized influence on the DESIGN Committee's policy writing. It also points to a need for

additional research on the ways leadership impacts the policy writing process in other contexts. That additional research could also help address the gap in TPC research on leadership that I highlighted at the beginning of this chapter.

CHAPTER 5: TAKING A STEP BACK: IMPLICATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

In this dissertation, I have sought to tell the story of the DESIGN Committee's writing process. Informed by research in technical and professional communication (TPC) and organization studies, I constructed an antenarrative to provide alternative perspectives to the dominant, official narrative found in the National Science Foundation (NSF) reports the committee submitted at the end of each fiscal year. In addition, I analyzed the feminist leadership practices of both the committee leader, Hannah, and the committee as a whole, through the lens of apparent feminism, focusing on community, collaboration, and self-empowerment as key leadership practices.

These analyses allowed me to create a tapestry of the DESIGN Committee's policy writing process. As I argued in Chapter 3, proximity, transparency, and accountability were key threads that I uncovered in my antenarrative tapestry, which contrasted with the chronological, events-based narrative in the NSF reports. Additionally, through the 3Ps heuristic provided by Jones, Moore, and Walton (2016), I analyzed the power differential between members of the State Board of Education (SBOE) and the DESIGN Committee. By exercising power over the committee members, the SBOE contributed to a lack of transparency and accountability in the SIGGE project and impeded the policy writing process of the DESIGN Committee.

I wove new threads into my tapestry through my analysis of the feminist leadership practices and their effects on the policy writing process in Chapter 4. There, I argued that Hannah's feminist leadership practices consisted of three components: creating community, encouraging self-empowerment, and fostering collaboration. Together, these practices helped enact the first two goals of apparent feminism: calling attention to the need for feminist work in technical communication and collaborating with nonfeminist allies. In addition, I discussed the

ways Hannah's leadership practices both encouraged members to enact Frost's new conception of efficiency and obstructed members' efforts to write efficiently in a traditional sense. Finally, I argued that the committee as a whole adapted Hannah's practice of creating community by expanding their sense of community to faculty in the university system. By collecting anecdotes of faculty members affected by current policy, the committee incorporated diverse voices—and worked more efficiently, in Frost's view—in the process of creating policy.

Having completed my tapestry, I'd like us to take a step back and look at the bigger picture. If we picture ourselves in a room with the tapestry hanging on the wall, we can imagine ourselves physically moving a few steps backward and considering the larger context in which the tapestry has been woven. With this larger context in mind, I will now discuss implications of my work and areas of further research.

The Policy Writing Process and Feminist Leadership Practices: New Understandings and Challenges

In this section, I discuss the implications of my research for policy writers. While I recognize that the writing process and leadership practices of the DESIGN Committee are unique, I believe that my project provides three important takeaways for policy writers working in other contexts.

First, my research emphasizes three barriers in the policy writing process: proximity, transparency, and accountability. These barriers are important because they represent some of the challenges that policy writers may face, and I believe they contributed to the SIGGE Project only implementing one new policy change, an automatic stop-the-clock policy. In the case of the DESIGN Committee, a lack of physical proximity and a reliance on remote work slowed down the committee's work. Because the SBOE was not transparent in its rejection of the modified

duties policy, the committee was unsure of how to revise their policy proposal and proceed in their work. And because some stakeholders did not share data the DESIGN Committee needed to propose new policy or document changes after the implementation of policy, an example of a lack of transparency as defined by Castilla (2015), the DESIGN Committee was unable to meet the three goals of the SIGGE project: implementing new policy to address gender inequity in STEM; documenting the effects of that new policy; and publishing research on their policy implementation process.

Of course, policy writers in other contexts may not experience the same barriers or challenges. However, my research does highlight the role barriers or challenges can play in the policy writing process and the need for policy writers to come up with effective ways to address those barriers. In addition, it suggests that policy that addresses issues of diversity, equity, or inclusion may be seen as “biased” or not “objective,” which could present additional obstacles to policy writers. I caution policy writers to be aware of potential resistance to their work and devise strategies for countering that resistance. For example, policy writers might ask themselves: how can we anticipate specific objections to our work and address stakeholder concerns early in the writing process? What rhetorical strategies and data would be most convincing to reluctant stakeholders or gatekeepers?

