

Academic Careers and the Gender Gap

MAUREEN BAKER



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

Sample Material © 2012 UBC Press

Contents

List of Tables / vi

Preface and Acknowledgments / vii

- 1 Setting the Scene / 1
- 2 Gendered Patterns of Education, Work, and Family Life / 26
- 3 University Restructuring and Global Markets / 45
- 4 Social Capital and Gendered Responses to University Practices / 67
- 5 Gendered Families and the Motherhood Penalty / 96
- 6 Subjectivities and the Gender Gap / 123
- 7 Explaining the Academic Gender Gap / 150

Methodological Appendix / 175

Notes / 181

References / 184

Index / 201

Tables

- 2.1 Doctoral graduates by sex and country / 30
- 2.2 Labour force participation rates, 2007 / 31
- 2.3 Doctorates by full-time/part-time work and sex / 33
- 2.4 Maternal employment rates, 2005 / 36
- 2.5 Percentage of persons working part-time, 2000 / 37
- 3.1 Expenditure on research and development in higher education / 48
- 3.2 Public and private funding in the postsecondary sector / 51
- 5.1 Marital and parental status of participants, 2008 / 104

Preface and Acknowledgments

This book arose from four decades of scholarly interest in gendered patterns of work and more specifically in university-based academic work. In the late 1960s, as an undergraduate student at the University of Toronto, I discovered that Canadian men with eight years of elementary school education earned more money than women with a master's degree. This correlation, which I found in a Statistics Canada publication in my college library, inspired me to continue my formal education to the highest level. When I began my doctorate at the University of Alberta in 1972, there were no women in tenure-track positions in the Sociology Department. I thought I wanted to become a university professor but had few female role models, which encouraged me to study academic women for my doctoral research. In 2008, as a senior professor working in New Zealand, I decided to re-examine the academic gender gap by interviewing academic men and women in two different types of universities in that country. This book includes both of these studies, based on qualitative interviews from 1973 and 2008, as well as an extensive survey of the research on gender patterns of work, restructuring in academia, and the academic gender gap in the liberal states, including Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

First, I would like to thank Rosalind Sydie, who is now an emeritus professor at the University of Alberta, for supervising my original research in the early 1970s, and Margrit Eichler from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education in Toronto for examining it. Second, I want to thank Patrizia Albanese from Ryerson University in Toronto for suggesting at a conference a few years ago that I rekindle my research interests in the academic gender gap after so many years. Third, I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Helen Cox and Christine Todd, who helped with the 2008 study and were postgraduate students at the University of Auckland at the time. Fourth, I want to express my appreciation for the support of the staff at UBC Press, especially Darcy Cullen, Ann Macklem, and Deborah Kerr, and the two anonymous reviewers who provided invaluable comments used in the final draft. Finally, I would like to thank David Tippin from the University of Auckland for his extensive discussions about university restructuring and for his continued support throughout the project.

Academic Careers and the Gender Gap

Setting the Scene

1

Gender has influenced the kinds of choices that I have made, or perhaps it's also influenced what I felt might be possible.

– FEMALE LECTURER, NEW ZEALAND, 2008

I've always just assumed that I have enjoyed some advantage or privilege as a result of being male – you know, in the job market and maybe even in career advancement – but it's something you just don't really think about that much.

– MALE SENIOR LECTURER, NEW ZEALAND, 2008

Since I was a doctoral student in the 1970s, women's representation among university students, graduates, and academics has increased dramatically, but the quotes above, which come from my recent research, suggest that gender continues to influence aspirations and work patterns. Throughout this book, I discuss a considerable amount of research that shows that an academic gender gap persists for university-based scholars. Notable differences exist in disciplinary specialization, work location, job security and satisfaction, rank, salary, and career development of male and female academics in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the

United Kingdom, and the United States.¹ Like many workplaces, universities have restructured in recent years, but have these new priorities actually promoted or counteracted gender equity? How are academic careers influenced by institutional practices, collegial relations, personal lives, and perceptions, and how have these changed over the decades? By investigating gendered lives in a restructuring professional setting, I explore issues that remain central to the sociology of work, gender studies, and the study of personal life.

To better understand how and why the gender gap continues to persist, this book situates academic work within the larger context of changing labour markets, workplace reorganization, and patterns of earning and caring among men and women. Academic work has some unique characteristics compared to other jobs, including its extensive qualifications, its relatively high degree of job control, its international marketplace, and its reliance on entrepreneurial skills for research productivity and promotion. Nevertheless, I argue that it has been influenced by many of the global trends that are visible in other workplaces and that academic employees tend to share patterns of gender relations with wider populations.

This book investigates the ways that the academic gender gap has changed over the decades, how it has been perpetuated, and why this should matter to universities and academics. The topic provides an excellent opportunity to discuss the impact of gender on paid/unpaid work and to highlight the contributions that research on academia can make to sociological and feminist theory. In this volume, the growing body of research on gendered work is integrated with studies of the academic profession, adding findings from two of my own research projects done in different decades and countries. Verbatim quotes from the participants in these two studies are used to illustrate gendered patterns. I analyze structural, relational, and interpretive factors contributing to the academic gender gap, revealing some remarkably similar patterns among five countries.

