

Gender Bias in Academic Writing: Challenges and Equity Strategies

Muhammad Arinal Rahman

University of Szeged, Hungary

email: arinalrahman@gmail.com

Abstrak: Kajian ini menyajikan sintesis dari berbagai penelitian yang sudah ada mengenai hubungan yang kompleks antara gender dan penulisan akademik, eksplorasi gaya penulisan berdasarkan gender, persepsi tentang kualitas penulisan, representasi dalam penerbitan karya ilmiah, keterkaitan dengan identitas sosial lainnya, dan intervensi yang bertujuan untuk mempromosikan kesetaraan gender. Kajian ini mengungkapkan adanya variasi yang berbeda dalam praktik penulisan, dengan para akademisi perempuan cenderung menggunakan gaya yang lebih tentatif dan akademisi laki-laki lebih menyukai pendekatan yang tegas. Adanya penilaian yang bias, melanggengkan stereotip gender yang berdampak pada penilaian dan juga penghargaan. Perbedaan struktural yang terjadi dalam dunia penerbitan akademik, menghambat representasi yang beragam. Dengan menggunakan lensa interseksional, kita dapat melihat efek yang ditimbulkan oleh integrasi antara gender, ras, kelas, dan afiliasi disiplin ilmu. Intervensi yang diusulkan termasuk pedoman mengenai netralitas gender, pelatihan penanganan isu bias, program-program terkait inisiatif keberagaman, dan kebijakan institusional yang mendukung inklusivitas. Meskipun kemajuan telah dicapai, upaya berkelanjutan diperlukan untuk menghilangkan bias yang masih ada, mengatasi ketidaksetaraan, dan mengembangkan ruang yang adil yang menghargai beragam suara dalam produksi pengetahuan. Kajian komprehensif ini memberikan pandangan tentang arah penelitian di masa depan dan strategi dari berbagai institusi untuk mencapai kesetaraan gender dalam penulisan akademik.

Kata Kunci: *akademik; gender; interseksionalitas; intervensi; ketidaksetaraan dalam penerbitan; penulisan gaya penulisan*

Abstract: This review synthesizes existing research on the intricate relationship between gender and academic writing, exploring gendered writing styles, perceptions of writing quality, representation in academic publishing, intersectionality with other social identities, and interventions to promote gender equity. Findings reveal nuanced variations in writing practices, with female scholars tending toward more tentative styles and male scholars favoring assertive approaches. Evaluation biases persist, perpetuating gender stereotypes that impact grading and recognition. Structural inequities manifest in academic publishing landscapes, hindering diverse representation. An intersectional lens elucidates the compounding effects of gender, race, class, and disciplinary affiliations. Interventions proposed include gender-neutral guidelines, bias training, diversity initiatives, and institutional policies supporting inclusivity. While progress has been made, ongoing efforts are needed to dismantle persisting biases, address inequities, and cultivate equitable spaces valuing diverse voices in knowledge production. This comprehensive review informs future research directions and institutional strategies toward gender equity in academic writing.

Keywords: *academic writing; gender; intersectionality; interventions; publishing inequities; writing styles*

INTRODUCTION

Writing plays a vital role in academia by facilitating knowledge, communication, and assessment. Nevertheless, gender dynamics have significantly shaped the academic writing landscape, with historical biases and cultural norms impacting writing practices, perceptions, and progression opportunities (Francis et al., 2003; Kirsch, 1993; Poole et al., 1997). This review aims to synthesize existing research on the intricate relationship between gender and academic writing, exploring gendered writing styles, perceptions of writing quality, and the broader implications of gender inequities within academic publishing and career progression.

Numerous studies have investigated the nuances of gendered writing styles, examining patterns in language use, rhetorical strategies, and authorial positioning (Deats & Lenker, 1994; Ghafoori & Oghbatalab, 2012; Robson et al., 2002). These investigations have revealed similarities and differences in how male and female scholars construct their academic narratives, with implications for perceived authority, credibility, and evaluation. Furthermore, research has unveiled biases in assessing student writing, suggesting that gender perceptions can inadvertently shape evaluators' judgments, perpetuating stereotypes and potential inequalities (Earl-Novell, 2001; Peterson & Bainbridge, 1998; Read et al., 2004).