Secondly, my antenarrative demonstrates that a policy writing process may not consist of much policy writing. As a researcher who had not previously participated in policy work, I was surprised at how little time the DESIGN Committee spent on drafting policy. Part of the DESIGN Committee’s process can be explained by obstacles in research; the committee did not have the data it needed to propose and monitor the effects of new policy. However, even if the committee had collected or received data from stakeholders in a timely manner, my observation

of the committee's writing process suggests that drafting policy would still represent only a small fraction of the policy writers' work. Ultimately, the results of my research on the policy writing process of the DESIGN Committee can help other policy writers anticipate the kinds of work they might do and the importance of research and discussion to crafting new policy. My results could also prompt policy writing committees to discuss goals and methods at the outset. For example, policy writers might ask: How much time do we anticipate we will spend collecting data, and what are the most effective ways we can collect that data? (Policy writers could substitute another activity for "collecting data," as appropriate.) How much time do we anticipate we will spend composing policy, and how will we compose it? Would it be better for us to meet and compose policy together, or for individual members to draft policy proposals that we vote to adopt as a group?

Finally, my research on Hannah's feminist leadership practices points to the ways that leadership practices in general might impact the policy writing process. Because Hannah worked to create a community characterized by collaboration and self-empowerment, DESIGN Committee members worked together in subcommittees and were also expected to initiate individual or collaborative work on their own rather than wait for Hannah to direct them. However, as my results demonstrate, because committee members Melanie and Beth were not aware of Hannah's emphasis on self-empowerment when they joined the committee, it took them longer to understand their roles and responsibilities and contribute to the committee's research and discussion.

As I argue in Chapter 4, Hannah's feminist leadership practices shaped the policy writing process because they helped shape the direction of a committee whose work mostly consisted of data collection, data analysis, and discussion among group members. If the process had consisted

of writing, either individually or as a group, then Hannah's leadership practices might not have had as much of an impact.

Based on the results of my analysis, other policy writers working in committees or groups could benefit from asking their leader(s) to explicitly identify both their leadership practices and expectations for committee work. Alternatively, leaders could provide this information, or work transparently (Castilla 2015), without prompting by other committee members. By doing so, both leaders and committee members can establish how they will be accountable to one another during the policy writing process.

Feminist leaders may want to spend even more time taking into account issues of transparency and accountability. If feminist leaders are working with nonfeminists, as in the case of the DESIGN Committee and others who engage in the work of apparent feminism (Frost), they might consider whether it would be better to discuss their feminist convictions to project stakeholders or not. Hannah chose to deemphasize her commitment to radical feminism in her work with DESIGN Committee members and SIGGE Project stakeholders, but other feminist leaders may find different approaches are more appropriate for policy work.

Ultimately, it is important for policy writers to understand the policy writing process, alongside the leadership practices that influence that process, so that they can develop ways to best meet their policy goals. While my research analyzes *a* policy writing process, it can help prepare other policy writers for what they might expect in their work in academic contexts and beyond. This preparation and understanding of potential barriers is especially important for policy writers engaging in what could be considered activist work—that is, policy work that addresses diversity, equity, and inclusion. Frost's observation that people expect legislation to be “unbiased” or “objective” (2016) can also be extended to policy. Policy work that seems to favor

one group over another may spark resistance from those who see equity as a zero-sum game; in a zero-sum understanding, if one group, such as women, benefits from a policy, then another group, such as men, must be disadvantaged by that policy. Policy writers that can anticipate and address resistance may be able to lessen the impact of this barrier—a barrier that could very well contribute to the ultimate success or failure of their policy goals.

Further Research

My tapestry sought to present the story of the DESIGN Committee as they sought to advance gender equity in STEM through policy work. While the kind of qualitative research I conducted in this dissertation and weaved into my tapestry is not generalizable, it does point to larger questions posed by the field of TPC and in academia as a whole. While policy has been an important research thread in TPC, few studies have addressed policy writing in an academic context. While I hope my research can provide direction for those wishing to do similar policy work at other institutions, more research is needed to understand not just the variety of policy writing processes and (feminist) leadership practices enacted by policy makers, but also strategies and tactics for successfully composing and implementing policy that addresses issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

In Chapters 3 and 4, I discussed several avenues of additional research. In Chapter 3, I discussed a need for additional research on the policy writing process in academic contexts. My project represents one specific instance of that process, and little TPC research has focused on policy writing in academia. In addition, I stressed the need for additional research on the success and challenges of policy work seen as “biased,” such as policy work that addresses gender equity. It is likely that policy work related to other issues of diversity, equity, and inclusion could meet similar resistance.

In Chapter 4, I wrote of a need for research that explores the importance of leadership practices on the policy writing process. In the case of the DESIGN Committee, whose process mostly did not involve writing but rather research and discussion, Hannah's leadership practices had a large impact on the work of the group. Little research in TPC addresses feminist leadership, and my research points to the importance of understanding how these practices influence the writing process. Furthermore, the field of TPC could benefit from investigating the ways leadership practices in general influence the process of writing technical communication.