Despite decades of social change, equity initiatives, and family-friendly policies, I argue that from country to country, the academic gender gap is maintained for much the same reasons. The book focuses on three major areas influencing the gender gap: work-related and institutional

matters, typical configurations of family and personal life, and personal ambitions and subjectivities. I present these in three separate chapters as though they are different issues, but they are shown to be closely interconnected. Although I acknowledge that inequalities based on other factors such as ethnicity, culture, race, social class, and a combination of these persist in universities, the tight focus on male/female differences not only contributes to feminist research but also makes the project more manageable when dealing with cross-national comparisons.²

Several concepts used throughout the book will be more clearly defined later in this chapter. The first is that of the “liberal states,” a term that refers to Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The second is the “academic gender gap” – the difference between the work-related patterns of men and women faculty, or academic staff.³ This chapter also briefly explores typical academic practices, university priorities, and restructuring for readers unfamiliar with this environment. In addition, I discuss the focus, methodology, theoretical framework, and main contribution of the book.

Chapter 2 establishes the socio-demographic context behind this analysis of the academic gender gap by providing an overview of labour market trends and gendered patterns of postsecondary education, paid work, and family/personal life in the liberal states. By “gendered patterns” I am referring to differences in the typical trends for men and women, which in the statistics are categorized by biological sex but are actually influenced largely by social constructions of gender and family life. Chapter 3 discusses some of the economic and governance issues underpinning changing university workplaces in the liberal states. Although practices and priorities vary somewhat by university, institutional type, and jurisdiction, I identify a number of significant commonalities that cut across these boundaries, which have also been noted by other researchers (Auriol 2007; Currie, Thiele, and Harris 2002; Fairbrother and Rainnie 2006; Geiger 2004; Mohrman, Ma, and Baker 2008).

I am using the academic profession to explore the ways that professional employees are influenced by institutional priorities and practices, labour market trends, parenthood, and gender, and to draw some conclusions about why the gender gap still exists in universities. In the minds of the general public, academic work typically refers to preparing and

delivering lectures to undergraduate students. However, for many scholars it also involves leading seminars for graduate students and supervising and examining their research projects. They may also help to make decisions within their departments and university committees, review manuscripts for scholarly journals and publishers, contribute to their professional associations, and provide expert advice to the greater community. Most importantly for this book, they create and disseminate new knowledge through their own research and publications.

Although many scholars are hired to engage in the three strands of teaching, research, and service, this book focuses on rising expectations of research productivity, as this aspect of university work illustrates a number of global changes over the past four decades.⁴ I also concentrate on academics with career-oriented or permanent jobs. These individuals are typically perceived by senior colleagues and managers (such as deans and department heads/chairs) as more successful than doctorates who are employed as long-term part-timers or contingent workers (in temporary positions). However, we need to acknowledge that contingent workers form a growing percentage of academic staff and have become central to both teaching and research (Dobbie and Robinson 2008; Muzzin and Limoges 2008).

After this contextual background, Chapters 4 to 6 present findings from my own interviews with academics in order to investigate more fully the contributors to the academic gender gap. My studies were carried out in two liberal states (Canada and New Zealand), which vary considerably by population but share many similarities in labour market trends, social policies, university restructuring, gendered patterns of paid/unpaid work, family patterns, and gender relations (Baker 2001, 2010b). The fact that the studies were done in differing decades helps to illustrate social and institutional changes over time.

My studies varied somewhat by research design, but both used qualitative interviews to discuss the impact of university priorities, professional expectations, gender, and parenthood on academic careers. Both sets of interviews reveal the subjective experiences of participants and their personal perceptions of academic work, illustrated by their own words. These studies, combined with the wider research, show some enduring patterns but also notable changes since the 1970s.

I conclude in Chapter 7 that the three categories of contributors to the academic gender gap (relating to institutional/professional practices, family/personal life, and subjectivities) are really inseparable and inter-related. This final chapter attempts to distinguish between social constraints (those factors derived from changing work environments, collegial relations, access to social and material support, and gendered home lives) and patterns that reflect beliefs, perceptions, or subjectivities. Some of the sex differences initially appear to be personal choices, but I show that many of these so-called choices are actually shaped by patterns of support and structural limitations. I also argue that similar gendered configurations are apparent in the universities of Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The Liberal States and Their Universities

This book draws on studies that investigate changing global labour markets, university practices, and male/female patterns in postsecondary education, paid/unpaid employment, and university-based academic work. First, the analysis focuses on universities alone because colleges and polytechnics have concerns of their own and do not share all the trends apparent in the various categories of universities.

Second, the book focuses on Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States because these countries share similar university restructuring processes, patterns of institutional governance, and academic practices. With comparable cultural and policy backgrounds, they also reveal remarkably analogous trends in postsecondary educational attainment of women and men, patterns of paid/unpaid employment, and the academic gender gap. I label these five countries as liberal states, a term that is frequently used in policy comparisons rather than gender studies. I also contextualize the academic gender gap within broader issues of policy concerns such as university funding, labour regulation, and global market trends.

Why call these countries liberal states? Decades ago, Esping-Andersen (1990) distinguished between three worlds of welfare capitalism, contrasting liberal states to both the corporatist ones in Western Europe and their social democratic counterparts in Northern Europe. He argued that these three “ideal types” reflect differing philosophical orientations

to the role of the state in public life and especially to social spending. Esping-Andersen demonstrated that the liberal states relied on relatively unregulated markets and individual wage earners to maintain productivity and well-being, and that social provision was largely targeted to the poor and needy. In contrast, the corporatist states focused more on maintaining the wages of middle-income earners, whereas social democratic states provided universal benefits and services to all citizens in an attempt to promote equality.

Esping-Andersen argued that countries in each cluster have always shared policy solutions, especially during the development of employment standards and welfare programs from the 1930s to the 1970s. Although aspects of his schema have been disputed, classifying countries into similar types remains useful for comparative research.⁵ I argue that Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States continue to share policy solutions relating to labour market and university restructuring. They also reveal similar trends in family and work, which are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2 (Baker 2001, 2010b; Kamerman and Kahn 1997; O'Connor, Orloff, and Shaver 1999; OECD 2007a, 2008b).

