

**NZ Pay and Employment Equity for Women Conference  
28<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> June, Wellington**

**Glass Ceiling Stream**

**Almost there:  
a comparative case study of senior academic women in  
Australia and New Zealand**

Dr Jenny Neale  
Deputy Dean  
Humanities and Social Sciences  
Victoria University (Wellington)  
New Zealand

Dr Kate White  
Senior Project Officer  
Senior Management Group  
Victoria University, Melbourne  
Australia

**ABSTRACT**

*This paper examines how organisational culture interacts with the policy framework within which career progression is structured for academics in an Australian and a New Zealand University. It explores the effects this has for women at Associate Professor/Reader level in attempting to promote their careers. Women at this level generally need to demonstrate both research excellence and international recognition of it. Yet these women often considered their research was undervalued and found it difficult to set aside time in order to maintain research productivity. Moreover, they encountered a disjuncture between formal and informal processes around promotion that discriminates against senior academic women. Their experiences suggest that the glass ceiling operated subtly even in senior academia.*

*The issues these women needed to address in order to improve career outcomes are examined. These include: managing their academic careers; balancing research, teaching administration, pastoral care and community engagement; and seeking to navigate career progression in a predominantly masculine management culture.*

*As Helen Kelly indicated (AUS Status of Women Conference 2003), gender linked expectations around the sorts of roles taken both inside and outside the workplac, influence opportunities and pay. The paper argues that if academic women at Associate Professor/Reader level are to experience rewarding careers, the organisational culture of the university needs be reviewed. Ensuring that there is a match between the expectations of the role that women in these senior positions play and a rewards structure that tangibly values other forms of service as well as research excellence is essential.*

## 1. Introduction

Universities are not gender neutral when it comes to employing and promoting women staff. There are fewer women academics, they tend to be clustered at the lower levels of the lecturer scale, more are in contract and part-time positions and there is a pay equity issue with women earning less on average than their male peers. As Groombridge (2004 quoted in *Education Review*) asserts, "female academics ... are stranded ... in the 'ivory basement'". The situation is not improving significantly despite numerous initiatives over the past ten years or more. There appears to be discrimination in relation to the level of appointment (women being appointed at lower levels on the scale), promotion (women not applying as often as men or what they do being undervalued) and the organisational culture. The university culture is one based on a traditional model where equity initiatives are required to facilitate equality of outcome for staff. This paper examines how women at Associate Professor/Reader level in an Australian and a New Zealand university attempt to promote their careers in an environment where they are receiving contradictory messages from their organisation.

It is argued that there is an accepted and continuing perception of a standard model of what an academic career entails which is not gender neutral but defined in male terms and based on inbuilt formal and informal patriarchal support systems that benefit men (Bagilhole and Goode 2001). They do not have to make a conscious effort to be helped by it, whereas women are not admitted to this support system and are seen as weak if they set up their own system. Brooks (2001) argues that since leadership is associated with white heterosexual males, as the production and management of knowledge has traditionally been dominated by men, the male is taken as norm. The consequence is that men are perceived to fit the requirements of bureaucratic organisations more than women, which ultimately leaves women to be defined by lack and 'other-ness', as the work they do is ultimately measured against a male standard (Morley 1994; Harris, Thiele et al. 1998; Lewis and Copeland 1998). When competency frameworks are constructed from samples of a particular (male) leadership population, the frameworks produced by such a process are subject to the limitations of gender bias (Joyner and Preston 1998).

In Australia the number of women academics increased slightly between 1998 and 2003. In 1998 women comprised 50.9% of Level A academics (2003 53.2%), 41.9% of Level B (46.4%), 26.5 % Level C (33.6%), and 14.4% Level D&E (19.1%): The number of female academic staff was 35,867 in 2003, representing 42.5% of all academic staff in Australia. There is also a disparity between the actual numbers and the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) women academics. This indicates that at levels A and B (the entry levels) there are a sizable number of women academics who work less than full-time (See also Probert et.al. 1998:62). While there has been an increase in the number of women at senior lecturer and professorial level, women's representation in the professoriate remains unacceptably low. However, it is higher than in several European countries (O'Connor 2000:1-2; Leonard 1998:8) and in the United States where Glazer Raymo (1999:63) asserts: "gender-related percentages of tenured senior faculty have not changed significantly in the past decade".

