

# CROSSROADS

An interdisciplinary journal for the study  
of history, philosophy, religion and classics

SPECIAL ISSUE - RHIZOMES

VOLUME III ISSUE II 2009

ISSN: 1833-878X

Pages 30-39

**Teena Clerke**

*Ghostwriting + Shadowwriting: Constructing Research Texts that Speak to  
Women's Lived Experiences*

## ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the methodological strategies of ghostwriting and shadowwriting in the context of a feminist research project about women design academics. Central to these strategies is the idea that the practice of research writing is a form of enquiry and thus researchers are textual practitioners. I will argue that as textual practices of research, ghostwriting and shadowwriting provide ways for researchers to acknowledge that research texts: are jointly constructed by researcher and participant; seek not truth, but to (re)present people's lived experiences; and through the act of writing, produce meaning, rather than discover reality. In these terms, as each research text produces one of many possible interpretations of participants' experiences, researchers are ethically responsible for their textual choices and practices. Ghostwriting and shadowwriting are proposed as two such possible strategies.

## BIOGRAPHY

Teena has worked as a graphic designer for over twenty years, focusing on community cultural development and social change, and has participated in ten solo and group art exhibitions, with paintings represented in private collections in Australia, UK, USA, Japan, New Zealand and Canada. Since 1995, she has taught undergraduate and postgraduate design at various Sydney universities, and now teaches adult education at

UTS. Teena has a Dip.Ed. (VET), M.Ed, and is currently researching women design academics in her doctorate at UTS.

## **GHOSTWRITING + SHADOWWRITING: CONSTRUCTING RESEARCH TEXTS THAT SPEAK TO WOMEN'S LIVED EXPERIENCE**

In this paper, I will discuss the idea of research writing as a method of enquiry, specifically through the use of two postmodern research strategies, within the context of a feminist doctoral research project. The strategies are ghostwriting and shadowwriting.

I will outline my use of ghostwriting, and also introduce shadowwriting, as two<sup>i</sup> of the research methodologies used in my doctoral research about women design academics.<sup>ii</sup> The reasons for choosing ghostwriting, and for developing shadowwriting, are three-fold. First, as postmodern research methods, they represent ways in which to acknowledge that research writing produces texts that are jointly constructed by researcher and interviewee, and as such, accounts of these events are neither neutral nor objective. Second, from a postmodernist perspective, research texts are (re)presentations of people's lived realities, and thus become a kind of fiction as they seek not to represent 'truth', but rather, perform an account of a lived experience. Third, as co-constructed textual practices, meaning is contested and what is produced is one of many possible interpretations. By foregrounding certain parts and backgrounding or even omitting others in the 'writing up' of interview data, the researcher interprets people's tales of their experience as one of many possible interpretations. In turn, as people tell the stories of events in their lives, they 'add to' these experiences as a way of making sense of what happened. Taussig refers to these additions as 'excess',<sup>iii</sup> which Rhodes claims is where the value of the research lies.<sup>iv</sup> In this sense, the value of the 'excess' in research data is that it often sparks new insights into people's lives that may then also contribute to new knowledge.

'Ghostwriting' was used by Carl Rhodes as an interview-based research methodology in his doctoral thesis on organisational change.<sup>v</sup> He used it as a way of writing 'for and on behalf of someone else',<sup>vi</sup> in this case, the participants in his study. In a subsequent publication, he describes ghostwriting as '...a practice of interview-based research that uses the metaphor of researcher as ghostwriter...as a way of understanding research that enables researchers to acknowledge their role in the production of textual representations of their research participants.'<sup>vii</sup> Drawing on Laurel Richardson, Rhodes claimed that as research is a form of textual practice, 'researchers are themselves textual practitioners'<sup>viii</sup> who by speaking about the people they study also speak for them, and in the process of inscribing their lives, 'bestow meaning and promulgate values'.<sup>ix</sup> As such, researchers produce interpretations of the world in which their participants inhabit.

Further, Rhodes argues rather than producing 'true' accounts of experience, through ghostwriting the social activity of interviewing is acknowledged as a 'situated and context-dependent performance practice'<sup>x</sup> that textualises experience. The ghostwritten text then becomes 'both a description and a component part of the practices it refers to [while] ...the texts construct rather than discover the world',<sup>xi</sup> and as textual practitioners, researchers construct the worlds they study. In this sense, research texts perform an interpretive function, and through their textual practice, researchers produce texts that perform as representations of the 'lived realities' of the lives of the people for whom they purport to speak. Rhodes suggests researchers thus have an ethical responsibility for the textual choices and knowledge claims they make in and through their writing, in terms of how they themselves are present, and also how they (re)present their participants' experiences.