In the liberal states, patterns of educational attainment, employment trends, the rising percentage of female doctorates, and gendered aspects of university-based academic work have been shown to be similar (Auriol 2007; Brooks 1997; Currie, Thiele, and Harris 2002; Kingfisher 2001; OECD 2007a, 2009a). For example, about half of new PhDs in these countries are now earned by women, and women comprise nearly half of new full-time academic university appointments and about 20 percent of senior positions (Auriol 2007; CAUT 2011b; Lipsett 2008; Monroe et al. 2008). For these reasons, the book discusses the liberal states collectively, arguing that restructuring trends and the gender gap cross international borders.

Nevertheless, some differences must also be acknowledged. For example, Australia, Canada, and the United States are divided into states or provinces, which have developed their own educational systems, creating many internal variations. Some liberal states and the jurisdictions within them invest more public money than others in postsecondary

education and research. Academic salaries also vary considerably by jurisdiction and by institution (CAUT 2011a, 55-57; Falks 2010). The United States has more private universities than the other liberal states, and its government contributes less public funding to the postsecondary sector (CAUT 2011a, 57). In addition, promotional systems and ranks vary, especially between North American universities and those in Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom. Gendered patterns of employment after motherhood for all women and for academics differ slightly by jurisdiction: rates of maternal employment are higher in North America than in the other liberal states (OECD 2009c).

Within a jurisdiction, differences also exist between universities, relating to their public/private status, predominant forms of funding, strategic goals, size, national or international prestige, and the composition of their student body (Auriol 2007; Fisher et al. 2009; OECD 2009a). In official statistics, universities are often categorized into two broad types: the first is research/medical/doctoral, and the second is teaching/undergraduate/baccalaureate, because universities within these broad institutional types tend to share many of the same priorities and practices. Some official statistics, such as those in Canada, also use an intermediate category of “comprehensive” university (CAUT 2011a, 57).

Although this book refers to research and teaching universities, I also argue that the historical differences between the two types are becoming blurred as more institutions pressure their academics to increase their research productivity, obtain external research funding, and develop collaborative research networks that are sometimes international. This is particularly predominant in countries with national research assessment exercises, which include Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom (discussed further in Chapter 3). Canada and the United States have not established national research assessment schemes, as the provinces and states have retained jurisdiction over education. However, I suggest that pressures to increase research productivity influence universities in all the liberal states and that many of the former teaching universities are becoming more comprehensive.

In the first two chapters, comparative statistics reveal similar patterns in paid and unpaid work throughout the liberal states, which I maintain

are influenced by political and socioeconomic forces that tend to be international. In addition, I reveal that gender relations are altered in similar ways by these global changes in work.

What Is the Academic Gender Gap?

Volumes have been written about the academic profession, but this book focuses on the changing academic gender gap in a restructuring university environment. This concept refers to the varying qualifications and experiences of male and female scholars employed in universities, including differences in job security, institutional affiliation, working hours, rank, salary, job satisfaction, collegial networks, and length of career. Over the decades, the gender gap has diminished substantially if one measures it by indicators such as the rising percentage of female doctorates and faculty, as well as the gender differences in promotion and salary.

Significantly more women now receive PhDs and find permanent positions within universities than during the 1970s (Brooks 1997; Glazer-Raymo 2008; Long 2001; Sussman and Yssaad 2005). In Canada, for example, the percentage of female full-time university teachers increased from 13 in 1970 to 34 in 2008, and 45 percent of full-time university teachers newly appointed in 2007-08 were women (CAUT 2009, 2010, 18). Similar developments have occurred in the other liberal states (Auriol 2007; Carrington and Pratt 2003; Lipsett 2008; New Zealand Ministry of Education 2009), as shown in more detail in Chapter 2, though comparable statistics for each of the five countries are not always available for the same years.

Notable improvements in the rank of female academics are apparent in recent decades, but women are still disproportionately clustered in junior positions. In the universities of the liberal states, men occupy between 76 and 82 percent of senior positions, a drop from 90 to 95 percent in the 1960s (Carrington and Pratt 2003; CAUT 2011b; New Zealand Human Rights Commission 2008; Sussman and Yssaad 2005; AAUP 2006).⁶ In all the liberal states, male academics are more likely to work full-time with fewer career interruptions, to publish more peer-reviewed articles, and to be promoted to higher ranks with higher salaries in a promotion system that often favours research over teaching and

service (Brooks 1997; Brooks and Mackinnon 2001; Monroe et al. 2008; Nakhaie 2007).

As more women enter the academic profession at the lower ranks, there is clear evidence that intergenerational change has been occurring. The gender gap, however, cannot be attributed solely to age cohort or the fact that fewer women received doctorates in the past. Research suggests that gendered family circumstances, household responsibilities, and personal priorities help preserve the gap (Bassett 2005; Bracken, Allen, and Dean 2006; Comer and Stites-Doe 2006; Monroe et al. 2008; Settles et al. 2006). Differences have also been explained on the basis of institutional discrimination and marginalization in collegial networks, sometimes referred to as a “chilly climate” for academic women and an “unbreakable glass ceiling” (Curtis 2005; Drakich et al. 1991; Drakich and Stewart 2007; Valian 1998; Wagner, Acker, and Mayuzumi 2008).⁷ Systems of hiring and promotion have also been cited as reasons for the perpetuation of the gender gap.