The New Zealand University system is based largely on the British one, although it is increasingly being influenced by US practice. The origins have importance in terms of career structure. The Chief Executives of all Universities are the Vice-Chancellors. The standard academic staff hierarchy is that of lecturer, senior lecturer,

reader/associate professor, professor as in the UK, with only 11% of permanent academic staff nationally being full professors. In 2001 the seven universities employed 17,282 full-time and part-time staff of whom 53% were women. Academic staff represented 6963 of this total and 37.7% of these were women. At the senior management level there were 187 employees but only 43, or 23%, were women (Ministry of Education). Over the previous five years the percentage of women employees increased by 5% and women academics by 8%. The percentage of women executive staff has doubled over that period. In 2002 Massey University appointed New Zealand's first woman Vice-Chancellor lagging behind Australia who currently has 10 women (of 38) Vice-Chancellors.

## 2. The Policy Framework

It is important to examine the policy frameworks within which career progression is structured for academics in the Australian and New Zealand Universities. These provide a context for the gender linked expectations around the sorts of roles both inside and outside the workplace and how these influence career opportunities and pay.

### *The Australian experience*

Changes in the management of Australian Universities have impacted on the ability of women academics to promote their careers. They particularly impact on women seeking to be promoted to senior positions. One outcome is that women academics often do not receive the pay and career opportunities commensurate with their skills and experience.

It has been demonstrated in Australian universities that there is a substantial gap between earnings of men and women (Probert et.al. 1998). In a broader Australian context, a recent study found that an estimated gap of 15.3 per cent between the Australia-wide average for non-managerial women's and men's average weekly total ordinary full time earnings was "due entirely to the fact that women are segmented into lower job levels than are men and thus are simply paid less". It also found that women comprised 23.5% of managerial jobs in Australia, which exacerbated gaps in earnings. (Doughney 2003: 47-8).

A factor in the differential financial parity in Australian universities has been the increasing practice of negotiating individual salary packages. In 1999-2000 the Australian Federal Government awarded universities extra funding if their administrators could include individual workplace agreements in their Enterprise Bargaining agreements, even though academic unions opposed these (Currie et.al. 2002:39).

Research in Australia is funded through a range of schemes comprising block and competitive grants. It is understood that the Federal Minister for Education favours a U.K. style research assessment exercise similar to that which has been adopted by New Zealand, as discussed below (*The Australian*, 31 March, 12 May 2004).

The present framework has had implications for women academics who often have greater domestic responsibilities. As Currie et.al. (2002:39) explain:

To compete for higher salaries, women are being asked to get tougher, be more productive, and become more competitive in attracting grants. There is a lack of

recognition that women do not have the same material conditions and freedom as men.

Probert et.al. (1998:62) found that the main constraint on Australian women academics was family responsibilities, which directly impacted on income for women "because they are more likely to have to reduce their hours of work or delay the start of their careers". They also found that women start at a lower level of appointment and are significantly less likely than men to have a PhD. They argued that women's concentration in the lower levels of academic classification also explains their lower ratio of continuing employment. They found that academics in contract position were more likely to be at level A (below lecturer) than level B (lecturer) and, in "sandstone" universities, more likely to be female (1998:46, 62). Nevertheless, Probert et.al. found that "all things being equal" women and men were likely to be at similar levels.

The nature of distribution of work within academic departments is also a constraint on the career aspirations of senior academic women. Ellis-Newman (2001) reported that Australian academic women in her study performing higher level duties experienced discrimination; they were not paid higher duties allowances whereas men at comparable levels were. Moreover, Ellis-Newman found that some women were pressured into taking on higher duties than those prescribed in the position classification standards for their level. They were afraid to complain because male colleagues would question their commitment to the job and this would negatively impact on their chances of promotion.

### *The New Zealand experience*

In New Zealand there has been direct government intervention to link funding to academic research performance. The way in which the tertiary sector is funded is changing with the implementation of a Performance Based Research Fund (PBRF) similar to the British Research Assessment Exercise (RAE). This is replacing the research 'top-up' component of the government funding currently based on equivalent full time students (EFTs) with the amount of top-up varying according to level and type of qualification. All eligible staff in the tertiary sector are required to submit an evidence – based portfolio (EP) to the Tertiary Education Commission (TEC). Of particular concern is whether the effects of the PBRF will impact differentially on some groups in academe and, in this instance, whether women will be disadvantaged.

Literature from countries with such a system in place indicates that this may be the case. Jackson (2002:24-25) suggests that women are less likely to have work submitted to the (RAE). The Higher Education Funding Council in Britain did not provide a gender breakdown of submissions to the last RAE so Halvorsen (2002) used other data for her analysis. The results were equivocal but showed that the cost centres with the highest proportion of women also had the lowest aggregated RAE scores. While there is no overall correlation between the proportion of women in a subject area and its RAE rating, "[h]igh scores across a discipline are more likely to be achieved when there is a high proportion of professors within that discipline" (ibid 355). The requirement for a track record in such research assessment exercises has differential outcomes for women who are more often on short-term contracts or take career breaks. They also have lower seniority and thus lower research status (Bagilhole 2002). Moreover, only since 2001 have maternity leave or other career breaks, part-time work, and absences because of illness been taken into account in the RAE. Jackson (2002:24-25) notes that there still needs to be more information on what "taken into account" means. However, the impact of career breaks is evident

in the “under-representation of women [in the RAE] ... in the age ranges 35 to 54 ... across the overwhelming majority of grades in all institutions and ... across all main subject areas” (Ledgerton 2004).