I believe there are two additional avenues of research suggested by my project that could benefit our understanding of both policy writing and technical communication in other contexts. By investigating a policy writing process that sought to redress gender inequity in a system of higher education, my work attends to Walton, Moore, and Jones' (2019) call for social justice research in technical communication. The methodologies of antenarrative and apparent feminism helped me further orient my research toward this call. While the experiences of women in academia have been studied since the 1980s (see Glazer-Raymo, Townsend, & Ropers-Huilman, 2000), the recent #MeToo movement and women's marches to protest the sexist actions and statements of President Trump have called attention to the need for additional feminist interventions in academia. Within TPC, researchers could utilize the antenarrative and apparent feminist methodologies to redress sexism and oppression outside of my dissertation's context on policy and addressing gender inequity in the STEM fields.

Finally, I would like to call particular attention to one thread in the antenarrative I constructed in Chapter 3: proximity. The DESIGN Committee members' lack of close physical proximity, with distances of hundreds of miles separating many members, made face-to-face meetings difficult, which prompted the group to work remotely and rely on online video

conferencing tools such as a Skype and Zoom to get work done. In the age of COVID-19, professionals⁵ in both the academy and industry have shifted to working online, with Zoom emerging as one of the most popular meeting tools. As my research demonstrates, the complexity of the DESIGN Committee's policy work, mostly completed remotely and on Zoom meetings, led to significant challenges for committee members. Additional research in TPC that focuses on the affordances and challenges of remote work and video conferencing tools could help people in a variety of contexts adjust and thrive in our new reality.

⁵ I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge how many professionals are in a position of privilege by working remotely from their homes. Some faculty and staff at institutions across the United States have been required to report to work as usual during the pandemic, despite safety concerns during the COVID-19 pandemic. In addition, many more people outside of academia, such as frontline healthcare workers and service workers, have continued to work outside of the home. Limiting one's exposure to the virus by working remotely is a privilege that millions do not have.

REFERENCES

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society, 4*(2), 139–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124390004002002>
- Almjeld, J., McGuire, M., & Blair, K.L. (2017). Organic mentorship: A feminist model to support scholars and leaders. In K. Cole & H. Hassel (Eds.), *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership* (pp. 216-224). Routledge.
- AAUW. (2020). *The motherhood penalty*. <https://www.aauw.org/issues/equity/motherhood/>
- Agar, M. (1985). Institutional discourse. *Text, 5*(3), 147-68.
- Allen, J. (1991). Gender issues in technical communication studies: An overview of the implications for the profession, research, and technology. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication, 5*(4), 371-392.
- . (2004). The impact of student learning outcomes assessment on technical and professional communication programs. *Technical Communication Quarterly, 13*(1), 93-108. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15427625TCQ1301_9
- Alvesson, M. (1993). Organizations as rhetoric: Knowledge-intensive firms and the struggle with ambiguity. *Journal of Management Studies, 30*(6), 997-1015.
- Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y.D. (2009). *Understanding gender and organization* (2nd ed). Sage.
- Bagilhole, B., & White, K. (2011). Introduction: Building a feminist research network. In B. Bagilhole & K. White (Eds.), *Gender, power, and management: A Cross-cultural analysis of higher education* (pp. 1-19). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barker, R., & Zifcak, L. (1999). Communication and gender in workplace 2000. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 29*(4), 335-347.

- Barton, B. F., & Barton, M. S. (1988). Narration in technical communication. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 2(1), 36–48.
- Bell, E., Meriläinen, S., Taylor, S., & Tienari, J. (2019). Time's up! Feminist theory and activism meets organization studies. *Human Relations*, 72(1), 4–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718790067>
- Bligh, M., & Ito, A. (2017). Organizational processes and systems that affect women in leadership. In S.R. Madsen (Ed.), *Handbook of research on gender and leadership* (pp. 287-3030). Edward Elgar.
- Boje, D. M. (2001). *Narrative methods for organizational & communication research*. Sage.
- . (2008). *Storytelling organizations*. Sage.
- . (2015). *What is antenarrative?* <https://davidboje.wordpress.com/2015/08/06/what-is-antenarrative/>
- Boje, D. M. (Ed.). (2011). *Storytelling and the future of organizations: An antenarrative handbook*. Routledge.
- Boje, D. M., Haley, U. C., Saylor, R. (2015) Antenarratives of organizational change: The microstoria of Burger King's storytelling in space, time and strategic context. *Human Relations*, 69(2): 391–418. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726715585812>
- Blackmore, J. (1999). *Troubling women: Feminism, leadership, and educational change*. Open University Press.
- Blackmore, J., & Kenway, J. (Eds.). (1993). *Gender matters in educational administration and policy: A feminist introduction*. The Falmer Press.