Academic Practices and University Restructuring

One problem with discussing academic priorities and practices across the liberal states is that differing terminology is often used for the same things. For example, academics are typically called faculty in North America but academic staff in the other countries. Education beyond secondary school is normally called postsecondary or higher education in North America but tertiary education in the other countries. Degrees beyond the undergraduate level are often called graduate degrees in North America and postgraduate in the other countries. Gaining job security in North America involves a rigorous process called tenure, but this is known as confirmation or permanence in the other countries and is sometimes less arduous. In this book I normally use the North American terminology, sometimes noting others in parentheses, but have also tried to find generic terms that are less confusing.

One reason for discussing the liberal states collectively is that university practices and priorities are often said to vary more by institutional type than by jurisdiction (Fletcher et al. 2007; Geiger 2004). As noted above, universities are often divided into two main types – research and

teaching – although the intermediate category called comprehensive is used as well. Universities are also ranked both nationally and internationally, and the research universities typically receive higher ratings (discussed in Chapter 3). This book focuses on research and teaching universities to highlight the gender differences in job location and institutional prestige. Decades ago, Jessie Bernard (1964) discussed the sexual division of labour evident in American universities, where men more often concentrated on knowledge creation in the research universities, and women tended to specialize in teaching and the pastoral care of students, especially in the women's colleges.

Historically, research universities have placed considerable pressure on academics to create new knowledge, as well as teach, supervise research students, and contribute to decision making in the institution and profession (Caplow and McGee 1958; Jencks and Riesman 1977). Many research universities, especially in North America, continue to accentuate knowledge creation partly by using temporary (or sessional) lecturers to teach some of the larger undergraduate classes and paying them on a course-by-course basis or for one or more sessions or semesters. This strategy, which saves university salary money and frees up senior academics for graduate supervision and research, has been increasingly applied since the late 1970s. In fact, many universities in the liberal states are restructuring to strengthen their focus on research productivity, to gain more external funding, and to heighten their international reputation (Dobbie and Robinson 2008; Glazer-Raymo 2008; Lucas 2006; Mohrman, Ma, and Baker 2008). I argue that this trend, which is underpinned by economic pressures, tends to augment the academic gender gap.

The teaching universities have historically concentrated on classroom instruction and assisting undergraduate students to gain a general education, with fewer expectations that faculty will train future researchers or become producers of new knowledge themselves. In recent decades, some colleges, polytechnic institutes, and teacher training schools have been converted into teaching universities, or merged with existing universities, and continue to provide vocational training as well as undergraduate education. There is some evidence that teaching universities have hired and promoted more women academics than the research

universities and have also introduced more classroom innovations (CAUT 2009; Fletcher et al. 2007; New Zealand Human Rights Commission 2008). However, they usually require scholars to spend more time on class contact hours, the pastoral care of students, and other teaching-related activities, even when they increase expectations of research productivity.

Academic practices vary somewhat by institutional governance and funding. Most universities in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom are publicly funded and therefore must abide by government regulations and guidelines. However, they can also be privately funded, as many are in the United States. Private universities differ from public ones in a number of ways, including lower rates of unionization, which could influence working conditions, job security, and salaries (Wickens 2008).

Terms of university hiring and promotion are usually specified in collective agreements between management and professional associations or labour unions, but the laws governing collective bargaining differ by jurisdiction. Unionization rates also vary substantially by jurisdiction but also by the public or private status of the university, by the individual university, by departments within them, and the employment status of academics (part-time/full-time or temporary/permanent). Current unionization rates are difficult to ascertain and compare cross-nationally, but Wickens (*ibid.*) notes that in the United States, less than 40 percent of full-time faculty members were unionized in 1995. Labour unions are more often found in the public universities, but unionization rates appear to be rising, including in private universities and among part-time or temporary workers, many of whom are graduate students (*ibid.*).

In Canada, where most colleges and universities are publicly funded, unionization rates appear to be higher than in the United States, but these rates vary considerably by informational source and how they are calculated. Rhoades (1998) states that 44 percent of full-time faculty in Canadian universities were represented by collective bargaining agents in the mid-1990s compared to 65 percent of employees in other public institutions. Dobbie and Robinson (2008) give a much higher figure, referring to union density of 79 percent in 2004, but without providing a reference. However, James Turk, executive director of the Canadian

Association of University Teachers (pers. comm., 30 August 2011), verified this 79 percent figure, which suggests a considerable increase in university unionization during the past decade. Although I contacted the Tertiary Education Union in New Zealand, it was unable to provide a unionization rate for full-time academics in that country.

Even when a trade union is present in a university, not all academics become union members.⁸ In some countries, university managers have attempted to undermine unions by offering individual contracts to academics, as well as special arrangements for leave and supplemental benefits that fall outside the collective agreement.⁹ Dobbie and Robinson (2008) note that greater unionization in Canada and the United States during recent years has stalled neither the decline in tenured faculty relative to part-timers nor the corporatization of higher education.

Hiring and Promotion

Before the 1970s, university-based academic work (as well as other professional employment) was often hierarchical and dominated by powerful managers and “old-boy ties” (Bernard 1964; Epstein 1971). In some universities, deans and department heads were permitted to make decisions about hiring and promotion with few written guidelines or consultations with other academics. The most prestigious universities hired from top graduate schools, accepted few women, expected their academics to generate research papers as well as teach students, and assumed that the most productive of them would use the global academic marketplace to their advantage (Caplow and McGee 1958). Less prominent universities were more likely to hire local graduates and women, as well as strong teachers with fewer publications. In recent decades, however, promotion rules have become more formalized, decisions are typically made by committees, and a number of equity initiatives have been introduced at the institutional and departmental level.