There has been much discussion about the role of women as academics and how their multitude of roles impacts on research and career paths. In New Zealand, research indicated that 41% of men thought universities discriminated against academic women and that 35% of women said they encountered discrimination (Brooks 1997). One measure was that women were paid less than men working at the same level in the same profession (Morley 1994). This barrier is well documented, for example by Chalmers (1998), Probert (1999) and Probert and Ewer et al (1998). The latter assert that the imbalance in pay can mainly be attributed to the distinctive way women balance work and family life, i.e. they are more likely to work part time, and take career breaks due to family responsibilities. Women considered that they had little choice regarding these issues.

The framework for career progression is therefore not gender neutral. The focus on rewards for research and winning competitive grants assumes a level playing field in academia. But for many women this is a myth. Gendered linked expectations of roles influence opportunities and pay for women academics. The outcome is a gap in earnings for academic women in Australia and New Zealand. This is mirrored by the UK experience where it is estimated that women in academia earn 81.6 p for every pound that their male colleagues earn, with little improvement in this rate in the last ten years (*The Guardian*, 13<sup>th</sup> May 2003).

The following case studies of women at Associate Professor/Reader level in Australia and New Zealand highlight the challenges to break free of these gendered linked expectations and to receive remuneration that adequately reflects the job they do.

### **3. The Case Studies**

At the newer Australian University in this case study only one of the sixteen women in the professoriate was a full professor at that time. Open-ended interviews were conducted with fifteen of these women. Their profiles fell roughly into three groups.

The *first* group had more diverse pathways into academia, did not have PhDs but were studying for a PhD or Professional Doctorate, did not plan an academic career, had children and career interruptions, were in the social sciences, had fewer publications and local as opposed to cosmopolitan reference groups (Inglis 1999:2). The *second* group had PhDs, had not planned academic careers, and designed their careers and research around family commitments. The *third* group did not have career breaks, had been promoted more quickly than those in group one, had substantial publications, were more likely to have cosmopolitan reference groups – some making the strategic choice of external rather than internal research collaborations, all but one did not have children, and were more focused on promotion but also more frustrated at the barriers they experienced in the management culture of the University. Most of the women had been at the university for some years and had been promoted through the ranks.

The distinctions between the first and third groups revolve around children and lack of them. A recent US study has found that women’s chances of academic tenure are greatly reduced if they have children. Only 44% of all tenured women in the study were married and had children within 12 years of earning their PhDs, whereas 70%

of tenured men married and became fathers during that period (*The Australian*, 10 March 2004).

In the New Zealand case study women made up just over a fifth of the Associate Professors, whereas in 1975 they were 6% and in 1990 just over 10%. The research involved a questionnaire sent to the 15 women Associate Professors as an email attachment. The questionnaire, formatted for qualitative in-depth answers, could be filled out electronically and then downloaded and returned through the university internal mail system. This method was chosen to provide anonymity for those responding. However, most of the women identified themselves in the completed questionnaire.

Nine of these women were promoted to the rank of Associate Professor while the other six were appointed to positions at that level. One of this latter group had been promoted to the rank of Associate Professor at her former university, "because of excellence in teaching though research was important". While some of the women had been part of academe for more than 30 years – having what could be described as a fairly traditional career path, others had become academics in the past 10 years after successful professional careers in the public or private sector. Two women were in their first year as Associate Professor in 2003, while one woman had been an Associate Professor since 1995.

#### **4. Disjuncture between formal and informal processes around promotion**

The paper examines the formal and informal promotion processes in Australian and New Zealand universities because these often determine the pay and career opportunities for academics seeking to advance their careers. A survey of selected Australian Universities indicated that they generally seek to locate their promotions policy within EEO and Affirmative Action legislation, principles of merit, and fostering career development for academic staff (White 2003b). Generally, there are three broad criteria for promotion: teaching, research and scholarship, and service. The weighting given to each of these criteria differs according to the level of promotion. For promotion to Associate Professor/Reader and Professor there is stronger weighting to excellence in research.

While some Universities in Australia have attempted to measure excellence in teaching, the process of academic promotion, in particular the criteria for promotion, is often not understood by sections of the academic community. There is a general perception in the academic community that the only criterion for promotion, particularly at senior levels, is excellence in research and generating research funding, thus research productivity is the discriminator in promotion (Drennan and Beck 2000: 5). There is perhaps also a perception that the weightings given to various categories within each main criterion are often interpreted arbitrarily.