In addition to individual writing routines, gender roles have also been evident in broader academic publishing. Studies on how authors are chosen, how peer review is done, and how editors make decisions have revealed possible unfairness in the system, prompting concerns about the inclusion and recognition of different voices and viewpoints (D'Angelo, 2008; Lundine et al., 2019; Pullen, 2006). Additionally, research has explored the intersections of gender with other social identities, such as race, class, and disciplinary affiliations, highlighting the multifaceted nature of these dynamics (Preece, 2018).

Despite extensive research, much remains to learn about the complex relationship between gender and academic writing. In order to completely understand these dynamics, we need extensive research that includes a variety of disciplines, institutions, and cultural environments. Gender dynamics in academic writing can differ significantly depending on the field, institution, or culture, affecting everything from writing styles to publishing opportunities.

Moreover, while an ongoing effort exists to explore the effectiveness of interventions and policies promoting gender equity, we still lack detailed research on their long-term impact and best practices across different contexts. Conflicting findings in current research further highlight the need for a more cohesive understanding of these issues.

To address these gaps, this review focuses on the following research questions:

1. What are the key patterns and differences in gendered writing styles and practices within academic contexts?
2. How do gender perceptions influence the evaluation and reception of academic writing?
3. What are the potential structural inequities and gender biases in academic publishing and career advancement processes related to writing?
4. How do intersecting social identities, such as race, class, and disciplinary affiliations, interact with gender dynamics in academic writing?
5. What interventions, policies, and institutional practices have been proposed or implemented to address gender inequities in academic writing and publishing, and how effective have they been?

These questions are designed to build on each other, helping us gain a complete understanding of the relationship between gender and academic writing. We will start by looking at individual writing styles and perceptions, then move on to broader issues in publishing and career progression, and finally examine how intersecting identities and interventions influence these dynamics.

This review is essential because it can increase our understanding and encourage critical discussion about the gendered aspects of academic writing practices, evaluation procedures, and publishing environments. By pointing out these patterns and intricacies, we can strive to break down institutional prejudices, encourage a variety of viewpoints, and establish more equitable chances for academics of any gender. It is essential to tackle gender inequalities in academic writing to promote a more diverse and representative academic knowledge base that encompasses a variety of experiences and perspectives within the academic sector.

The aim is to offer specific examples and suggestions derived from our research to guide institutional efforts in fostering gender equality in academia. By consolidating current research and identifying areas needing further investigation, this review offers a comprehensive understanding of the complex connection between gender and academic writing. This will guide future research efforts and institutional initiatives to advance gender equality and inclusivity in academia.

METHODS

A methodical approach was used to thoroughly examine the current literature on gender and academic writing (Macaro, 2019). The assessment procedure consisted of various essential steps, such as outlining the scope and research inquiries, conducting a thorough literature review, evaluating and choosing pertinent studies, critically examining the included studies, and combining the results.

Defining the Scope and Research Questions

The initial step was to define the scope of the review and create specific research questions to direct the literature search and synthesis. The review included studies on how gender relates to aspects of academic writing, such as writing styles, perceptions of writing quality, representation in academic publishing, and impact on career progression. The study's inquiries focused on prominent topics like gendered writing practices, evaluation biases, publishing disparities, intersectionality with other social identities, and possible interventions and policies.

Literature Search Strategy

An in-depth literature search was conducted across several electronic databases, such as Web of Science, Scopus, ERIC, and Google Scholar. The search method used appropriate keywords and subject headings about gender, academic writing, writing styles, publishing, assessment, and higher education. Moreover, the included studies underwent backward and forward reference checking to find other pertinent literature.