- Bosley, D.S. (1994). Feminist theory, audience analysis, and verbal and visual representation in a technical communication writing task. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 3(3), 293-307. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572259409364573>
- Brasseur, L. (1993). Contesting the objectivist paradigm: Gender issues in technical and professional communication curriculum. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 36(3), 114-123.
- Britt, E.C. (2006). The rhetorical work of institutions. In J.B. Scott, B. Longo, & K.V. Wills (Eds.), *Critical power tools: Technical communication and cultural studies* (pp. 133-150). State University of New York.
- Brown, J.S., Denning, S., Groh, K., & Prusak, L. (2005). *Storytelling in organizations: Why storytelling is transforming 21st century organizations and management*. Routledge.
- Calás, M. & Smircich, L. (2006). From the “Woman's point of view” ten years later: Towards a feminist organization studies. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & T. B. Lawrence (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of organization studies* (pp. 284-346). SAGE.
- Carlson, P. A. (2001). Information technology and organizational change. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 31(1), 77–95. <https://doi.org/10.2190/0LRE-8DKQ-JF8E-49RE>
- Castilla, E. J. (2015). Accounting for the gap: A firm study manipulating organizational accountability and transparency in pay decisions. *Organization Science*, 26(2), 311-333. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0950>

- Cleary, Y., Slattery, D. M., Flammia, M., & Minacori, P. (2019). Developing strategies for success in a cross-disciplinary global virtual team project: Collaboration among student writers and translators. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 49(3), 309–337. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281618775908>
- Cole, K., & Hassel, H. (Eds.). (2017). *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership*. Routledge.
- Cole, K., Hassel, H., & Schell, E.E. (2017). Remodeling shared governance: Feminist decision making and resistance to academic neoliberalism. In K. Cole & H. Hassel (Eds.), *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership* (pp. 13-28). Routledge.
- Conklin, J., & Hayhoe, G.F. (2011). Preface. In J. Conklin & G.F. Hayhoe (Eds.), *Qualitative research in technical communication*, (pp. vii-xiv). Routledge.
- Cook, K.C. (2000). Writers and their maps: The construction of a GAO report on sexual harassment. *Technical Communication Quarterly* 9(1), 53-76.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572250009364685>
- Coogan, D. (2002). Public rhetoric and public safety at the Chicago Transit Authority: Three approaches to accident analysis. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 16(3), 277-305.
- Czarniawska, B. (Ed.) (1997). *A narrative approach to organization studies*. Sage.
- Dautermann, J. (1993). Negotiating meaning in a hospital discourse community.
In R. Spilka (Ed.), *Writing in the workplace: New research perspectives* (p. 98-110). Southern Illinois University.

- Davy, D., & Valecillos, C. (2010) Qualitative research in technical communication. In J. Conklin & G.F. Hayhoe (Eds.), *Qualitative research in technical communication* (pp. 347-375). Routledge.
- DeVasto, D., Graham, S.S, & Zamparutti, L. (2015). Stasis and matters of concern: The conviction of the L'Aquila Seven. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 30(2), 131-164. doi: 10.1177/1050651915620364
- Doheny-Farina, S. (1986). Writing in an emerging organization: An ethnographic study. *Written Communication*, 3, 158-185.
- Fatt, J. P. T. (2004). Leadership styles between technical and non-technical superiors: Guess who will give subordinates more freedom on the job? *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 34(1), 91–111. <https://doi.org/10.2190/Y1QW-4BQU-R178-L3GT>
- Fine, M.G., & Buzzanell, P.M. (2000). Walking the high wire: Leadership theorizing, daily acts, and tensions. In P.M. Buzzanell (Ed.), *Rethinking organizational & managerial communication from feminist perspectives* (pp. 128-156). Sage.
- Flynn, E.A. (1997). Emergent feminist technical communication. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 6(3), 313-320.
- Fonow, M. M., & Cook, J. A. (1991). Back to the future: A look at the second wave of feminist epistemology and methodology. In M. M. Fonow & J. A. Cook (Eds.), *Beyond methodology: Feminist scholarship as lived research* (pp. 1–15). Indiana University Press.
- Frost, E.A. (2016). Apparent feminism as a methodology for technical communication and rhetoric. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 30(1), 3-28. doi: 10.1177/1050651915602295