The New Zealand University in this case study also sets strict criteria for promotion to Associate Professor/Reader which emphasises a high level of research excellence and international recognition of the research. However, the university can "in a very small number of cases" advertise a position of Associate Professor/Reader on a limited-term contract "to make it possible to appoint persons with appropriate scholarly achievement to positions which involve a high degree of managerial or administrative responsibility, even though they do not meet the exacting research requirements for promotion".

### *Informal processes – merit v patronage*

Burton argues that the way in which universities are constructed and academics are rewarded discriminates against women. She asserts that women in Australian universities:

are more likely than men to argue that prevailing interpretations of merit, and the relative value placed on staff contributions to the attainment of universities' mission goals are not gender neutral, and disadvantage women overall (1997:xi).

This alludes to the informal processes that surround promotion which are often juxtaposed to the formal processes. Women academics, as discussed above, consider that they will be eligible for promotion based on the merit of their teaching and research. But other factors come into play, as Wyn (1997:110) explains:

the notion of merit, a 'gateway' to promotion, may be constructed subjectively by key people involved in the promotion process, so that the formal criteria that women depend on, such as publications, are disparaged or ignored because they are published in local journals or are not numerous. Instead, informal contacts and networks of local or overseas academics may be drawn on.

Wyn argues that women are therefore placed in a contradictory position as they tend to depend on the formal processes and procedures to achieve recognition and advancement through merit, "yet it is in the interpretation of these processes that systematic disadvantage occurs". She adds that while institutions ostensibly value individual performance and objective merit, this masks "entrenched cultural practices that are institutionalised but which are played out at the individual level on promotion committees, at staff meetings and in corridors" (Wyn:110). Where women have sought to gain promotion through merit, they often receive no validation and encouragement from male colleagues and managers. When they do finally achieve a professorship, there is often no real sense of achievement (Bagilhole 2000a:11).

Research and publishing is increasingly becoming an important measure of success and ability to gain promotion in academic careers (Morley 1995; Du Plessis 2000), along with the ability to gain research income (Bagilhole 2002). While these appear to be 'objective' measures, some women academics are of the view that promotion committees either directly or indirectly discriminate against women seeking promotion. Brooks (1997:122) found that academic women in New Zealand "felt that the experience of promotion for academic women was a different experience from that for academic men". Wilson's 1986 report indicated that female respondents were less confident than their male colleagues at the prospect of gaining promotion (quoted in Brooks 1997). Harper and Sawicka (2001) support this finding. Their research shows that it will take women two to ten years longer than men to achieve promotion. Two of the New Zealand women explained why it might take women academics longer to be promoted:

I realised years ago when filling in a feminist inspired questionnaire that I had been taken a bit less seriously as a graduate and young lecturer than I would have been if male. This was a watershed moment for me. I suddenly understood things differently and became more assertive as a result.

...part of what made me apply to be promoted to associate professor was observation of male colleagues who showed little hesitation in 'climbing the ladder'. It wasn't that I simply wanted to emulate but I didn't either want to observe with a sense of unarticulated disgruntlement.

Certainly, women in the Australian case study had mainly negative experiences of promotions processes. As one of these women explained, women at the University were more likely to seek promotion on the basis of excellence in teaching rather than research:

anyone who goes up in our university on the basis of teaching is instantly disadvantaged because it is so much harder to measure and make the case. I see it time and time again that the members of the [promotion] committee have to be reminded that we are actually not adding up the research publications for this particular candidate in quite the same way as we might do for one who has gone on 70 per cent research or whatever it might be, because there are some members of the committee who like to think in the very numeric way and they feel very comfortable looking at the publications and wondering about the status of the journals.

Park (1996:48) argues that this quantity over quality approach to assessing research publications “encourages conservative research that can be completed within a short time” and may lead academics to “compromise their personal and intellectual values”. Moreover, the system of academic referees being required to support promotion applications can be problematic for women, in a pervasive culture where their achievements may be valued and evaluated differently from those of male peers (Bagilhole 2000:2). As one New Zealand woman said, “My experience was that senior colleagues were often dismissive of ‘softer’ or ‘different’ types of research”.

Wyn (1997:110) argued that these informal processes tend to marginalize women at an individual level and can impact on their confidence to apply for promotion, or to re-apply if they have been unsuccessful in applying the first time. As she explains:

The experience of marginality by these women is understood by them as part of the functioning of institutional processes. But it is also experienced and understood as a highly *personal* process, in which particular individuals or groups of people consciously make decisions which have the effect of marginalizing women’s contribution, especially in public contexts, such as promotion committees (1997, p.110).

