



PALGRAVE STUDIES IN GENDER AND EDUCATION

Gender, Power and Higher Education in a Globalised World

Edited by
Pat O'Connor · Kate White

The background of the cover is a dark, atmospheric illustration. It depicts a figure standing on a set of stairs, holding a glowing torch that illuminates the scene. Above the figure, a large, dark, abstract shape hangs from the ceiling, resembling a person or a complex structure. The overall color palette is dark with a prominent blue and purple hue, creating a mysterious and contemplative mood.

palgrave
macmillan

Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education

Series Editor
Yvette Taylor
School of Education
University of Strathclyde
Glasgow, UK

This Series aims to provide a comprehensive space for an increasingly diverse and complex area of interdisciplinary social science research: gender and education. Because the field of women and gender studies is developing rapidly and becoming ‘internationalised’ – as are traditional social science disciplines such as sociology, educational studies, social geography, and so on – there is a greater need for this dynamic, global Series that plots emerging definitions and debates and monitors critical complexities of gender and education. This Series has an explicitly feminist approach and orientation and attends to key theoretical and methodological debates, ensuring a continued conversation and relevance within the well-established, inter-disciplinary field of gender and education.

The Series combines renewed and revitalised feminist research methods and theories with emergent and salient public policy issues. These include pre-compulsory and post-compulsory education; ‘early years’ and ‘life-long’ education; educational (dis)engagements of pupils, students and staff; trajectories and intersectional inequalities including race, class, sexuality, age and disability; policy and practice across educational landscapes; diversity and difference, including institutional (schools, colleges, universities), locational and embodied (in ‘teacher’–‘learner’ positions); varied global activism in and beyond the classroom and the ‘public university’; educational technologies and transitions and the (ir)relevance of (in)formal educational settings; and emergent educational mainstreams and margins. In using a critical approach to gender and education, the Series recognises the importance of probing beyond the boundaries of specific territorial-legislative domains in order to develop a more international, intersectional focus. In addressing varied conceptual and methodological questions, the Series combines an intersectional focus on competing – and sometimes colliding – strands of educational provisioning and equality and ‘diversity’, and provides insightful reflections on the continuing critical shift of gender and feminism within (and beyond) the academy.

More information about this series at
<http://www.palgrave.com/gp/series/14626>

Pat O'Connor • Kate White
Editors

Gender, Power and Higher Education in a Globalised World

palgrave
macmillan

Editors

Pat O'Connor
Department of Sociology
University of Limerick
Limerick, Ireland

Kate White
School of Education
Federation University
Ballarat, VIC, Australia

Geary Institute
University College Dublin
Dublin, Ireland

ISSN 2524-6445

ISSN 2524-6453 (electronic)

Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education

ISBN 978-3-030-69686-3

ISBN 978-3-030-69687-0 (eBook)

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69687-0>

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Switzerland AG 2021

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use. The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration © Tithi Luadthong / Alamy

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by the registered company Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

To Jenny Neale (1945–2019) who was a valued member of the Women in Higher Education Management Network. She made a significant contribution to research on gender and higher education, and was a wonderful colleague and friend.

Praise for *Gender, Power and Higher Education in a Globalised World*

“Gender inequality in higher education is a persistent, complex and global concern, with varying dynamics in different national and regional contexts. This book is a very welcome contribution, investigating reasons behind the slow pace of progress towards gender equality in higher education, by in-depth analyses of contexts, developments and discourses in fourteen countries and five continents.”

—Liisa Husu, *Senior Professor, Örebro University, Sweden.*

“Progress on the elimination of gender inequality in higher education has been minimal despite herculean efforts by many institutions and governments. This insightful collection of case studies of universities in 14 countries explores how taken-for-granted, ostensibly *bias free* policies and assumptions, continue to stymie progress. The book documents diverse dynamics and discourses that prevent progress on gender equality, for example, definitions of ‘excellence’, biological essentialism bias and assertions of gender neutrality. The volume is a must-read for anyone interested in fairness and justice around gender.”