Universities normally hire academics in both temporary and permanent employment. The tenure-stream positions, which are expected to lead to permanent jobs, are the most often advertised, sometimes internationally, and hiring decisions are usually made by committees comprised of academics with oversight by academic managers. To qualify

for these positions, candidates increasingly require a PhD as well as university teaching experience and scholarly publications or conference papers based on their research.¹⁰ They must also fit in with the teaching, administrative, and research needs of the university and department, which are not always readily apparent to applicants.

Several years after their first tenure-stream appointment, academics are normally expected to apply for tenure or relative job security.¹¹ Many procedural variations exist, but universities typically require some form of written application based on evidence of sustained performance in teaching, service, and research. The rigour of this process varies considerably according to institutional prestige and jurisdiction, requiring proof that performance and productivity are anywhere from acceptable to exceptional.

Many universities also provide annual salary increases and/or cost-of-living adjustments within each rank without requiring a promotion application, as well as merit pay for exceptional performance shown in annual reviews. However, formal applications are obligatory for promotion into the next rank (such as from assistant professor to associate professor in North America, and from lecturer to senior lecturer in the other countries). In this process, universities typically expect candidates to submit extensive dossiers listing their accomplishments in teaching, service, and research, and also require them to provide written justifications for promotion. Although most institutional guidelines indicate that all three areas of teaching, service, and research are important for tenure and promotion, the larger and more prestigious universities tend to give more weight to research productivity, peer esteem, and international reputation, especially for promotion beyond the junior ranks (Brooks and Mackinnon 2001; Monroe et al. 2008; Nakhaie 2007; Ornstein, Stewart, and Drakich 2007; White 2004).

With globalizing labour markets, more academics are now seeking promotional jobs in other countries, as productive researchers are often able to improve their rank and status by acquiring external job offers and changing universities. Highly valued individuals can also use job offers from other universities to bargain for additional resources at their current workplace or threaten to leave for a better position elsewhere. Geographic

mobility has always been viewed as an advantage to academic bargaining and promotion (Caplow and McGee 1958; Jencks and Riesman 1977). For example, Bernard (1964) argued that female scholars in the United States, especially married mothers, were typically less mobile than their male counterparts, which put them at a disadvantage in the academic marketplace. Negotiating for more resources with little intention of actually accepting a job offer is generally frowned upon by unions and academic colleagues, and is less likely to be effective in universities with strong unions and formalized rules about remuneration.

Work Expectations

As academics reach the middle and higher ranks, they are normally required to contribute to university decision making as well as professional activities such as peer reviewing articles, book manuscripts, and grant applications. They would also be expected to publish their research widely in scholarly journals and books, fund their research via internal and external grants, and develop national or international research networks. They might perform consulting work for governments or other organizations but are generally expected to raise their university's profile through their professional activities. Increasingly, universities are developing prestigious research chairs, which are top academic positions funded from private donations or new state resources. These chairs usually involve high salaries, reduced teaching loads, and considerable status, and they are much more likely to be held by men than by women (Reimer 2004; Side and Robbins 2007; Slaughter and Leslie 1999).

Increasingly, and particularly in the top research universities, academics who have not accrued sufficient publications, contributed significantly to their institution, or gained a national or international reputation will not be promoted to the highest rank before they reach the age of retirement. Historically, most scholars in Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom never progressed to the rank of professor, because each department contained only one professor, who served as head of department for an indefinite period. Now that head of department is usually a fixed-term position lasting less than five years, there could be several professors in a department, and a lower-ranking individual could become its head or chair.¹²

Hiring and promotion have become more competitive in an international labour market with shrinking government contributions to operating costs. Academics must now focus even more on research productivity and entrepreneurial research activities to progress through the ranks. Mothers with young children have fewer opportunities to undertake such projects, but feminists also suggest that whatever tasks women perform in their employment are typically granted less recognition and remuneration than men's (Brooks 1997; Daly and Rake 2003).

Institutional Restructuring

In recent decades, universities have undergone significant institutional changes as their socioeconomic environments have been redefined. Numerous researchers have analyzed these changes, revealing similar trends in the liberal states.¹³ In many jurisdictions, student enrolments and university operating costs have typically risen faster than government grants to public universities since the 1970s (Fisher et al. 2009; Sikes 2006). In Canada, government funding as a percentage of university operating revenue declined from 84 percent in 1978 to 58 percent in 2008, whereas tuition fees paid by students increased from 12 to 35 percent (CAUT 2011a, 2). In New Zealand, universities now receive only 45 percent of their annual income from government grants (NZVC 2010), down considerably from the 1970s.

To compensate for diminished state funding, many institutions have raised tuition fees and recruited more international or out-of-state students, often charging them higher fees than domestic or local students. They have also sought more external funding, especially from alumni and corporate donors. To increase "flexibility" and control labour costs, they have hired more temporary or part-time academics. In the United States, the percentage of faculty who were full-time and tenured declined from 36.5 in 1975 to 24.1 in 2003 as universities hired more part-timers and temporary faculty (West and Curtis 2006, 7).

Another significant change is that public universities now tend to operate more on a corporate model rather than a public service one, with stringent accountability measures, greater demands to diversify funding sources, and even expectations of profit making in some instances (Brenneis, Shore, and Wright 2005; Chan and Fisher 2008; Marginson

and Considine 2000; Metcalfe 2010; Mohrman, Ma, and Baker 2008; Slaughter and Leslie 1999). The growth of accountability regimes means that university managers place a stronger emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness. Public universities have also increased their use of national and international benchmarking to compare their performance with similar institutions and to rank institutional and departmental productivity, status, and achievements (CAUT 2011a, 56; Taylor and Braddock 2007; Turk 2000).