- Gellis, M. (2002). Leadership, rhetoric, and the polis. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 32(3), 199–208. <https://doi.org/10.2190/LK0E-AKGL-K3W2-PV60>
- Glazer-Raymo, J., Townsend, B.K., & Ropers-Huilman, B. (Eds.). (2000). *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective*. Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Grabill, J.T. (2000). Shaping local HIV/AIDS services policy through activist research: The problem of client involvement. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 9(1), 29-50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572250009364684>
- Grabill, J.T., & Simmons, W.M. (1998). Toward a critical rhetoric of risk communication: Producing citizens and the role of technical communicators. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 7(4), 415-441. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572259809364640>
- Graham, M.B., & Lindemann, N. (2005). The rhetoric and politics of science in the case of the Missouri River system. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 19(4), 422-448. doi: 10.1177/1050651905278311
- Green, S.E., Jr., & Li, Y. (2011). Rhetorical institutionalism: Language, agency, and structure in institutional theory since Alvesson. *Journal of Management Studies*, 48(7), 1662-1697.
- Grundy, S. (1993). Educational leadership as emancipatory practice. In J. Blackmore & J. Kenway, (Eds.), *Gender matters in educational administration and policy: A feminist introduction* (pp. 165-177). The Falmer Press.
- Hall, D., & Nelson, B. (1990). Sex-biased language and the technical-writing teacher's responsibility. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 4(1), 69-79.

- Hill-Vásquez, H., & Britt-Smith, L. Do we really want the flies that we might catch? Interrogating “post-feminist” lessons for “success.” In K. Cole & H. Hassel (Eds.), *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership* (pp. 38-45). Routledge.
- Holvino, E. (2010). Intersections: The simultaneity of race, gender and class in organization studies. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 17, 248-277. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2008.00400.x
- hooks, b. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody*. Pluto Press.
- Howe, S.A., Juhas, M.C., & Herbers, J.M. (2014). Academic women: Overlooked entrepreneurs. *Peer Review*, 16(2). Retrieved from: <https://www.aacu.org/peerreview>
- Hurley, E.V., Wray, A., & Cirillo-McCarthy, E. (2017). Rhetorics of interruption: Navigating sexism in the academy. In K. Cole & H. Hassel (Eds.), *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership* (pp. 259-269). Routledge.
- Iannello, K.P. (1992). *Decisions without hierarchy: Feminist interventions in organization theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Ingram, S., & Parker, A. (2002). Gender and modes of collaboration in an engineering classroom: A profile of two women on student teams. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 16(1), 33–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651902016001002>
- Jarzabkowski, P., & Sillince, J. (2007). A rhetoric-in-context approach to building commitment to multiple strategic goals. *Organization Studies*, 28(11), 1639–1665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840607075266>

- Jiang, M. (2020, April 22). *Video chat is helping us stay employed and connected. But what makes it so tiring - and how can we reduce 'Zoom fatigue'?* BBC.com Remote Control. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20200421-why-zoom-video-chats-are-so-exhausting>
- Johnson, N.G., Denmark, F.L., Cantor, D.W., Halpern, D.F., & Keita, G.P. (2007). Leadership through policy development: Collaboration, equity, empowerment, and multiculturalism. In J.L. Chin, B. Lott, J.K. Rice, & J.Sanchez-Hucles (Eds.), *Women and leadership: Transforming visions and diverse voices* (pp. 140-156). Blackwell.
- Johnson-Eilola, J. (1996) Relocating the value of work: Technical communication in a post-industrial age. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 5(3), 245-270. doi: 10.1207/s15427625tcq0503_1
- Jones, N.N, Moore, K.R., & Walton, R. (2016). Disrupting the past to disrupt the future: An antenarrative of technical communication. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 25(4), 211-229. doi: 10.1080/10572252.2016.1224655
- Jovanovic, J., & Armstrong, M.A. (2014). Mission possible: Empowering institutions with strategies for change. *Peer Review*, 16(2). Retrieved from: <https://www.aacu.org/peerreview>
- Keller, E.J. (2019). *Rhetorical strategies for professional development: Investment mentoring in classrooms and workplaces*. Routledge.
- Kelman, S. (2017). Public administration and organization studies. *Academy of Management Annals*, 1(1), 225-226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/078559810>
- Kimball, M. A. (2006). Cars, culture, and tactical technical communication. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 15(1), 67-86. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427625tcq1501_6

- Kirsch, G.E. (1999). *Ethical dilemmas in feminist research: The politics of location, interpretation, and publication*. State University of New York Press.
- Knieval, M.S. (2008). Rupturing context, resituating genre: A study of use-of-force policy in the wake of a controversial shooting. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 22(3), 330-363. doi: 10.1177/1050651908315984
- Koerber, A., Provencher, J., & Starkey, J. (2020): Leadership communication in the STEM workplace: A qualitative study. *Technical Communication Quarterly Online*. doi: 10.1080/10572252.2020.1794047
- Kossek, E.E., & Zonia, S.C. (1994). The effects of race and ethnicity on perceptions of human resource policies and climate regarding diversity. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 8(3), 319-334.
- Lay, M.M. (1989). Feminist theory and the redefinition of technical communication. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 3(2), 5-28.
- (1991). Feminist theory and the redefinition of technical communication. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 5(4), 348-370.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651991005004002>
- Longo, B. (1998). An approach for applying cultural study theory to technical writing research. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 7(1), 53-73.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572259809364617>
- . (2000). *Spurious coin: A history of science, management, and technical writing*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