—Patricia Yancey Martin, *Professor Emerita of Sociology,
and Daisy Parker Flory Distinguished Professor,
Florida State University, United States.*

“This is an engaging and informative book that offers an insightful and comparative analysis of the persistence of gender inequalities in higher education. Edited by two leading feminist scholars, this book documents the challenges women academics continue to face within deeply gendered structures of academic power and privilege. It reminds us all of the work that has been achieved as well as the critical questions that must continue to be asked. A compelling and timely contribution to the field.”

—Professor Tanya Fitzgerald, *University of Western Australia.*

CONTENTS

1	Gender Equality in Higher Education: The Slow Pace of Change	1
	Pat O'Connor and Kate White	
2	Institutionalised Resistance to Gender Equality Initiatives in Swedish and Portuguese Academia	25
	Helen Peterson, Teresa Carvalho, Birgitta Jordansson, and Maria de Lourdes Machado-Taylor	
3	Problematising Excellence as a Legitimizing Discourse	47
	Pat O'Connor and Sarah Barnard	
4	Making the Right Choice: Discourses of Individualised Responsibility in Higher Education	71
	Marcela Linková, Özlem Atay, and Connie Zulu	
5	Whatever Happened to Gender Equality in Australian and New Zealand Universities?	93
	Brigitte Bönisch-Brednich and Kate White	
6	Silencing Women's Voices: An Ethnographic Perspective from India and the UAE	117
	Monica Gallant and Tanuja Agarwala	

7	#MeToo in Professional Associations: Harassment, Gender, and Power	139
	Kathrin Zippel	
8	Re-visiting Gender Equality Policy and the Role of University Top Management	163
	Anke Lipinsky and Angela Wroblewski	
9	Power, Legitimizing Discourses and Institutional Resistance to Gender Equality in Higher Education	187
	Pat O'Connor and Kate White	
	Index	209

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Tanuja Agarwala Faculty of Management Studies, University of Delhi, New Delhi, India

Özlem Atay Department of Management, Faculty of Political Sciences, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey

Sarah Barnard School of Business and Economics, Loughborough University, Loughborough, UK

Brigitte Bönisch-Brednich School of Social and Cultural Studies, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington, New Zealand

Teresa Carvalho Department of Social, Political and Territorial Sciences, University of Aveiro, Aveiro, Portugal

Maria de Lourdes Machado-Taylor Agency for Assessment and Accreditation of Higher Education, Porto, Portugal

Monica Gallant SP Jain School of Global Management, Dubai, United Arab Emirates

Birgitta Jordansson Department of Sociology and Work Science, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

Marcela Linková Institute of Sociology of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic

Anke Lipinsky Center of Excellence Women and Science CEWS, Gesis-Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences, Mannheim, Germany

Pat O'Connor Department of Sociology, University of Limerick, Limerick, and Geary Institute, University College, Dublin, Ireland

Helen Peterson Department of Sociology and Work Science, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden, and Department of Sociology, Örebro University, Örebro, Sweden

Kate White School of Education, Federation University, Ballarat, VIC, Australia

Angela Wroblewski Research Group Higher Education Research, Institute of Advanced Studies, Vienna, Austria

Kathrin Zippel Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Northeastern University, Boston, MA, USA

Connie Zulu School of Professional Studies in Education, North-West University, Mahikeng, South Africa

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	Global ranking of 14 countries and percentage of women among university Heads/Rectors/Presidents/VCs	6
Table 1.2	Women as a percentage of full professors (Grade A) in the 14 countries: 2000, 2010, 2020 (or nearest approximate date for the data)	8
Table 8.1	Potential contributions of sex quotas, empowerment and gender competence in university top management to transform the gendered university culture	180



Gender Equality in Higher Education: The Slow Pace of Change

Pat O'Connor and Kate White

1 INTRODUCTION

This book is about gender equality and inequality in higher education (HE). It is over 20 years since Valian (1998) in her seminal book questioned why women's progress in the professions, including academia, was so slow. The fact that this question still needs to be asked in the context of academia is revealing. Gender equality is widely seen as a human rights issue (EIGE, 2020a; UN, 2020). Assuming a binary concept of gender, the first problem frequently identified is gender parity; that is, that the proportion of powerful positions held by women in the institutional

P. O'Connor (✉)

Department of Sociology, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland

Geary Institute, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland

e-mail: Pat.OConnor@ul.ie

K. White

School of Education, Federation University, Ballarat, VIC, Australia

e-mail: kate.white@federation.edu.au

© The Author(s), under exclusive license to Springer Nature
Switzerland AG 2021

P. O'Connor, K. White (eds.), *Gender, Power and Higher Education
in a Globalised World*, Palgrave Studies in Gender and Education,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-69687-0_1

structures of society (including HE) should be the same as those held by men. This symbolically challenges stereotypes about the gendered enactment of power and its consequences. However, the idea of parity accepts the existing institutional structures. Although it raises important issues, some of which will be discussed in this book, it is a limited perspective.