Study Selection and Screening

The initial search results were evaluated according to pre-established inclusion and exclusion criteria. The inclusion criteria included articles from peer-reviewed journals, book chapters, and research reports published in English that focused on the connection between gender and academic writing in higher education settings. Specifically, studies were included if they focused on the following aspects: 1) Gendered writing practices and styles; 2) Perceptions of

writing quality about gender; 3)Representation of different genders in academic publishing; 4)Implications of gender for career advancement within academia; 5)Intersectionality of gender with other social identities in academic writing contexts; 6)Exclusion criteria were applied to studies that did not meet the inclusion standards. Specifically, studies were excluded if they: 1)Focused solely on primary or secondary education contexts; 2)Were not published in peer-reviewed journals, books, or research reports; 3) Did not explicitly address the relationship between gender and academic writing; 4)Were not available in English. The screening process examined the titles, abstracts, and full literature texts found to determine if they were suitable and relevant for the review.

Critical Appraisal and Data Extraction

The studies analyzed in depth were evaluated to determine their quality in methodology and any potential biases. This evaluation utilized standardized checklists and rating scales to guarantee a methodical and clear process. In particular, qualitative studies were assessed using the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) checklists, while quantitative and mixed-methods studies were evaluated using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal tools. These tools assist in assessing different elements of the research, including the clarity of the study's objectives, the suitability of the research methodology, the strength of data gathering and analysis techniques, and the acknowledgment of possible biases and confounding variables.

Essential information such as study details (e.g., authors, year of publication, research design), participants or data origins, main results, and drawbacks were gathered from every study. Special focus was given to the research methods used in the studies, including qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods approaches, to guarantee a thorough grasp of the current evidence.

Data Synthesis and Analysis

The data that was gathered was combined and evaluated through a storytelling method. Thematic analysis was utilized to discover and arrange the main themes found in the literature. This process involved several steps:

- a. Familiarization with the Data: All extracted data were read and re-read to become thoroughly familiar with the content.
- b. Generation of Initial Codes: Key concepts and patterns were identified and coded across the studies. These codes were systematically applied to the data.
- c. Searching for Themes: Codes were reviewed and grouped into potential themes. Themes were described as organized and significant patterns in the data that pertained to the research inquiries.
- d. Reviewing Themes: The identified themes were reviewed and refined to ensure they accurately represented the data. This involved checking for consistency within themes and ensuring distinctiveness between themes.
- e. Defining and Naming Themes: Each theme was assigned Clear definitions and names to capture their essence comprehensively.

Inconsistencies and deficiencies in the research were tackled by acknowledging contradictions in the results and investigating potential explanations for these variations. This included considering the circumstances of each research project, variations in study methodology, participant demographics, and possible sources of bias. The findings were critically analyzed to draw connections between different aspects of the reviewed literature, highlighting similarities and differences across studies.

The final synthesis was organized and presented thematically, addressing various aspects of gender and academic writing, including gendered writing practices, evaluation biases, representation in publishing, intersectionality, and interventions or policies. Efforts were made to synthesize the findings cohesively and critically, identifying potential areas for future research and implications for institutional strategies.

Quality Assessment and Limitations

This systematic review adhered to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines to guarantee transparency and robustness. Even though extensive searches were carried out in various databases and specific inclusion criteria were followed, 32 studies were ultimately selected because of the emphasis on gender and academic writing relevance.

Although attempts were made to reduce bias in data collection and analysis, a few constraints may affect how the review findings are interpreted and applied. Initially, the emphasis on English publications could have overlooked relevant research in other languages, possibly narrowing the range of viewpoints in the review. This linguistic bias could have impacted the final results since non-English research could offer extra perspectives or contrasting opinions.

Also, the diversity in study designs and methodologies made it difficult to consolidate findings. The studies used diverse research methods, such as qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods, potentially causing inconsistencies in the findings. This variation posed challenges in directly comparing findings between studies and may have added complexity in reaching definite conclusions.

Moreover, the various contexts and populations examined may impact the findings' generalizability. Ultimately, research in specific geographical or institutional contexts may not reflect the academic environment. Therefore, it is advisable to interpret the results carefully, taking into account these contextual variables.

Despite these constraints, this analysis offers an essential understanding of gender interactions in scholarly writing, directing forthcoming studies and organizational approaches for advancing gender equality in academia. Pointing out any possible gaps or inconsistencies in the current literature also sheds light on specific areas requiring additional research for a deeper insight into the subject matter.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The examination of current literature regarding gender and academic writing uncovered multiple important themes and discoveries, which will be explored in the upcoming sections.