Bagilhole (2000a, p. 2) notes staff perceptions that Heads of Department are key figures in the production and reproduction of the “culture” of the University. Wyn also emphasises the pivotal role of Deans and Heads of Department as gatekeepers in the promotions process, and how there can be gendered dimensions to this gatekeeping. She refers to the “mentoring for failure” discussions that male colleagues offered (1997, p. 118). This is a subtle form of exclusion by men who do not wish “to treat women as equals or as serious competitors for positions of power” (Lorber, 1994, p.234).

These entrenched cultural practices become more evident to women as they seek promotion to the senior ranks of academia, usually as they move from senior lecturer to Associate Professor/Reader. For those women who have focused on excellence in teaching, cultural practices make it clear that this is not a sufficient criterion for promotion to the professorate, regardless of the formal promotion policies. In these circumstances merit becomes an elusive concept.

Feminist academics question current promotions processes and call for them to be reviewed (for example, Burton 1997, Bagilhole 2000a, Reay 2000, Park 1996). Park (1996:55), for example, questions the current emphasis on research as the only

effective criterion for promotion. Women academics need to break the conundrum of being told they are excellent teachers and spending most of their time teaching, only to find when they come to seek promotion that teaching does not count.

## 5. Achieving Balance

### 5.1 Managing academic careers

The ability to manage academic careers is often determined by lack of choices available to women even at the outset of their careers. The fact that women PhD graduates in one Australian study reported that they got less pleasure from their careers than the men surveyed (Asmar 1999: 269), may be linked back to this issue. Moreover, the study found that proportionately more women than men early in their respective careers appear to suffer from high teaching and administration loads, indicating that allocation of workloads for these women left them with fewer choices to be research active (Asmar 1999:260).

The choices that women academics make impact on the type of research that they undertake and the reference groups that they develop. Inglis found women were more likely to form local, rather than cosmopolitan, research reference groups (Inglis 1999:2). Some of the women in the Australian case study had limited choices: they had not so much been directly blocked for promotion as been blocked by lack of choice in their career path. A common theme was the ever-increasing teaching and administrative load. The diminishing time available for research meant that they had to undertake research while on annual or long service leave, rather than any designated study leave – for which they must apply and seek approval. Some women were actually advised by their Heads of Department to do research while on annual leave (see White 2002:51). Few of these women were optimistic of their chances for promotion.

One interviewee in the Australian case study described the logistical difficulties of managing an academic career:

particularly for promotion to professor from Associate Professor/Reader, it seems they very narrowly focus on research and focus on international recognition of research. It doesn't recognise other things that people have done that are leadership; there is a difference between individual achievement and capacity to provide leadership to other people.

It is the sheer volume of work. I think a lot of the volume comes from poor management and inordinate amount of time ... spent developing an undergraduate program.

I don't think I have been to work later than 7.30 a.m. ... and I don't think I have been home before 7 o'clock at night ... so when do you do your own research when you are working like that?

Women in the New Zealand study indicated that although they may wish to be promoted to full professor they considered this to be somewhat remote. As Gale (1999:290) indicated she hoped that "... once having broken through the glass ceiling we do not fall back down or are pulled back". One woman thought that she was considered a 'lightweight', a perception echoed by several women in the Australian case study. While two women saw themselves being in the same position in five years time, a couple hoped that they would be further up the academic rank. These women also expected to be able to write and research more by this stage. Several explicitly did not aspire to be Professors because they perceived the role as entailing

more administrative responsibility and less time for research and teaching which were their 'primary love'. One woman did aspire to the position of Professor if the constraints could be managed and another saw herself as either a Head of School or Dean in five years time. Others saw their careers leading elsewhere – to retirement from the university, refocusing their life and having positions outside the university where they would have more flexibility and could spend more time on research related activities or be properly recognised for their management skills.

The emphasis on being internationally known for their research varied. One woman in the New Zealand case study pointed out that she was "well known" in her discipline area and was recruited to establish what was then a new Department. On the other hand, another indicated that being an Associate Professor/Reader "would have less meaning if it was based on teaching (because of the crudeness of measures involved) or administration (which is not 'academic') even if [the emphasis on international research recognition] it delays your own promotion". The comment was also made that the weighting toward administration differed according to whether it was a promotion to Associate Professor/Reader or appointment, with the latter case considered a rationale for more of an administrative role.

Managing academic careers therefore is a challenge for many women academics. It involves making choices at the outset of their career, navigating their way through the demands of teaching, research and administration, making strategic choices about a research focus, and quarantining time for research.