Through ghostwriting, Rhodes troubles the idea in traditional qualitative research that 'research writing is an unproblematic representation of the social world'<sup>xii</sup> and instead, suggests that meaning is constructed and contested in such texts. He argues that 'methodological discussions linked to the collapsing of division between fact and fiction'<sup>xiii</sup> in this and other papers,<sup>xiv</sup> work to draw attention to the 'fictionality of research texts [that] implies a heightened sense of researcher-author responsibility'.<sup>xv</sup> This means that researchers have an ethical responsibility for the textual choices they make to represent both themselves and also the people about whom they write.

In these ways, rather than seeking to represent the interview data as 'truth', as researcher, my ethical responsibility to the women with whom I have spoken is in the (re)presentation of their experiences in a way that honours their participation in my research. By using textual strategies that acknowledge these things, I seek to mindfully work with, rather than resolve, the tensions around the ethical responsibilities for (re)presenting the experiences of others in the project of my doctoral research work, while seeking the 'value' in their stories.

### **WOMEN DESIGN ACADEMICS**

The purpose of my doctoral research is to investigate the everyday lives of women who work as design

academics in order to shed some light on how women's experiences shape their contributions to an emergent discipline, and how this can be examined through the stories that describe what is happening at a local level. The research is framed by Dorothy Smith's institutional ethnography.<sup>xvi</sup> Drawing on Foucault's conception of discourse, Smith suggests that 'what can be said or written is subject to the regulation of the discourse within which it is framed...regulating how people's subjectivities are coordinated, what can be uttered, what must be excluded, what is simply not made present...is discursively determined'.<sup>xvii</sup> And so as women, our stories become regulated within the dominant disciplinary discourses that determine what gets said, who gets to say it, and what counts as being worthwhile, and in the process, also determines what is omitted and not recorded. Thus, by examining women's stories, I ask, what kinds of research do women undertake and what choices do they make about the work that they perform in the academy? I aim to capture a moment in history and ask women to think about how they've come to be who they are and make the decisions they're making, and what they see to be the critical questions for them at this time, and how this might be spoken about.

My interest in women academics has arisen from my experience since 1996 working as a design academic at different universities in Sydney. During this time, I noticed that many of my academic colleagues were women and also that the majority of students attracted to the professional practice of design were women. This seemed to represent a significant shift from the 1970s when I began my own design studies, and when the field was male dominated.

My observation is supported by preliminary statistical data and is a phenomenon that appears not to be restricted to Australia.<sup>xviii</sup> Liz McQuiston reported that in 1988,<sup>xix</sup> the proportion of women in student intakes in British design courses was roughly 50%,<sup>xx</sup> significantly different from the previous five years. She includes the results of a 1986 US survey that shows, nationwide from 1980 to 1985, the proportion of women working in design practice 'jumped' from 25% to 52%, noting though, that there were 'still few (if any)',<sup>xxi</sup> women heading education courses or departments in design areas. This increase is contextualised in a field that has experienced enormous shifts in its traditions and practices. In particular, these include a shift from mechanical to digital production technologies facilitated by the computer; the transition of design education from the technical college to the university that saw the emergence of design as an academic discipline; and a reconsideration of design's social position through an examination of the relationship between design practice, pedagogy and academic research. Further, in Australia in the late 1980s and early 1990s, major policy changes in the higher education sector reconfigured the constitution of academic work to include administration, teaching and research, as well as increased participation in the university's processes of marketisation.

So, the research problematic begins with my observation about more women in the discipline of design. Yet, despite their increased numbers in the field, women's presence seems to have gone unnoticed, unrecorded and unspoken. Further, there is a lack of written stories or histories that select, record and interpret as being of significance to the discipline, events in women's experiences that are valuable because they are different to those of men.