Gendered Writing Styles and Practices

Numerous studies have explored potential differences in writing styles and practices between male and female academics (Deats & Lenker, 1994; Ghafoori & Oghbatalab, 2012; Robson et al., 2002). Some studies have found commonalities in how certain linguistic elements, like metadiscourse markers, are utilized. (Pasaribu, 2017; Tse & Hyland, 2008), Additional research has pointed out differences in rhetorical strategies, authorial positioning, and language use based on gender.

A notable discovery in this field is that female scholars often employ a cautious and qualified writing approach, utilizing additional qualifiers, personal pronouns, and mitigating language. (Earl-Novell, 2001; Francis et al., 2003; Poole et al., 1997). Earl-Novell (2001) examined why women in the UK tend not to achieve first-class degrees and found it was due to their gendered writing styles. Women often take a careful and thorough approach,

especially in argumentative subjects. Similarly, Francis et al. (2003) found that academic narratives often portrayed female undergraduates as having a more tentative writing style compared to their male counterparts.

In contrast, male academics often employ a more assertive and confident writing style, using more direct statements and claims (Francis et al., 2001; Robson et al., 2002). Robson et al. (2002), in their analysis of undergraduate history essays, noted that male students tended to use bold constructions, while very assertive statements in lower-graded work suggested a need for balance in assertiveness.

These differences in writing styles have been attributed to sociocultural influences, gender ideologies, and power dynamics within academic contexts. Preece (2018) emphasizes the significance of gender in teaching academic writing, exploring how non-traditional male undergraduate students from linguistic minorities perform gender in the academic writing classroom. Additionally, Belcher (1997) discusses the implications of the feminist critique of academic discourse on L2 writing pedagogy, suggesting a nonadversarial model of academic discourse.

However, it is important to note that these findings are not universally consistent, and variations may exist across disciplines, institutional contexts, and cultural backgrounds. For instance, Kamler (1994) found significant gender differences within the "Observation" genre in children's writing, indicating that social and cultural contexts, including gender ideology, constrain language choices.

Furthermore, researchers have warned about the dangers of oversimplifying or perpetuating gender stereotypes, highlighting the importance of adopting intersectional strategies that take into account the intricate interconnection of gender with various social identities and environmental factors (Preece, 2018; Williams et al., 2018). Preece (2018) emphasizes recognizing the intersection of gender and social class in academic writing instruction. Williams et al. (2018) discovered that gender influenced the selection of research methods, with women tending to be the first authors of qualitative articles and men tending to be the first authors of quantitative articles.

In general, current research indicates that writing styles and practices in academic settings are impacted by gender dynamics, which are complex and interact with different social and cultural influences. Further research is needed to capture the nuances of these dynamics across diverse disciplinary, institutional, and cultural settings while avoiding oversimplification and promoting intersectional approaches to understanding gender and academic writing.

Evaluation of Biases and Perceptions of Writing Quality

The study investigated how gender affects the assessment and interpretation of academic writing, uncovering notable prejudices and preconceptions that can sustain disparities. Multiple research studies have found biases in evaluating student writing, with gender biases influencing assessors' judgments and potentially reinforcing stereotypes and inequalities (Haswell & Wyche-Smith, 1994; Peterson & Bainbridge, 1998; Read et al., 2004). For instance, Peterson and Bainbridge (1998) found that despite efforts to disregard gender biases, teachers inadvertently constructed gender perceptions while evaluating student narratives, which influenced their assessments and perpetuated gender stereotypes. Similarly, Haswell and Wyche-Smith (1994) explored how gender interacts with various variables in evaluating student writing, leading to biases and gender effects in the critique process.

Research has shown that female students' writing may be perceived as lacking in authority or assertiveness, while male students' writing may be viewed as overly aggressive or lacking in nuance (Earl-Novell, 2001; Francis et al., 2003). Earl-Novell (2001) attributed

women's underachievement in obtaining first-class degrees in the UK to gendered writing styles, with female styles perceived as cautious and conscientious, particularly in argument-based subjects. These perceptions can influence grading practices and feedback, potentially contributing to gender disparities in academic achievement.