- Manthey, K. (2017). Dress for success: Dismantling politics of dress in academia. In K. Cole & H. Hassel (Eds.), *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership* (pp. 178-185). Routledge.
- Markel, M. (2005). The rhetoric of misdirection in corporate privacy-policy statements. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 14(2), 197-214.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427625tcq1402_5
- . (2010). Monitoring changes to federal health IT privacy policy: A case study in punctuated equilibrium. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 20(1), 25-46.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2011.528344>
- Mayr, A. (2008). *Language and power: An introduction to institutional discourse*. London, UK: Continuum.
- Meloncon, L. (2017). Contingent faculty, online writing instruction, and professional development in technical and professional communication. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 26(3), 256-272. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2017.1339489>
- Mehlenbacher, B., Kelly, A. R., Kampe, C., & Kittle Autry, M. (2018). Instructional design for online learning environments and the problem of collaboration in the cloud. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 48(2), 199–221.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281616679112>
- Moore, K.R., Meloncon, L., & Sullivan, P. (2017). Mentoring women in technical Communication: Building safe spaces through an affective mentoring model. In K. Cole & H. Hassel (Eds.), *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership* (pp. 233-240). Routledge.

- Nora, K., Gregory, R., Lopez, A., & Williams, A. (2017). Surviving sexism to inspire change: Stories and reflections from mothers on the tenure track. In K. Cole & H. Hassel (Eds.), *Surviving sexism in academia: Strategies for feminist leadership* (pp. 136-143). Routledge.
- Starke-Meyerring, D., Duin, A.H., & Palvetzian T. (2007) Global partnerships: Positioning technical communication programs in the context of globalization. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 16(2), 139-174.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2020.1794047>
- Michelmore, K., & Sessler, S. (2016). Explaining the gender wage gap in STEM: Does field sex composition matter? *RSF: The Russell Sage Foundation Journal of the Social Sciences*, 2(4), 194-215. doi:10.7758/rsf.2016.2.4.07
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, M.A., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. Sage.
- Miller, C. (1979). A humanistic rationale for technical communication. *College English*, 40(6), 610-617. doi: 10.2307/375964
- Olson, K. M. (2009). Rethinking *Loci communes* and Burkean transcendence: Rhetorical leadership while contesting change in the takeover struggle between AirTran and Midwest Airlines. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 23(1), 28–60.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651908324378>
- Organization Studies. (2020). Aims and scope. <https://journals.sagepub.com/aims-scope/oss>
- Paradis, J., Dobrin, D., & Miller, R. (1985). Writing at Exxon ITD: Notes on the writing environment of an R&D organization. In L. Odell & D. Goswami (Eds.), *Writing in nonacademic settings* (pp. 281-307). Guilford.

- Pare, A. (1993). Discourse regulations and the production of knowledge. In R. Spilka (Ed.), *Writing in the workplace: New research perspectives*, (pp. 111-123). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.
- Patel, S. (2014, September 18). *A guide to coding qualitative data*.
<http://salmapatel.co.uk/academia/coding-qualitative-research/>
- Perkins, J.M, & Blyler, N. (1999). *Narrative and professional communication*. Ablex.
- Petersen, E. J., & Moeller, R. M. (2016). Using antenarrative to uncover systems of power in mid-20th century policies on marriage and maternity at IBM. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 46(3), 362–386.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281616639473>
- Pick, K. (2017). Women, leadership, and power. In S.R. Madsen (Ed.), *Handbook of research on gender and leadership* (pp. 228-237). Edward Elgar.
- Porter, J.E., Sullivan, P., Blythe, S., Grabill, J.T., & Miles, L. (2000). Institutional critique: A rhetorical methodology for change. *College Composition and Communication*, 51(4), 610-642.
- Ranney, F.J. (2000). Beyond Foucault: Toward a user-centered approach to sexual harassment policy. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 9(1), 9-28.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572250009364683>
- Read, S., & Michaud, M. (2018). Hidden in plain sight: findings from a survey on the multi-major professional writing course. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 27(3), 227-248.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2018.1479590>
- Rehling, L. (1996). Writing together: Gender's effects on collaboration. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 26(2), 163-176.