Further, the dominant discourses in the professional design literature still represent women as being strangely absent from the discipline—'the role of women in graphic design is consistently marginalised or overlooked',<sup>xxii</sup> and 'graphic design, and particularly typographic design is dominated by white middle-class males'.<sup>xxiii</sup> On the occasions where women are included in the design literature, it is often in the form of 'compensatory histories',<sup>xxiv</sup> that 'add' individual women designers as 'equal qualifiers' to historical accounts without 'focusing on the kinds of interactions women have had with design'.<sup>xxv</sup> This would suggest that in the context of dramatically changed design traditions and practices, what is missing from the dominant discourses are issues that interest and are of value to women because they arise from women's experiences.

In my conversations with other women design academics, I noticed commonalities in the stories they told about how they became academics, such as how they just 'fell into it'. Whilst not uncommon to women in other fields, these stories are also not necessarily gender-specific. However, what struck me was that if the women hadn't planned to be academics but were still there in fairly large numbers, what then happened to them after they began working in the university? How does this process of women becoming academics affect design students' educational experiences? What do women bring to their academic work, and how does this affect their research and contributions to scholarly knowledge in the field? Further, how do women reflect on the experiences that have shaped their contributions to the field of design? And what kinds of research do women undertake and what choices are available to them in the work they perform as practitioners and academics within the university?

These questions are pertinent as design currently engages in the process of 'becoming a discipline' while women in design engage in the process of 'becoming academics'. By examining how these things are being spoken about at a local level, I see an increasing need to open up a broader discursive space for women to reflect on how they contribute to a globally changing design discipline, so this becomes known as part of the acknowledged fabric of work that women perform in the university. My reason for using ghostwriting and shadowwriting in my research is because in the existing published records of women in design, women's lived experiences are usually edited out, and this works to obscure the effects of the textually mediated relations of ruling that organize their work and shape the material conditions of their lives. As textual research strategies, ghostwriting and shadowwriting may work to render these conditions visible, while also creating a different kind of record of women's lives in the field.

By using ghostwriting and shadowwriting in my research, I address Rhodes' questions, how is it possible to account for fictionality in research texts, and what does it mean to account for it in different ways?<sup>xxvi</sup> I will do this by acknowledging that the written texts have been generated through research events organized by me for my doctoral research, motivated by a feminist perspective to speak to women's experiences as design academics. I will also argue that textual strategies such as ghostwriting and shadowwriting are useful ways to write an ethically responsible research text, while also opening a discursive space so women may talk about their lived experiences in the discipline of design at this contemporary moment.

The following sections of this paper contain two texts that were constructed by me, drawing on data generated from an 'on the record' interview, de-identified data from a collective memory workshop,<sup>xxvii</sup> and various de-identified conversations I have had with women during my doctorate. I include these texts to show that in the reading, they each present a coherent narrative of one woman's experience in becoming a design academic. However, in the construction, there is more than one woman present in each text. In the first text I am present as co-author, and in the second, the shadow of myself is present as both researcher and participant, in a collective biography constructed from the accounts of six women. The data in these texts are excerpts from recorded conversations in four distinct research events. I have chosen the theme of 'becoming academic' in the texts, partly because it makes it easier to read them as companions texts, and partly because it is an opportunity to speak to the patterns that are emerging in the data in the way women talk about their lived experiences as design academics.

One reason for using these textual strategies is to 'play' with the research data in order to heighten the value of the 'excess' in the stories women tell so that, as Rhodes suggests, the division between fact and fiction may be collapsed and the written texts that arise may 'count' as disciplinary knowledge in the field of design. Another is that as a feminist research project, the imperative is to co-construct texts with women about their lives as design academics so that they speak to other women's experiences as well. In this sense, rather than representing 'truth', my aim is that the texts 'ring true' to women other than those with whom I have collaborated in that they speak to the patterns in women's lives. None of the outcomes will be 'more true' than any other, yet as I am working from the assumption that all research writing is a kind of fiction, then 'truth' is not what is sought. I am interested in how the construction of these particular research texts may intervene in women's lives, and what might then be possible in terms of opening a new kind of discursive space in the emerging discipline of design; a space in which women may converse and 'record' those events in their lives that have significance for the discipline precisely because they are of significance to women.

By using ghostwriting, and its extension, shadowwriting, I am responsive to the women with whom I speak, and also responsible for improving the material lived conditions of women's lives in the design academy. By engaging in these particular textual practices, I am able to account for my part in co-constructing these stories, but more importantly, the building of these different kinds of texts provides ways for me to be respectful to the women who participated in my work, so that their stories are 'out there' for others to read. In the process, the very act of putting these stories 'out there' may work to change the material conditions of women's everyday lives that shape the choices that are available to them as design academics.