## **5.2 Balancing research, teaching administration, pastoral care and community engagement**

The issue of choices and effective use of time informs any discussion on the nexus between teaching and research, especially for women academics. The most problematic aspect in the division of time is the way in which the other areas take precedence over research. However, there is a gender dimension in attempting to achieve this balance. The allocation of workloads and of specific responsibilities within job descriptions can differ for men and women in academia. There is a subtle glass ceiling operating for many women in the way their jobs are constructed and how they are rewarded.

Women Associate Professor/Readers in the New Zealand case study illustrated how they attempted to juggle their time commitments:

I would like more time for research...(but) teaching takes most of my time. Provision of programmes (and therefore teaching load) is the driver of the School's activities – possibly because it relates directly to EFTs.

Other aspects of a job can crowd out research – teaching is privileged – professional responsibilities and community service closely allied.

Teaching has always inspired research but at the same time it takes up time and energy that I need in order to follow through on research.

One woman indicated that although she would like more time for research currently her teaching load was not heavy and she therefore did not have a problem with balance. Another said that:

I only manage to achieve a balance by working far too many hours a week!! I find myself looking forward to weekends and holidays as a chance to

'catch up' with my work. Finding 'quality' time for my research is particularly difficult.

Doing administration was another imperative:

Many A.Ps are cheap labour in terms of administration and that takes up more time than any of the others. Community service drops off the end as research has to be prioritised.

Issues around general responsibility to make things work in the school – doing admin - and own work/goals are compromised.

This reference to busy work or 'administrivia', which does not have an equal weighting with research when it comes to promotion, is important. The "domestic" work of academia is a trap and increasingly women are wary about stepping into that role. Some senior women in the Australian case study said that they only advanced in their careers when they learnt to say "no".

Serving on committees to achieve the required gender balance was a further imperative. Women in the Australian case study spoke of being coerced to take up committee appointments by Heads of Departments and Deans. As one woman put it: "they only want women there to be able to tick a box that says we have got a woman".

The importance of research for continued advancement, and the rationale for being an Associate Professor/Reader, while acknowledged becomes compromised, as several women in the New Zealand case study explained:

PBRF will be a driver - but I anticipate some guilt/grief if I'm not able to attend to the things I do best – the research/teaching nexus.

I've 'downsized' my research into articles rather than extended monographs...to keep some degree of momentum in research.

Research "squeezed in" during non-teaching periods or more generally during Research and Study leave. Have loads of information waiting for time.

Research having least immediate deadlines and longest time frames gets bumped, yet can't as lies at heart of what we do. It does require hard headedness to keep research as a priority but it is what defines university teaching and keeps one alive to one's discipline.

This theme of finding time for research was echoed by one woman in the Australian case study:

I should have got more [published papers] because I had given conference papers and presented them at workshops and various other venues, they were ready to go off, but I was too busy ... to set that bit of extra time to get my work published.

The women Associate Professor/Readers in the New Zealand case study had various strategies for addressing the expectation that they would provide more pastoral care, whether they were dealing with other staff or students:

I manage this by being philosophically committed to the importance of pastoral care and in practice by attempting to engage professionally and culturally in appropriate ways. I work to sustain clear boundaries between

personal and professional and to keep the pastoral aspects appropriately contained and positioned.

This is always a huge issue for professional disciplines. It takes a lot of time but I have become more hard-nosed about it and am much more likely now to refer students and to stick to policies.

I am available for student enquiries and advice whenever I am in my office. I do not turn anyone away even if involved in something urgent.

We probably overdo it as too much nurturing impedes independence in learning. However, we recognise the realities of our students' lives and go as far as we can to accommodate their needs.

However, not all women had developed effective strategies. One woman in the Australian case study was overwhelmed by a sense that, as a Head of Department, she had to be available:

you are always getting interrupted. Because I have an open door policy, I am always being interrupted by people coming into the office and wanting to do things.

The domestic sphere is incorporated into the job of women academics and needs to be factored in when considering the question of balance for women Associate Professor/Readers and the way in which they manage their working lives. The pre-eminent position of research as the distinguishing feature of ranks above that of senior lecturer suggests that the research impetus has to be maintained if women wanted to advance in seniority. While there was some ambivalence around exactly what being internationally known for their research meant, the women considered such recognition important affirmation of their scholarship, attributes and skills. It is suggested that women are judged on their past achievements while men are judged on their potential, an observation that resonated with women in these case studies. Some of these women did not see that they would continue to advance or stay in the university system. Many found they did not have the balance right. Having reached this level they generally did not have the time to devote to the research about which they were passionate and had to reassess how they coped with the demands being placed on them. One woman in the New Zealand case study indicated how she had resolved this dilemma:

I see myself as someone who tends to engage quasi-politically with the broader context of my work. This means that I have ended up on committees...but [a series of incidents]...worked in various ways to convince me to focus on my life as an academic, and I have found this return to the work that attracted me to this career in the first place very satisfying personally.