- Rentz, K. C. (1992). The value of narrative in business writing. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 6(3), 293–315.
- Robinson, J. (2016). Look before you lead: Seeing virtual teams through the lens of games. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 25(3), 178-190. doi: 10.1080/10572252.2016.1185159
- Rodrigo, R., & Ramirez, C.D. (2017). Balancing institutional demands with effective practice: A lesson in curricular and professional development. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 26(3), 314-328. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572252.2017.1339529>
- Rubin, H.J., & Rubin, I.S. (2015). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed). Los Angeles, CA. Sage.
- Rude, C.D. (1997). Environmental policy making and the report genre. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 6(1), 77-90. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15427625tcq0601_5
- Rutter, R. (1991). History, rhetoric, and humanism: Toward a more comprehensive definition of technical communication. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 21(2), 133–153. <https://doi.org/10.2190/7BBK-BJYK-AQGB-28GP>
- Sandham, S., & Fuller, G. (2020) The ‘Damore memo’: What is the value of antenarrative in organizational communication? *Continuum*, 34(3), 431-447. doi: 10.1080/10304312.2020.1724881
- Schryer, C.F., & Spoel, P. (2005). Genre theory, health-care discourse, and professional identity formation. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 19(3), 249-278. doi: 10.1177/1050651905275625
- Simmons, W.M. (2007). *Participation and power: Civic discourse in environmental policy decisions*. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

- Small, N. (2017). (Re)kindle: On the value of storytelling to technical communication. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 47(2), 234–253.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281617692069>
- Smart, G. (1999). Storytelling in a central bank: The role of narrative in the creation and use of specialized economic knowledge. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 13(3), 249-273.
- Smith, C.F. (2000). Writing public policy: A practicum. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 9(1), 77-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572250009364686>
- Smith, E.O., & Thompson, I. (2002). Feminist theory in technical communication: Making knowledge claims visible. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 16(4), 441-477.
- Spilka, R. (2009). Practitioner research instruction: A neglected curricular area in technical communication undergraduate programs. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 23(2), 216-327. doi: 10.1177/1050651908328882
- Spoel, P., Goforth, D., Cheu, H., & Pearson, D. (2008). Public communication of climate change science: Engaging citizens through apocalyptic narrative explanation. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 18(1), 49-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10572250802437382>
- Sullivan, P. (2015). On defining “institution.” Retrieved from:
<https://patriciasullivan.org/irdefinitions13.pdf>
- Sullivan, P., & Spilka, R. (2011). Qualitative research in technical communication: Issues of value, identity, and use. In J. Conklin & G.F. Hayhoe (Eds.), *Qualitative research in technical communication*, (pp. 1-24). Routledge.

Terry, J. (2020). *Weft*. Art history glossary.

<http://blog.stephens.edu/arh101glossary/?glossary=weft>

Thatcher, B.L. (1998). Writing policies and procedures in a U.S./South American context.

Technical Communication Quarterly, 9(4), 365-399.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572250009364706>

Tong, A., and Klecun, E. (2004). Toward accommodating gender differences in multimedia communication. *IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication*, 47(2), 118-129.

Tong, R., & Botts, T.F. (2018). *Feminist thought: A more comprehensive introduction* (5th ed). Routledge.

Waddell, C. (1995). Defining sustainable development: A case study in environmental communication. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 5(2), 201-216.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10572259509364597>

Walker, K., & Walsh, L. (2011). “No one yet knows what the ultimate consequences may be:” How Rachel Carson transformed scientific uncertainty into a site for public participation in *Silent spring*. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 26(1), 3-34.

doi: 10.1177/1050651911421122

Walton, G. M., Logel, C., Peach, J. M., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (2015). Two brief interventions to mitigate a “chilly climate” transform women’s experience, relationships, and achievement in engineering. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 107(2), 468–485.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037461>

Walton, R., Moore, K.R., & Jones, N.N. (2019). *Technical communication after the social justice turn: Building coalitions for action*. Routledge.

- Watanabe, T. (2019, August 20). *Women-only STEM college programs under attack for male discrimination*. Los Angeles Times. <https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2019-08-20/women-only-science-programs-discrimination-complaints>
- White, K., Rumsey, S., & Amidon, S. (2016). Are we “there” yet? The treatment of gender and feminism in technical, business, and workplace writing studies.” *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 46(1), 27-58.
- Wick, C. (2000). Knowledge management and leadership opportunities for technical communicators. *Technical communication*, 47(4), 515-529.
- Weigold, M. F., & Schlenker, B. R. (1991). Accountability and risk taking. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(1), 25-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167291171004>
- Williams, M.F. (2009). Understanding public policy development as a technological development process. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 23(4), 448-462. doi:10.1177/1050651909338809
- . (2012). Reimagining NASA: A cultural and visual analysis of the US space program. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 26(3), 368–389. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651912439698>
- Wolfe, J. (2015). Teaching students to focus on the data in data visualization. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 29(3), 344–359. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651915573944>
- Yim, M. C., & Park, H. S. (2019). Why legitimacy matters in crisis communication: A case study of the “nut rage” incident on Korean Air. *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, 33(2), 172–202. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1050651918816360>

APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW GUIDE: DESIGN COMMITTEE LEADER

I used this interview guide when I conducted an online interview with Hannah, the DESIGN Committee leader, in October 2018.