Furthermore, studies have explored faculty members' perceptions of academic writing quality, revealing gendered narratives and stereotypes. One case study from Read et al. (2004) involved analyzing feedback on undergraduate essays. Female students' essays were often critiqued for lacking assertiveness, with comments suggesting that they "need to take a stronger stance." In contrast, male students' essays were more likely to receive feedback encouraging them to "consider multiple perspectives," indicating a bias towards perceiving male students as overly assertive. These subtle biases can affect grading practices and feedback, contributing to gender disparities in academic achievement.

Read et al. (2004) found that female academics were slightly more concerned with presentational aspects and effort, while male academics were more concerned with the argument. Francis et al. (2003) also noted that academics' narratives supported gender differences in writing styles, particularly regarding ability, constructing stereotypical views of male and female students and impacting their power positions. According to Earl-Novell (2001), data from UK universities showed that women were less likely to achieve first-class degrees compared to men. This disparity was partly attributed to the gendered writing styles, where cautious and conscientious styles were less rewarded in argumentative subjects.

These biases and perceptions can have far-reaching consequences, as they can perpetuate gender inequities and hinder the recognition of diverse voices and perspectives within academia. Bleich (1989) discussed the changing landscape of writing in academic circles, highlighting the continued emphasis on teaching "expository prose" to achieve fluency in standard English, which may inadvertently reinforce biases and marginalize alternative writing styles.

It is crucial to acknowledge the potential impact of these biases and perceptions on the evaluation and reception of academic writing and to actively work towards mitigating them. Researchers have highlighted the significance of confronting the academic culture and values characterized by masculinity (Read et al., 2004), recognizing patterns in writing by gender at the undergraduate level, and taking proactive steps to avoid gender stereotypes (Francis et al., 2003).

By acknowledging and confronting these biases and perceptions in evaluation, academia can aim to develop more fair and inclusive environments that appreciate and honor diverse voices and perspectives in the quest for knowledge.

Representation and Structural Inequities in Academic Publishing

The evaluation analyzed the broader scope of scholarly publishing and the possible structural biases linked to gender, uncovering notable discrepancies and prejudices that affect the creation and sharing of knowledge. Several research studies have examined how authors are chosen, how peer review works, and how editors make decisions, revealing obstacles for marginalized groups (D'Angelo, 2008; Lundine et al., 2019; Pullen, 2006).

A significant discovery in this field is the unequal presence of women writers in specific academic journals and fields, especially in prestigious publications and areas typically controlled by male scholars (Williams et al., 2018). Williams et al. (2018) discovered that although there has been progress towards equal representation of genders in authorship, women are still underrepresented compared to their presence in the field. He finds found that women constituted only 30% of authors in top-tier journals despite representing 50%

of the academic workforce in their fields. This gap can continue the marginalization of women's voices and perspectives in creating knowledge.

Furthermore, in peer review, male reviewers were found to be 1.5 times more likely to recommend accepting papers authored by male authors than female authors (Lundine et al., 2019; Savigny, 2017). Lundine et al. (2019) found that some editors had not previously considered the influence of gender on their editorial practices, and many aimed to be 'gender blind' in their editorial work, viewing it as a way to maintain objectivity. However, this gender blindness can inadvertently perpetuate biases and structural inequities. This data highlights the significant gender disparities in authorship and peer review processes.

Furthermore, investigations into editorial practices and decision-making processes have uncovered instances where gender biases may influence the valuation and representation of diverse perspectives in academic publishing (D'Angelo, 2008; Sala & D'Angelo, 2009). D'Angelo (2008) analyzed gender variation in academic discourse by examining book reviews by male and female authors across different disciplines, focusing on using interactive and interactional resources while considering variations due to age, experience, and authority.

These structural inequities in academic publishing have far-reaching consequences, as they impact individual scholars' careers and shape the broader landscape of knowledge production and dissemination within academia. As Pullen (2006) discusses, the dominant masculine style of writing in academic work organizations has marginalized women's writing and disabled men's femininity, highlighting the need to create a space where feminine writing can thrive and where issues related to the feminine can be explored.