Though they may not have the balance right themselves, women in these case studies stressed the importance of trying to achieve this end:

Don't undersell yourself, work hard to achieve the balance between teaching and research, develop good networks and don't compromise too much just to keep others happy.

Be determined and devote as much time to publishing as possible

Such strategies are considered critical to ensuring that women have

the opportunity to advance their careers. As Margaret Wilson, Minister of Labour, pointed out (AUS Biennial Women's Conference 2003) there is evidence to suggest that the pay gap exists just as much in universities as the rest of the workforce. Thus making strategic decisions about the deployment of time was essential to counter the more obvious areas of disparity.

## 6 Conclusion

Gendered linked expectations of roles influence opportunities and pay for women academics. In terms of pay equity, pay gaps are greater for women in more senior positions in comparison to women in academe in general. The case studies of women at Associate Professor/Reader level in Australia and New Zealand highlight the challenges for many women academics. These women expressed their difficulty in reaching the level of Associate Professor/Reader. To do so they were required to be research active and have achieved international recognition of their research along with all the other tasks expected of them.

While these women were devoted to and received recognition for their teaching, they often perceived that they were required to take on a greater share of administration and pastoral care than male colleagues at the same level. They also considered community service was important. There appeared to be tacit agreement within Departments/Schools that roles for even senior female academics were constructed differently than those for men.

But the gender-linked expectations of roles mean that women in the case studies were often diverted from the one activity that would ensure their promotion – research. Consequently, many will have difficulty advancing to full professorships and senior management positions. These gender-linked expectations also mean that these women often do not have an expectation of remuneration that reflects their workload and diverse roles. Until they can break the subtle straightjacket or glass ceiling of gender-linked roles, they will not receive remuneration that adequately reflects their skills and experience within the organization

## References

Asmar, C. 1999, "Is there a gendered agenda in academia? The research experience of female and male PhD graduates in Australian universities?", *Higher Education* 38: pp.255-273.

Bagilhole, B and White, K. 2004, "Created in their image: An analysis of male cultural hegemony in higher education in Australia" and the United Kingdom in B. Groombridge and V. Mackie ed. *Researching Research Agendas: Women, research and Publication in Higher Education*, Proceedings of the Australian Technology Network – Women's Executive Development 2003 Research Conference, Curtin University, Perth, pp.1-12

Bagilhole, B. 2002. "Against the odds: women academics' research opportunities" *Gender, Teaching and Research: Challenges for the 21st Century*. G. Howie and A. Tauchert. Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing House: 46-56.

Bagilhole, B. 2000b, "Too Little Too Late? An Assessment of National Initiatives for Women Academics in the British University System", *Higher Education in Europe*, vol.XXV, No.2, pp.139-145.

- Bagilhole, B. 2001. "Herding Cats: Managing Academics and the Issue of Equal Opportunities in Universities". The Politics of Gender and Education: Gender and Education 3rd International Conference.
- Bagilhole, B. and J. Goode 2001. "The contradiction of the myth of individual merit, and the reality of a patriarchal support system in academic careers." *The European Journal of Women's Studies* 8(2): 161-180.
- Brooks, A. 1997, *Academic Women*, SHRE and Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Brooks, A. 2001. Restructuring Bodies of Knowledge. *Gender and the Restructured University*. A. Brooks and A. Mackinnon: 15-44.
- Burton, C. 1997, *Gender Equity in Australian University Staffing*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Chalmers, A. 1998. *Workload and Stress in New Zealand Universities in 1998: A Follow-up to the 1994 Study*. Council for Educational Research & Association of University Staff. Wellington, New Zealand
- Currie, J. et.al 2002, *Gendered Universities in Globalized Economies: Powers, Careers and Sacrifices*, Lexington Books, New York.
- David, M. and Woodward, D. 1998, *Negotiating the Glass Ceiling: Careers of Senior Women in the Academic World*, Falmer Press, London.
- Doughney J. 2003, *Women and paid work in Australia: The more things change the more they stay the same*, Work and Economic Policy Research Unit, Victoria University, Melbourne
- Drennan, L and Beck, M. 2000, "Teaching and Research – equal partners or poor relations?" paper presented at the Qualitative Evidence-based Practice Conference, Coventry University.
- Du Plessis, R. 2000. "Teaching, Research and Gender and the Possibilities of 'Scholarship'. Women in Feminised Universities' AUS Status of Women Conference, Wellington.
- Ellis-Newman, J. 2001, Women and work: gender disparity in Australian universities, *Journal of Media and Culture*. <http://www.media-culture.org.au/0111/Ellis-Newman.html>
- Gale, F. 1999. "Who nurtures the nurturers? Senior women in universities." *Winds of Change: Women and the Culture of Universities Conference Proceedings*, Sydney.
- Glazer-Raymo, J. 1999, *Shattering the Myths: Women in Academe*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Groombridge, B, 2004 "Women academics stranded in ivory basement" *Education Review* May 5-11
- Harper, J. and T. Sawicka 2001. "Academic Mentoring: A Pilot Success at Victoria University of Wellington: Occasional Paper No. 5". C. Hall. *Higher Education in NZ* Wellington