1. What is your understanding of “feminism?” It is a label you identify with or advocate?
2. How do you define feminist leadership?
3. Why did you choose a feminist approach to leadership for your work in the DESIGN Committee?
4. How have you enacted feminist leadership practices within the context of the DESIGN Committee?
5. How would you describe the impact your leadership practices have had on the work of the other committee members?
 - a. Follow-up question: Depending on participant’s response, ask about the importance of agency for herself and other committee members.
 - b. Success and challenges
6. In your view, what are some of the challenges and affordances of feminist leadership in the policymaking process?
 - a. Ask for specific examples
7. What are the skills and experiences you’ve drawn upon throughout your work on the SIGGE project?
 - a. What skills have you developed as a result of this project? How did you develop those skills?
 - b. In your view, what skills do people need to do the kind of work you’ve done in this project?

APPENDIX B. INTERVIEW GUIDE: DESIGN COMMITTEE MEMBERS

I used this interview guide when I conducted online interviews with five DESIGN Committee members, which took place from January to April 2019.

History and Context

1. How did you join the SIGGE project?
 - a. Why did you join this project?
 - b. What do you see as your main responsibilities and projects?
2. How would you describe the goals of the DESIGN Committee?
 - a. What do you see as some of the successes the committee has achieved so far?
 - b. What do you see as some of the challenges the committee has faced so far?
3. How would you describe your contributions to the DESIGN Committee so far?

Feminist Leadership

4. How are your experiences on the DESIGN Committee similar to or different from other committees you've worked on/group's you've worked with?
5. How do you define leadership? How do you understand leadership?
6. Do you self-identify as feminist?

Skills and Experiences

7. What are the skills and previous experiences you've drawn upon throughout your work on the DESIGN Committee?
 - a. What skills have you developed as a result of this project? How did you develop those skills?
 - b. In your view, what skills do people need to do the kind of work you've done in this project?
8. Is there anything else you'd like to tell me about the work of the DESIGN Committee or the SIGGE project?

APPENDIX C. POLICY WRITING CODES

This appendix consists of sample codes for the three threads/themes I developed for my antenarrative in Chapter 3: proximity, transparency, and accountability. I chose these sample codes because they were the most relevant for my data analysis. This appendix provides a definition for each code. Note that some codes are found in more than one thread/theme.

Table C1. Proximity

Code Name	Remote Work	Group Communication	Using Technology
Definition	Any paragraph unit that describes the process of working online or working from different geographical locations.	Any paragraph unit that describes communication practices within the DESIGN Committee.	Any paragraph unit that describes using technology to do committee work.

Table C2. Transparency

Code Name	Getting Policy in Place	Working with Stakeholders	Using Technology
Definition	Any paragraph unit that describes challenges to the acceptance or implementation of policy proposed by the DESIGN Committee	Any paragraph unit that describes working with SIGGE project stakeholders outside of the DESIGN Committee.	Any paragraph unit that describes using technology to do committee work.

Table C3. Accountability

Code Name	Getting Policy in Place	Working with Stakeholders	Collecting Data
Definition	Any paragraph unit that describes challenges to the acceptance or implementation of policy proposed by the DESIGN Committee	Any paragraph unit that describes working with SIGGE project stakeholders outside of the DESIGN Committee.	Any paragraph unit that describes challenges the DESIGN Committee experienced related to collecting data

APPENDIX D. FEMINIST LEADERSHIP CODES

This appendix consists of codes I developed for my analysis of the DESIGN Committee’s feminist leadership practices for Chapter 4. This appendix provides a definition and example of a paragraph unit for reach code.

Table D1. Feminist Leadership Codes

Code Name	Apparent Feminism	Connection	Community	Self-Empowerment	Collaboration
Definition	Any paragraph unit related to one of the three goals of apparent feminism.	Any paragraph unit that describes the creation of connection(s) among DESIGN Committee members	Any paragraph unit that describes a sense of community among DESIGN Committee members.	Any paragraph unit that describes a process of empowerment or self-empowerment among DESIGN Committee members.	Any paragraph unit that describes collaboration among DESIGN Committee members and/or project stakeholders.