The market for university faculty, staff, and students has also become increasingly international. More students receive their degrees outside their hometowns than they did in the 1970s. Graduate students from Australia, Canada, and New Zealand travel to other countries, such as the United States and the United Kingdom, to attain master's and doctoral degrees from prestigious institutions. Many academics also work in universities in other countries for a portion of their career. For example, 40.8 percent of university teachers currently working in Canada are either non-permanent residents or originally were immigrants (although most of these would now be Canadian citizens) (CAUT 2011a, 20).

In addition, scholars are expected to review and publish articles for international as well as national journals and to prepare and review book manuscripts for publishing companies located in other countries as well as their own. They also prepare reference letters or promotion assessments for colleagues and department heads in other countries. They receive visiting scholars and go abroad for conferences, research projects, and sabbatical leave. All these factors contribute to an international job market for academics and the convergence of academic standards and practices among the liberal states.

At the same time, universities have expanded their academic programs and taken advantage of new technologies and distance learning in order to teach or attract more students and increase their revenue. They have also accepted a more diverse range of students in terms of age, sex, parental status, social class, and race/ethnicity, which has required the creation of more student services as well as changes in teaching style. Public universities have been pressured by their governments, professional associations, and staff and student unions to develop equity initiatives and

family-friendly guidelines to accommodate the growing diversity among students and academics. Many institutions have established student equity programs and campus day care centres, and have expanded employment-related programs such as parental leave, flexible working hours, and gender-based mentoring for scholars.

All these issues will be discussed in more detail in later chapters. However, the trends suggest that although universities have become more cognizant of equity and diversity, they have also grown more managerial and capitalist in their attempts to increase revenue and to compete nationally and internationally (Fisher et al. 2009; Metcalfe 2010; Slaughter and Leslie 1999; Turk 2000). This is apparent in the public universities of all the liberal states because they are influenced by similar market trends, neo-liberal initiatives, and patterns of demography, migration, and human rights, which encourage a convergence of institutional practices. However, stronger international and research pressures are more apparent in the research universities than in their teaching counterparts.

The Book's Theoretical Framework

This book draws on feminist political economy theories, social capital theory, and interpretive frameworks. First, feminist political economy theories suggest that people's lives are shaped by their access to social, institutional, and material resources that are unequally distributed between men and women (Bakker and Silvey 2008; Luxton 2006; Vosko 2002). Therefore, I have situated this study within the wider economic and political context of global market changes, which have encouraged many workplaces, including universities, to restructure. I argue that certain types of restructuring tend to augment the gender gap.

Since the 1970s, governments in the liberal states have been signing freer trade agreements with other countries while strengthening work incentives and weakening labour legislation. Greater emphasis on market forces has encouraged many employers to become more efficient and productive, to reduce their operating costs, increase their revenue sources, and expand into foreign markets. To accomplish these goals, they often create flexible and specialized labour forces, partly by hiring

more temporary workers (Armstrong and Armstrong 2004; Banting and Beach 1995; Easton 2008; Fairbrother and Rainnie 2006; Kalleberg 2011). However, this reinforces a dual labour market, which consists of “good” jobs and “bad” jobs (Torjman and Battle 1999).

Typically more secure and better paid, the former are often protected by labour legislation and/or union contracts. The latter are accompanied by less security, fewer employment benefits, and lower wages. On average, good jobs are more likely to be gained by white, middle-class, educated employees with fewer family responsibilities, whereas bad jobs are more often done by students, visible minorities, less educated workers, and mothers with daily responsibilities for young children (Bakker and Silvey 2008; Easton 2008; Vosko 2000; Vosko, MacDonald, and Campbell 2009; Walby et al. 2007). These economic and political changes have altered practices in many workplaces, including universities. More details of university restructuring will be discussed in Chapter 3, but I show throughout this book that many of the part-time and temporary positions in universities are occupied by doctoral students, partnered women, and mothers. Academic men are more likely to find full-time permanent jobs at the more prestigious universities and to progress through the ranks of academia.

The book draws heavily on research and theories about the impact of domestic divisions of labour on paid work in the current competitive environment. I maintain that typical patterns of marriage, where women partner with older and professionally established men, tend to augment the social expectations that they will shoulder the domestic and care work, creating a “second shift” of after-hours household work, especially for employed mothers (Hochschild 1989, 1997; Johnson and Johnson 2008). More often than men, women accept the day-to-day responsibilities of childrearing and housework, which gives them less time and motivation than men to pursue full-time careers or to gain promotion (Bittman and Pixley 1997; England 2010; Grummell, Devine, and Lynch 2009; Kitterød and Pettersen 2006; McMahon 1999; Ranson 2009). When men and women become parents, they often make differing choices and negotiate space for different activities, based on their gender and social/material resources (B. Fox 2009).

I particularly rely on the “motherhood penalty” research because it shows that the careers of mothers tend to lag behind those of childless women and fathers (Budig and England 2001; Correll, Benard, and Paik 2007; Crittenden 2001; Portanti and Whitworth 2009). This research suggests that employed mothers are typically viewed by employers and co-workers as less committed and ambitious than fathers or child-free women. The careers of mothers tend to progress at a slower pace because having and raising children sometimes requires them to take time off work or reduce their employment hours, especially if they live in families where care and household management are seen as women’s work. They themselves sometimes choose to give priority to their children while they are preschoolers, hoping to return to full-time work at a later date. However, taking leave or reducing working hours is often consequential, especially for professional careers such as university teaching and research.