- Harris, P., B. Thiele, et al. 1998. "Success, Gender and Academic Voices. Consuming Passion or Selling the Soul?" *Gender and Education* 10(2): 133-49.
- Inglis, L. 1999 (1) *Motives and Performance: Why Academics Research*, Department of Management, Monash University, Working Paper 01/99.
- Inglis, L. 1999 (2) *Motives and Performance of Academics*, Department of Management, Monash University, Working Paper 33/99.
- Jackson, S. 2002 "Transcending boundaries: women, research and teaching in the Academy" in Howie, G. and Tauchert, A. (eds) *Gender, Teaching and Research: Challenges for the 21st Century*. Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing House.
- Joyner, K. and A. Preston 1998. "Gender difference in perceptions of leadership role, performance and culture in a university: A case study." *International Review of Women and Leadership* 4(2): 34-45
- Ledgerton, Margaret, 2004, "PBRF and women academics" *AUS Bulletin* 61:8 NZ
- Leonard, D. 1998, "Trends in Higher Education in England from a Gender Perspective", paper presented to conference on Gender in Higher Education in England, Mexico and the USA, Mexico.
- Lewis, S. and J. Copeland 1999. "We're tired of talking about women: working with men to address the culture of male dominated work and study places". *Winds of Change: Women and the Culture of Universities Conference Proceedings*, University of Technology, Sydney.
- Lorber, J. 1994, *Paradoxes of Gender*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Ministry of Education. 2001, University Staff Employed During the Week 30 July - 5 August 2001. Data released annually. See website: [www.moe.govt.nz](http://www.moe.govt.nz).
- Morley, L. 1994, "Glass ceiling or iron cage: women UK academia." *Gender, Work and Organisation* 1(4): 194-204.
- Morley, L. 1999, *Organising Feminisms: The micropolitics of the academy*, St Martin's Press, New York.
- O'Connor, P. 2000, "Resistance in Academia", paper presented to NAWA International Conference on Women in Higher Education, New Orleans
- Park, S. 1996, "Research, teaching and service: Why shouldn't women's work count?", *The Journal of Higher Education*, vol.67, No.1, pp.46-67.
- Probert, B. 1999. "Working for Australian Universities: pay equity for men and women" in *Hard Work in the Academy*. P. Fogelberg, J. Hearn, L. Husu and T. Mankinen. Helsinki University Press. Helsinki
- Probert, B. et.al. 1998, *Gender Pay Equity in Australian Higher Education*, National Tertiary Education Union, Melbourne.
- Reay, D. 2000, " 'Dim Dross': Marginalised Women Both Inside and Outside the Academy", *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol.23, No.1, pp.13-21.

- Rollison, K. 2000, The Cost of Equity on Campus, *The Age* (Melbourne), 15 March.
- White, K. 2004, "The Leaking Pipeline: women postgraduate and early career researchers in Australia", *Tertiary Education and Management*, 9.4 (forthcoming)
- White, 2003a, Women and Leadership in Higher Education in Australia, *Tertiary Education and Management*, 9.1, pp. 45-60.
- White, K. 2003b, "Surviving or thriving in academia: women, teaching, research and promotion in Australian Universities", paper presented to the 3<sup>rd</sup> European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education, Genoa.
- White, K. 2002, "Being Ignored: A case study of women in the professoriate in Australia" in C. Wiedmer ed. *Sound Changes: An International Survey of Women's Career Strategies in Higher Education*, Universelle 4, Office for Equal Opportunities, University of Zurich, pp.45-56.
- White, K. 2001, "Women in the Professoriate in Australia", *International Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, vol.3, No.2, pp.64-76.
- White, K. 2000, 'Strategies for Improving Research Productivity: Women and Research in Higher Education in Australia', paper presented to NAWE International Conference on Women in Higher Education, New Orleans.
- White, K. and Birch, L. 1999, Strategies to Increase Research Output of Women in Higher Education, paper presented to AWORC seminar, Deakin University.
- Wyn, J. "Senior Women Academics in Education: Working through Restructuring in Australian Universities" *Melbourne Studies in Education*, vol. 38, No. 1, May 1997, pp.103-127.
- Wyn, J., S. Acker, and E. Richards, (2000). "Making a difference: Women in management in Australian and Canadian faculties of education." *Gender and Education* 12(4): 435-447.