The following sections describe the processes in constructing first, an 'on the record' ghostwritten text, and second, a shadowwritten collective biography.

### **GHOSTWRITING RESEARCH TEXTS (JENNY'S STORY)**

*And lo and behold somebody had already said to me, there are some jobs going part-time lecturing at Sydney College of the Arts, which was just starting. Why don't you go for it? I thought, well, it'll fit in*

*with the kids. It was always to do with fitting in with the children, and school and kindergarten and whatever else. So I applied for the job, got it.*

*It was the first year of Sydney College of the Arts and we were just thrown in the deep end. I didn't have a clue what I was going to teach, although I'd put in some effort into thinking about it. I was teaching particularly in first year, which was a combined first year with visual arts and design and there was a lot of toing and froing, and a lot of juggling for power basically. And there was a lot of great ideas, but individuals got in the way, which meant that basically, within a few years, I'd become full-time, but they'd split the two schools and there was a lot of competition between them. And it was very sad because I actually learned a lot from my colleagues in the visual arts area, who had a perspective, which was quite challenging, quite different. So maybe about five years down the track, I finished up as head of department.*

Jenny Toynbee Wilson (interviewed March 2007).

The paragraphs above are excerpts from the ghostwritten story I am in the process of co-writing with Jenny Toynbee Wilson. The story is being produced from a series of 'on the record' interviews with Jenny in early 2007 for my doctoral research. As an Adjunct Professor in the Faculty of Design, Architecture and Building at the University of Technology, Sydney, Jenny's experiences as a design academic in Australia have spanned thirty years, a period that also saw enormous changes in design practices and traditions. I interviewed Jenny because I was interested to hear about her experiences as an academic during this dynamic period, and also because I wanted to construct an alternative account of the period in Australia, alternative in that it would be from a woman's perspective. Also, I thought Jenny might be interested in putting her experiences 'on the record', as an account of her contributions to design education, and as one of only a very few women at the time in Australia heading programs in higher education in the field.

By using ghostwriting to co-construct with Jenny this story of her experience, I am acknowledging my participation in the dual processes of organizing the interviews as a specific research event, and in 'writing them up' for the purpose of my doctoral research. In these processes, Jenny and I will collaborate to construct a 'compelling narrative'<sup>xxviii</sup> of the stories she told me over the course of several interviews about her experiences as a design academic. As we collaborate, we will be seeking to represent Jenny's experiences, while also seeking to craft a 'good story' that will engage and stimulate readers. As co-authors, we will make decisions about those aspects of the story to be foregrounded, those to be backgrounded, and those to be omitted, so that the story is coherent and engaging, while also being an agreed-upon record of her experience.

Through the interviews with Jenny, through our informal discussions, through reading her published papers and by selecting particular parts of Jenny's story to include in a 'compelling narrative', I am engaging in a form of textual practice situated within a feminist political project. I thus select the parts of the story Jenny told me that best suit the purposes of my research, while Jenny, by speaking to me during the interviews, has also engaged in a process of selection by telling me only some parts of her experiences. By ghostwriting her experience, and drawing on her published academic work, together we are participating in a textual practice of co-construction as we collaborate in telling the personalised story of her life as a design academic for the purposes of my research, while also acknowledging my presence in the text as the researcher. Ghostwriting provides an opportunity to construct for the 'record', and in addition to Jenny's published work as a design academic, an account of her lived experience as a woman academic when design education moved into the university.

## **DEVELOPING SHADOWWRITING FROM 'INCIDENTAL' RESEARCH DATA**

Almost incidentally and through the course of recording conversations I'd had with women design academics, with my supervisors, and during the developmental stages of my research, I realized that a number of written and spoken stories of women's experiences had been generated. Further, during the collective memory workshop, the conversations we had over several hours as five women talking about our work as design academics, also produced research 'data' in the form of our many stories, in addition to the written work itself. In reading these stories and being mindful to look for positive ways in which women spoke about their work and contributions to the field, such as high rates of PhD completion, I struggled with my tendency to notice the more predictable parts of their stories, vivid accounts of sexist attitudes and behaviours, muted accounts of institutional dynamics that worked to diminish the value of their work, and resigned admissions of a tendency to overload and overcommit themselves.