Second, the book draws on social capital theory. In the wider research, human and cultural capital usually refers to personal characteristics, skills, and qualifications that lead to employment, economic gain, or social mobility (Bourdieu 1977, 1986; Coleman 1988). The concept of social capital has been defined in various ways by different authors, but it generally refers to connections that can be used to gain access to social support, advice, information, protection, powerful positions, or economic gain, and that might contribute to feelings of belonging or community well-being (Bourdieu 1986; Putnam 2000). Bourdieu (1988) also differentiated between academic capital and intellectual capital, the former referring to integration and respect from colleagues in the university work environment.

For university-based scholars, attaining human and social capital would include earning a doctorate at a prominent university; developing research, writing, and collaborative skills; knowing how to get published and how to sell their research to other academics; acquiring the confidence to lecture and publish widely; and gaining the respect of colleagues. Throughout this book, the research suggests that for various reasons relating to upbringing, marriage patterns, care responsibilities, and access to professional support and resources, women are less likely than

men to attain the human and social capital necessary to compete equitably in the university environment (Beck and Young 2005; Bourdieu 1977; van Emmerik 2006).

Third, the book draws on interpretive perspectives that acknowledge the differing subjectivities and identities of equally qualified people working in the same occupation (Thomas and Davies 2002). Interpretive theories generally suggest that the meanings associated with particular actions or behaviours are socially constructed. This indicates that our subjectivities (including self-image, gender identity, attitudes, and decisions) are shaped by the ways in which we present ourselves to others and how they interpret, ignore, resist, or reinforce our actions (Butler 1990; Goffman 1959). I particularly rely on performance theories of gender, suggesting that masculinity and femininity are not what people *are* but what they *do* (Kimmel 2008; West and Zimmerman 1987).

The interpretive approach acknowledges that academic women and men sometimes develop differing priorities and make varying life choices, which is aptly demonstrated by some of the participant quotes from my research. However, even when the behaviour of academic women resembles that of academic men, it can be viewed, evaluated, and legitimated differently (Glazer-Raymo 2008; Kelan 2009; Probert 2005). I suggest that these differences are shaped by gendered social expectations but also by access to social support and material resources.

Although I focus on sex differences and the social construction of gender, I also acknowledge the relevance of intersectionality, a concept suggesting that the impact of sex on employment status may be compounded or alleviated by other factors, such as age, rank, marital status, sexual preference, ethnicity, culture, race, and institutional setting. Furthermore, I realize that not all women or men share the same ambitions, employment experiences, or domestic circumstances, even when they gain the same qualifications or rank, work in the same profession or institution, or share cultural backgrounds. Clearly, individuals differ. Furthermore, people often modify their attitudes and ambitions over time, with maturity but also with changes in their living arrangements, parental status, and circumstances in the workplace. The impact of gender could combine with any of these other factors to alter job status or acceptance within collegial networks (Kobayashi 2002; Kosoko-Lasaki,

Sonnino, and Voytko 2006). This book focuses on male/female experiences and social interpretations of gender in university workplaces in the liberal states, while acknowledging some of these other factors, particularly age, rank, and type of university.

The Research Basis of the Book

Academic Careers and the Gender Gap is based on several types of research sources, including international and national statistics and reports; studies on work, academic priorities, and the academic gender gap; and my own interviews with academics in two eras and countries. The book also draws on my personal career experience, which spans thirty-eight years and includes postsecondary teaching and research work in four of the five liberal states. In the feminist and qualitative research tradition, this experience contributes insider knowledge to the analysis of the academic gender gap.

Contextual data are provided for all the liberal states by drawing on statistics from the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), national statistics, and other comparative studies. More data are offered for Canada than for the other countries because the book is published there and because one of the empirical studies took place there. The other empirical study was done in New Zealand, but fewer comparable statistics are available from that country. In fact, finding comparable statistics for all the liberal states has been challenging. Some of the gaps are influenced by divergent definitions, an emphasis in official statistics on variables other than male/female differences, and inaccessible or costly data in some jurisdictions.

My Interview Studies

One study was carried out in Canada in 1973 and the other in New Zealand in 2008 (for further details, see the Appendix on page 175). Both were grounded in qualitative research, which is not intended to discover causes or correlations or to test hypotheses. Instead, it is designed to flesh out the details of people's lived experiences and to investigate their subjectivities. Comments from interview participants can often complement quantitative findings by heightening understanding of the reasons behind the statistical correlations.

Both studies focused on participants' perceptions of the impact of gender and marital and parental status on academic careers as well as their observations of the university and social context in which they worked. Both were based on face-to-face qualitative interviews in which subjects were encouraged to elaborate on their family and academic backgrounds, their partners and personal relationships, their mentors, and the priorities and practices of their universities. The 2008 interviews further noted the influence of institutional type (that is, research versus teaching university) on their work environment.

Throughout the book, I argue that, despite their distance from each other and their differences in size, Canada and New Zealand have experienced roughly comparable academic practices and gendered work. Whereas Canada's population is about 34 million (Statistics Canada 2011), New Zealand's is just over 4 million (Immigration New Zealand 2011). Although many academic practices are similar in the two countries, the rank and tenure system in Canada tends to follow the North American model, whereas New Zealand's is closer to that of Australia and the United Kingdom. Both Canada and New Zealand are bicultural countries, and they also share similar laws and social policies as well as socio-demographic trends (Baker 2001, 2006).¹⁴ In particular, both have experienced similar increases in women's educational attainment and percentages of women in the senior ranks of academia, comparable academic hiring/promotion practices, and high rates of foreign-born scholars.