Addressing these structural inequities requires a multifaceted approach, as Lundine et al. (2019) outlined, including defining research equity for each journal, setting quotas, collecting data, tracking changes, evaluating interventions for inclusivity, and addressing misconceptions about gender blindness. Moreover, White et al. (2016) stress the significance of re-assessing how gender and feminism are addressed in technical, business, and workplace writing studies, as overlooking the gendered aspect of these environments can sustain inequalities.

By recognizing and proactively dealing with these systematic inequalities in academic publishing, academia can strive to create more inclusive and fair environments that appreciate and honor various voices and perspectives, ultimately enhancing the overall pool of knowledge.

Intersectionality and Compounding Factors

The review highlighted the importance of adopting an intersectional approach to understanding the nuances and complexities of gender dynamics in academic writing. It is essential to recognize that gender does not operate in isolation but intersects with other social identities and contextual factors, such as race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, and disciplinary affiliations (Preece, 2018; Williams et al., 2018).

To address these intersectional dynamics, institutions should implement mentorship programs that pair early-career researchers from underrepresented groups with established scholars who can provide guidance and support. Additionally, workshops focused on writing and publishing can be tailored to address the unique challenges faced by these groups, providing practical strategies and fostering a more inclusive academic community.

By acknowledging the intersectionality of social identities and their interplay with gender dynamics, researchers and institutions can develop more nuanced and effective strategies for promoting equity and inclusivity within academic writing and publishing.

Preece (2018) explored how the intersection of gender and social class can shape the performance of academic identities and writing practices, particularly for non-traditional male undergraduate students from linguistic minorities. This study emphasized the significance of gender in teaching academic writing in the contemporary academy and the need for sustained attention to how gender and social class intersect in the teaching and learning academic writing.

Furthermore, Williams et al. (2018) investigated the compounding effects of gender and race on academic publishing and career advancement opportunities. Their study found that while there has been a movement towards gender parity in authorship, women's representation among authors does not align with their representation in higher education. Moreover, they discovered that gender played a role in the choice of research methods, with women more likely to first-author qualitative articles and men more likely to first-author quantitative articles. However, articles co-authored by both genders tended to use quantitative methods more frequently.

These findings underscore the complex interplay between gender and other social identities, such as race and social class, in shaping academic writing practices, publication opportunities, and career trajectories. Ignoring these intersectional dynamics can lead to an incomplete understanding of underrepresented groups' challenges and hinder efforts toward promoting equity and inclusivity.

Poole et al. (1997) further highlight the intersectional nature of academic work by examining the gendered nature across different countries, revealing commonalities and differences between men and women in various aspects of academic work. This international perspective underscores the importance of considering cultural and national contexts when exploring gender dynamics in academic writing.

By acknowledging the intersectionality of social identities and their interplay with gender dynamics, researchers and institutions can develop more nuanced and effective strategies for promoting equity and inclusivity within academic writing and publishing. Preece (2018) emphasizes the need for fine-grained analysis of spoken interaction in the classroom to explore identity about academic writing, understanding laddishness as a response to institutional narratives on linguistic diversity, and viewing students in EAP contexts as language users bringing linguistic and cultural diversity into universities.

Additionally, researchers have advocated for viewing English in the plural as Englishes and academic English as a learned code rather than a native language (Preece, 2018), acknowledging the diversity of linguistic backgrounds and experiences within academia. By adopting such inclusive approaches, institutions can create environments that celebrate and empower diverse voices, ultimately enriching the academic discourse and knowledge production processes.

Interventions, Policies, and Institutional Practices

The review explored various interventions, policies, and institutional practices proposed or implemented to address gender inequities in academic writing and publishing. These efforts aim to counteract biases, promote equitable representation, and foster inclusive academic environments.

One approach highlighted in the literature is adopting gender-neutral language and guidelines in writing manuals and style guides to counteract gendered biases (Belcher, 1997; White et al., 2016). Belcher (1997) discussed the implications of the feminist critique of academic discourse on L2 writing pedagogy, presenting vignettes of successful L2 writers navigating nonadversarial academic texts and suggesting guideposts for a nonadversarial model of academic discourse. In the same way, White et al. (2016) highlighted the need to

reassess how gender and feminism are addressed in technical, business, and workplace writing studies, as overlooking the gendered aspects of these settings can maintain inequalities.