In sitting with these tensions, I began to think about how I might manage decisions about what to foreground and what to background in my research texts. Essentially, as my research is about women not being seen to be

powerful within a particular academic field, the work is not so much about the specific women I speak to as it is about creating a collective account of what the history has been and what may be possible through the intervention of my research. Through a collective account of experience, such as may be generated from the data of multiple research events, a space may then be opened for women to talk about those events that are significant to the field of design precisely because they are significant to women in design.

Through discussions with a doctoral student who is also using ghostwriting in her research,<sup>xxxix</sup> we have coined the term ‘shadowwriting’ to describe a textual practice where the shadow of myself as researcher is alive and present (that is, not a ghost) in two key ways, first in the traces of my own experiences in the multiple stories of other women, and second, as author of an account assembled from snips of many stories, as if I was writing the autobiography of one woman.

As my aim is to investigate ‘what has been excluded by the absence of women from the making of the topics and relevances of the discourse’,<sup>xxx</sup> I hope to open up a new discursive space through the intervention of my research. By explicitly using postmodern research strategies such as ghostwriting and shadowwriting, I aim to produce new ‘knowledge’ that addresses the questions of, what has changed as a result of the increased presence of women in the emergent discipline of design?; what difference would it make if women were to become part of the contemporary design lexicon and canon?; and how can this be spoken about? Thus I want to record particular kinds of stories, generated from the stories women tell me, about how textually mediated practices work to organize the material lived conditions of women’s lives. Ghostwriting and subsequently, shadowwriting, may provide methodological strategies with which to do this.

#### **SHADOWWRITING—CONSTRUCTING RESEARCH TEXTS THAT SPEAK TO WOMEN’S LIVED EXPERIENCE (COLLECTIVE BIOGRAPHY)**

*Never entered my head that I would become an academic. It was kind of circumstances. It was only because somebody said, oh why don’t you come and teach? And I said, sure, would love to do that. And I still laugh and go, yeah but, I’m not an academic. I think that there is a sense often that you get asked to teach and you come along to do it, and then all of a sudden, you’re just kind of thrown into the deep end.*

*I remember when I came here for my first bit of casual teaching, I was sort of literally dropped in. I was teaching all over the place and I would get here just in time for the afternoon class from the one that I’d taught, three hours of a morning at another university. I’d run out, literally with a student hanging off my coat tails, saying, ‘when can we see you?’ as I run to the bus, and came chasing over here and started teaching an hour later for another three hours, a totally different subject. And it was that shift in headspace that had to take place on the bus.*

*And so, you know, it was very much a kind of satellite kind of relationship to the university. I was reliant on the students because I was desperately searching for the ethos of this program, appearing at fourth year level doing research supervision, and not having any kind of overview of what the program was, where these students had come through. And I relied so much on the students to let me know what they thought research was, because I had no sense of what they’d done before, and that relies on the students to get the ethos right. So I think that what I could have done with that group would have been very different if I had’ve had an understanding of what had happened earlier in the program. Yeah, I relied on the students very much for this first subject. And it was terrible.*

The text above is a composite text comprising the experiences of six women, and constructed from data recorded and transcribed during four separate research events held at different times, but each specifically for my research. The first two sentences are Jenny’s opening comments when she first told me how she became an academic. The rest of the text has been edited from two de-identified interviews with two senior academics, and the conversations between four women and myself during the collective memory workshop,<sup>xxxi</sup> conducted seven months later. While I transcribed the many hours I had recorded during these events, I began to notice certain patterns in the way women spoke about their experiences. The texts in this paper provide such an example, around the experience of teaching for the first time as a casual or part-time design academic. The similarities between how six different women spoke about this experience were striking, and sometimes even the turns of phrase were identical, such as, being ‘thrown in the deep end’. I realized that there might be some ‘value’ in these almost incidental details. I cut and pasted parts of those conversations and reworked them to form a coherent narrative, as if I was telling my own story. I wanted to use the actual words the women used as much as possible, as well as keeping them in the context and spirit in which they were used. In constructing the paragraphs above, I added some joining words and also deleted information that may have distracted from the story.