My first study, completed in 1973, was situated in a research university in western Canada and began with an analysis of the extent of the academic gender gap and factors contributing to it, as well as a discussion of academic practices in North American universities. The empirical portion consisted of interviews with thirty-nine women working in male-dominated departments of this large urban and public university at a time when women formed 13.5 percent of full-time tenure-stream or tenured faculty.¹⁵ In 1973, nearly all the departments of this university had a majority of male academics, and some contained few or no women.

The period in which this study occurred coincided with the second phase of the feminist movement and several studies of women's status

such as the Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada (1970) and university-based investigations.¹⁶ In this particular university, the vast majority of faculty were white, with North American or European origins. The study participants were white women of European/North American backgrounds. I contacted them by telephone and invited them to participate in a face-to-face interview with me in their office; the interviews, which lasted about one hour, used a schedule that was partially open-ended. The sample consisted mainly of full-time academics, from assistant professor to full professor, but also included some temporary lecturers, doctoral students, and several former doctoral students who had recently withdrawn from the program. Interviewing this latter group was designed to uncover why they had left their doctoral studies.

Many of the scholars at this Canadian university had migrated from the United States to take up positions (or to accompany their academic husbands) during the expansion of postsecondary education in the 1960s and 1970s. This suggests that geographic mobility was important to the academic profession even then. The project focused on the inconsistencies between the university discourse of academic merit and the realities of particularism as encountered by these women. It also explored their subjective experiences of being female in a male-dominated profession, as well as their role models and mentors, their career trajectories, and their personal and family circumstances. However, it did not compare male and female academics, as I did in the 2008 study.¹⁷ For more details, see the Appendix or Baker (1975).

The second study began with a survey of recent research on the academic gender gap and academic practices in the liberal states. The empirical portion included qualitative interviews completed in 2008 with thirty male and female academics working in two urban and public universities on the North Island of New Zealand. One was a large established research university that prided itself on its research and graduate education (as well as undergraduate teaching) and enjoyed a high national and international reputation. The second was also large but newer and more oriented to undergraduate teaching, with higher class contact hours for teaching staff, slightly higher percentage of women in senior positions, and a lower national and international profile.

The subjects in the 2008 study, most of whom were white with New Zealand/European backgrounds, were contacted by e-mail and invited to be interviewed by me or my graduate student assistant.¹⁸ The thirty participants, all of whom had doctorates, worked in permanent academic positions in all ranks (lecturer, senior lecturer, associate professor, and professor) in the humanities and social sciences in the two universities. These academic units were selected because they contained a higher percentage of women than did departments such as science or engineering and because I wanted the departmental culture and working conditions to be relatively constant among the participants.¹⁹

Unlike the 1973 interviews, those of 2008 compared the views and experiences of both men and women, and they were digitally recorded and fully transcribed. I also compared the perceptions of the participants by type of university and by rank (sometimes grouping the lecturers and senior lecturers together as junior and intermediate positions, and the associate professors and professors together as senior positions, to show broader trends and maintain participant anonymity).

The interviews were not meant to form a systematic comparison of academics working in two jurisdictions and two different eras, as the study design and sampling of the projects differed slightly. Instead, the rich and subjective verbatim comments from both projects are used to enhance our understanding of findings from the wider research and to provide more insight into changes over time and across borders. The high level of detail about participants' circumstances is unavailable in official statistics or quantitative studies that focus mainly on correlations between variables. These details tend to humanize the research and deepen the analysis.

The Book's Contribution

This book contributes to social science and feminist research by analyzing the relations between globalizing workplaces and the formal/informal elements of their culture. It also examines the interconnections between personal/family circumstances, access to social and material support, career ambition, and perceptions of professional success. The book demonstrates that the socioeconomic and political environments of many universities have changed over the past forty years, pressuring

academic managers to modify some of their institutional priorities and practices, with a number of gendered consequences. Nevertheless, many practices have remained relatively constant over the decades, and gender differences persist in the social/human capital of male and female scholars.

The chapters show that though the academic gender gap has diminished, it has persisted over the decades, cutting across national boundaries. Although it is most prevalent in the research universities, it remains widespread in universities throughout the liberal states. Through its use of colourful comments from the interviewees, the book illustrates the many differences as well as similarities in the careers, personal lives, and subjectivities of academics. Although we cannot generalize from these interviews alone, the book is underpinned by an extensive survey of the available research about the gender gap in the liberal states.

This volume acknowledges that public universities have made substantial improvements toward gender equity since the 1970s but argues that they have also responded to neo-liberal pressures by expecting academics to strengthen their focus on research productivity, funded research, and other entrepreneurial activities. These newer priorities contribute to gender inequities, but I also maintain that the academic gender gap is perpetuated by collegial interactions and gendered personal lives. This conclusion provides more serious challenges for institutional change.

© UBC Press 2012

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Baker, Maureen

Academic careers and the gender gap [electronic resource] / Maureen Baker.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Electronic monograph.

Issued also in print format.

ISBN 978-0-7748-2398-2 (PDF); ISBN 978-0-7748-2399-9 (HTML)

1. Women college teachers.
2. Women in higher education.
3. Work and family.
4. Sex role in the work environment.
5. Universities and colleges – Social aspects. I. Title.

LB2332.3.B34 2012

378.1'2082

C2012-903441-X

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Awards to Scholarly Publications Program, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

www.ubcpress.ca