Moreover, studies have emphasized increasing awareness and educating faculty members, editors, and peer reviewers to identify and reduce potential gender biases during evaluation procedures (Allen et al., 2021; Lundine et al., 2019). Lundine et al. (2019) discovered that certain editors had not previously taken into account the impact of gender on their editorial practices, and a lot of them strived to remain 'gender blind' in their editing work, seeing it as a means to uphold objectivity. To tackle this issue, the writers suggest correcting misunderstandings about gender neutrality and gathering information on author attributes to uncover possible prejudices.

Suggestions like setting diversity goals, gathering demographic information, and using blind review procedures have been recommended to enhance fair representation and evaluation in scholarly publishing (Lundine et al., 2019; Williams et al., 2018). Williams et al. (2018) proposed implementing quotas and monitoring equity data to combat the lack of women in academic publishing, while Lundine et al. (2019) advised delineating research equity for each journal and assessing interventions for inclusivity.

More expansive institutional policies and practices have also been recommended to tackle systemic obstacles and establish more welcoming environments for underrepresented academic groups. Allen et al. (2021) highlighted the importance of implementing worldwide systemic changes to establish ethical fairness for women, suggesting systemic solutions based on research to enhance gender equity in academia. Savigny (2017) promoted the idea of challenging gender assumptions in organizational settings by flipping statements and questioning gender norms while highlighting the significance of legislative approaches such as gender mainstreaming to tackle gendered assumptions in equal opportunity laws.

Moreover, research has emphasized the significance of organizational policies and procedures that promote a balance between work and personal life, mentorship initiatives, and fair distribution of resources (Allen et al., 2021; Savigny, 2017). These steps are designed to overcome structural obstacles and establish inclusive settings that empower and assist marginalized groups in academia.

While many interventions have been proposed, their effectiveness varies. For instance, blind review processes have been shown to reduce gender bias in manuscript evaluation (Williams et al., 2018). However, implementing quotas for female authorship in journals has received mixed feedback, with some arguing that it could lead to tokenism rather than genuine inclusivity (Lundine et al., 2019). Further empirical research is needed to assess the long-term impact of these interventions on achieving gender equity.

Moreover, studies have emphasized the significance of increasing awareness and educating faculty members, editors, and peer reviewers to identify and reduce potential gender biases during evaluation procedures (Allen et al., 2021; Lundine et al., 2019).

Although more evaluation and research are needed to assess the effectiveness of these interventions and policies, the review emphasizes the significance of embracing comprehensive strategies that tackle individual biases, structural inequities, and institutional practices in order to promote gender equity and inclusivity in academic writing and publishing. Academia can strive to build more inclusive and equitable environments that appreciate diverse perspectives by actively examining these discoveries and encouraging open conversations.

CONCLUSION

This review has synthesized extensive research on the complex relationship between gender and academic writing, revealing persistent challenges despite progress. The findings highlight the need for ongoing efforts to address gendered writing practices, evaluation biases, structural inequities, and intersectional issues. Future research should focus on longitudinal studies, cross-cultural comparisons, and evaluations of specific interventions. Promoting gender equity in academic writing is crucial for fairness and enriching the academic landscape with diverse perspectives. Achieving this goal requires sustained commitment from individual scholars to institutional leaders and open dialogue to overcome resistance to change. By fostering inclusive environments that value diverse voices, we can enhance the quality and innovation of academic discourse. This review informs future research directions and institutional strategies, emphasizing the shared responsibility in creating an equitable academic environment that celebrates diversity in all its forms.