And so, as a researcher, I constructed the text to tell a compelling narrative of a woman's first-time experience teaching design at a particular university, as if I was the one whose story this was. As such, the story is a kind of fiction, because although it uses the words the research participants used, I created this story as an account of one woman's experience in order that it 'ring true' for the participants as well as me. As I am both researcher and participant in this story, I am calling the method of writing shadowwriting, because the shadow of myself is present in both roles in the text. As in ghostwriting, such a textual practice that acknowledges the researcher as being both in and out of the text challenges the notion of 'truth' in research writing. But what is different about this methodology is that I am also consciously challenging what might be considered as research 'data', to enable me to draw on the incidental texts generated in the course of my doctorate. If by using ghostwriting as a research methodology the criteria for what counts as 'knowledge' in research texts is not truth, then it follows, the criteria for what counts as 'data' from which the texts are constructed, may also be challenged. Enter shadowwriting.

By shadowwriting, I mean that I have constructed the text as a collective biography, using the words that women have used, in order to draw attention to the pattern in the way that women speak about their experiences when they first taught design in a particular university. The women whose words I use vary in age, country of origin, educational background and professional design experiences, and each began teaching design in different universities. Their words are edited from the stories they told, that I recorded and transcribed in the context of formal research events organised by me, for the purpose of my doctoral research. However, in constructing this story as an authoritative research text, I am mindful of the tensions that arise between what I see as my ethical responsibility to represent the participants' experiences, and my need for the text to stand as an account that 'rings true', and is recognizable to other women. As such, I also rely on my own experiences of first-time design teaching at university to construct the text, even though this is not my story and I do not use my words.

In writing this account as a compelling narrative, I acknowledge, yet do not attempt to resolve, the tensions around: constructing a story that fulfils my research imperatives while also fulfilling my ethical responsibility to those whose words I use; what I choose to foreground in this story and what I choose to background; how I situate myself as both researcher and researched; and my need for the story, in the reading, to 'ring true' and resonate with other women. This is so that it may open a discursive space for women to engage with, reflect on, and intervene to change, the institutional relations of ruling that organize the materials conditions of women's academic lives in design.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, in this paper I have provided an outline of the epistemological imperatives behind the use of ghostwriting and shadowwriting in my feminist research project about women design academics. In describing how, as textual strategies, they work how to produce particular kinds of stories about how women see themselves and their work as design academics, I have demonstrated how they also help to generate a different kind of 'record' within contemporary design discourses—one that speaks to women's lived experience in an emergent discipline.

---

## REFERENCES

<sup>i</sup> In addition to these strategies, in my doctoral research I have also used collective memory work. As a political feminist project, collective memory work has at its heart the nature of the researcher researching themselves in a collective and generative research event. Each participant produces a memory of a particular event written in the third person. The group then collectively analyses each account of individual experience in order to uncover the disjunctures in the writing so that the hidden social relations of ruling may be made visible. Institutional ethnography (see xvi in these endnotes) seeks to begin enquiry in the lives of the everyday, the lived material conditions of women's lives that are shaped by the textually mediated relations of ruling that organize our work and social interactions. By using textual research strategies that seek to collectively generate, rather than find sets of data that, in the writing process, may be collectively analysed through the co-construction between researcher and researched, I ask, what then what are the possibilities for telling particular kinds of stories that speak to women's experiences, and in the process, sheds some light on the relations of ruling that organize their work and shape the choices available to them within the social organisation of their work. For further information on collective memory work, see Haug (xxvii in these endnotes), and also the following:

- June M. Crawford, Susan Kippax, Jenny Onyx, Una Gault and Pam Benton, *Emotion and Gender: Constructing Meaning from Memory*. (London: Sage, 1992).
- Betty Johnston. "Mathematics and gender, given or made?: A study of women, rationality and mathematical practices", Unpublished PhD thesis. (Sydney: University of Sydney, 1998).
- Judith S. Kaufman, Margaret S. Ewing, Adrienne E. Hyle, Diane Montgomery and Patricia A. Self, "Women and Nature: Using memory-work to rethink our relationship to the natural world", *Environmental Education Research* 7, no. 4 (2001): 359–77.
- Jennie Small and Jenny Onyx, *Memory-work: A Critique*, Report Number No. 20. (Sydney: University of Technology, Sydney, Faculty of Business, School of Management, 2001).
- <sup>ii</sup> In this paper, I use the term 'design' to denote the specific disciplinary and professional contexts of 'graphic design' and 'visual communication'. This means that when the term 'design' is used, it refers to the contemporary field of professional practice, pedagogy and scholarly research in which various elements are creatively arranged to produce visual information in different media forms for diverse communication purposes and audiences. When the term 'designer' is used, it refers to practitioners in this field, while 'design academic' refers to those who work as academics in higher education in the field.
- <sup>iii</sup> Michael Taussig, *Mimesis and Alterity: a particular history of the Senses* (New York: Routledge, 1993).
- <sup>iv</sup> Taussig's idea of 'excess' and 'mimesis' was introduced in a discussion with Carl Rhodes in January 2008, in which myself, Kate Bower and our supervisor, Alison Lee participated.
- <sup>v</sup> Carl Rhodes, *Writing, (Re)presentation and Control: an Exploration Through Narratives at Work*. Unpublished thesis, (Sydney: University of Technology, 1999).
- <sup>vi</sup> Carl Rhodes, "Ghostwriting Research: Positioning the Researcher in the Interview Text." *Qualitative Inquiry* 6, no. 2 (2000): 514.
- <sup>vii</sup> *Ibid.*, 511.
- <sup>viii</sup> *Ibid.*, 513.
- <sup>ix</sup> *Ibid.*, 513.
- <sup>x</sup> *Ibid.*, 514.
- <sup>xi</sup> *Ibid.*, 514.
- <sup>xii</sup> Carl Rhodes, "Writing Responsibly: Narrative Fiction and Organization Studies," *Organization*. 12, no. 4 (2005): 469.
- <sup>xiii</sup> *Ibid.*, 485.
- <sup>xiv</sup> Kate Bower, "'Ghostwriting': Generating authoritative research texts in feminist post positivist research", *Crossroads* (this issue).
- <sup>xv</sup> Rhodes, "Writing Responsibly": 467.
- <sup>xvi</sup> Dorothy E. Smith, *The Everyday World As Problematic: A Feminist Sociology* (Massachusetts: Northeastern University Press, 1987).
- Dorothy E. Smith, *Institutional Ethnography* (Lanham, Maryland: AltaMira Press, 2005).
- Dorothy E. Smith (ed.). *Institutional Ethnography as Practice* (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2006).
- <sup>xvii</sup> Smith, *Institutional Ethnography*, 17–18.
- <sup>xviii</sup> Based on preliminary data analysis conducted in July 2007 in consultation with the Faculty Manager of a design faculty at a Sydney metropolitan university.
- <sup>xix</sup> Liz McQuiston, *Women in Design: A Contemporary View* (London: Trefoil, 1988).
- <sup>xx</sup> McQuiston uses the term 'design' to refer to an expanded definition that includes interior, industrial and fashion as well as graphic design, but not architecture. This expanded definition is also used in many of the citations from the professional design literature in this section of the paper.
- <sup>xxi</sup> McQuiston, *Women in Design*, 6.
- <sup>xxii</sup> Laurie Haycock Makela and Ellen Lupton, "Underground Matriarchy," *Eye, The International review of Graphic Design* 4, no. 14 (1994): 42.
- <sup>xxiii</sup> Michel-Anne Dauppe, "Agents of change convene in Berlin," *Eye, The International review of Graphic Design* 5, no. 20 (1996): 83.
- <sup>xxiv</sup> Gerda Lerner, *The Creation of Patriarchy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986).
- <sup>xxv</sup> Carma R. Gorman, "Reshaping and Rethinking: Recent Feminist Scholarship on Design and Designers," *Design Issues* 17, no. 4 (2001): 73.
- <sup>xxvi</sup> Carl Rhodes. In a discussion about ghostwriting, January 2008 (see xiv).
- <sup>xxvii</sup> A workshop was conducted in October 2007 with five women, including myself as both researcher and participants, and drawing on the principles of Haug's collective memory work. For a detailed explanation of this feminist methodology, see the following: Haug, Frigga, et al. *Female Sexualisation: A Collective Work of Memory*. Trans. E. Carter. (London: Verso, 1987).

- 
- <sup>xxviii</sup> Rhodes, “Ghostwriting Research” : 520.  
<sup>xxix</sup> Bower, ““Ghostwriting””  
<sup>xxx</sup> Smith, *The Everyday World As Problematic*, 52.  
<sup>xxxi</sup> See xii.