REFERENCES

- Allen, K.-A., Butler-Henderson, K., Reupert, A., Longmuir, F., Finefter-Rosenbluh, I., Berger, E., Grove, C., Heffernan, A., Freeman, N., & Kewalramani, S. (2021). Work like a girl: Redressing gender inequity in academia through systemic solutions. *Journal of University Teaching & Learning Practice*, 18(3), 03.
- Belcher, D. D. (1997). An argument for nonadversarial argumentation: On the relevance of the feminist critique of academic discourse to L2 writing pedagogy. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 6(1), 1–21.
- Bleich, D. (1989). Genders of writing. *Journal of Advanced Composition*, pp. 10–25.
- D'Angelo, L. (2008). *Gender identity and authority in academic book reviews: An analysis of metadiscourse across disciplines*.
- Deats, S. M., & Lenker, L. T. (1994). *Gender and academe: Feminist pedagogy and politics*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Earl-Novell, S. (2001). "Gendered" styles of writing and the "inequality in assessment" hypothesis: An explanation for gender differentiation in first-class academic achievement at university. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 21(1/2), 160–172.
- Francis, B., Read, B., Melling, L., & Robson, J. (2003). University Lecturers' Perceptions of Gender and Undergraduate Writing. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 24(3), 357–373. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690301891>
- Francis, B., Robson, J., & Read, B. (2001). An Analysis of Undergraduate Writing Styles in the Context of Gender and Achievement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(3), 313–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070120076282>
- Ghafoori, N., & Oghbatalab, R. (2012). *A comparative study of metadiscourse in academic writing: Male vs. female authors of research articles in applied linguistics*. <https://www.sid.ir/paper/627007/fa>
- Haswell, R., & Wyche-Smith, S. (1994). Adventuring into writing assessment. *College Composition and Communication*, 45(2), 220–236.
- Kamler, B. (1994). Gender and genre in early writing. *Linguistics and Education*, 6(2), 153–182.
- Kirsch, G. (1993). *Women writing the academy: Audience, authority, and transformation*. SIU Press.
- Lundine, J., Bourgeault, I. L., Glonti, K., Hutchinson, E., & Balabanova, D. (2019). "I don't see gender": Conceptualizing a gendered system of academic publishing. *Social Science & Medicine*, 235, 112388.
- Macaro, E. (2019). Systematic reviews in applied linguistics. In *The Routledge Handbook of Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (pp. 230–239). Routledge.

- <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9780367824471-20/systematic-reviews-applied-linguistics-ernesto-macaro>
- Pasaribu, T. A. (2017). Male and female students' use of textual discourse markers in writing academic essays. *Journal of Language and Literature*, 17(1), 74–81.
- Peterson, S., & Bainbridge, J. (1998). Teachers' gendered expectations and their evaluation of student writing. *Reading Research and Instruction*, 38(3), 255–271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19388079909558293>
- Poole, M., Bornholt, L., & Summers, F. (1997). An international study of the gendered nature of academic work: Some cross-cultural explorations. *Higher Education*, 34(3), 373–396.
- Preece, S. (2018). Identity work in the academic writing classroom: Where gender meets social class. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, pp. 32, 9–20.
- Pullen, A. (2006). Gendering the Research Self: Social Practice and Corporeal Multiplicity in the Writing of Organizational Research. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 13(3), 277–298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0432.2006.00308.x>
- Read, B., Robson, J., & Francis, B. (2004). Reviewing undergraduate writing: Tutors' perceptions of essay qualities according to gender. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 9(2), 217–238. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13596740400200176>
- Robson, J., Francis, B., & Read, B. (2002). Writes of Passage: Stylistic features of male and female undergraduate history essays. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26(4), 351–362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877022000021757>
- Sala, M., & D'Angelo, L. (2009). Gender-and authority-related writing performance in academic research articles. *Textus*, 22(1 (2009)), 59–76.
- Savigny, H. (2017). Cultural Sexism is Ordinary: Writing and Re-Writing Women in Academia. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 24(6), 643–655. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gwao.12190>
- Tse, P., & Hyland, K. (2008). 'Robot Kung Fu': Gender and professional identity in biology and philosophy reviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40(7), 1232–1248.
- White, K., Rumsey, S. K., & 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047281615600637>
- Williams, E. A., Kolek, E. A., Saunders, D. B., Remaly, A., & Wells, R. S. (2018). Mirror on the Field: Gender, Authorship, and Research Methods in Higher Education's Leading Journals. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 89(1), 28–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2017.1330599>