A distinction is often made between gender parity and gender equality. Gender equality has frequently been depicted as treating everyone the same so as to ensure that they have equal resources such as money, position, power, time and cultural value to shape both their own lives and the society in which they live. However, in an unequal world treating people the same will perpetuate rather than reduce inequality. In order to create real gender equality for women in societal and institutional structures (including HE) which have been created by men for men and which incorporate and normalise a patriarchal dividend (Connell, 2005), it is necessary to transform the structures and cultures of those institutions and to re-imagine gender relations and the taken-for-granted ways of behaving and allocating tasks, power and resources. It is difficult to even envisage what such a world would look like.

It is important to recognise that in some countries (including India and the United Arab Emirates [UAE]; see Chap. 6 in this volume) biological essentialism is taken for granted, with women being regarded as simply different from men and in need of their protection, so that gender equality is effectively irrelevant. In other societies the binary concept of male/female is rejected, and intersex, transgender and other non-binary categories are identified. Thus gender, rather than being a set of characteristics or physical attributes attached to particular sexed bodies, is seen as 'a situated social practice, actualized through social interaction and rooted in the doing and saying of organizational actors' (van den Brink & Benschop, 2012, p. 73). This reflects the idea of individuals 'doing gender' (West & Zimmerman, 1987) regardless of their biological characteristics, in particular interactional situations. Typically, however, the attributes that are culturally valued and rewarded by access to public power, position, cultural value, money and time are enacted by bodies which are male, white, western and middle class (Connell, 2005).

Other bases of inequality such as race, gender orientation, religion, disability and family status have been identified. There has been increasing global awareness of race or ethnicity reflected in global movements such as the # Black Lives Matter. Even yet, in most countries, with notable exceptions such as the United Kingdom (HESA, 2019), there is little published

data on such intersectional characteristics in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) or specifically on black women, although this is a key issue in countries such as South Africa (see Chap. 4 in this volume; also O'Connor, 2011).

HEIs vary cross-nationally in their relationship with the state and the market (Clark, 1986); in their characteristics as single sex or co-educational institutions; as undergraduate and/or postgraduate institutions; as elite, mass or universal in terms of the recruitment of the student cohort (Burrage, 2010); and in their dependence on student fees, particularly from international students. They also differ in their valuation of teaching versus research; in the nature of their internal academic career structures; their gendered horizontal as well as vertical disciplinary patterns at staff and student level; and in awareness of gender inequality as an issue that needs to be tackled.

HEIs overwhelmingly remain male-dominated organisations with masculinist structures, cultures, criteria, procedures and processes (O'Connor, 2020). Both directly and indirectly they play an important part in reflecting and legitimising the patriarchal structures in wider society, and in validating their constructions of valued knowledge and gendered allocation of resources and micropolitical practices (O'Connor et al., 2020). The position of women in such structures, even those at senior level, is fraught with ambiguity (see Chap. 6 in this volume; Fitzgerald, 2018, Fitzgerald & Wilkinson, 2010; Burkinshaw, 2015; O'Connor, 2015). Attempts to transform these structures are resisted internally, directly and indirectly, with the silencing and marginalisation of those who are seen as 'subversive'; and with attempts to co-opt others and promote changes which appear radical but are little more than 'lipstick on the gorilla' (Saunderson, 2002).

Various schemas have been used to differentiate between the levels at which gender inequality operates. They typically include the individual, interactional and organisational as well as systemic and cultural levels (O'Connor et al., 2015; Risman & Davis, 2013). At the individual level, gendered selves are created which are differently valued; at the interactional level, gendered expectations and practices normalise differential access to resources and the informal enactment of power; at the organisational level, gendered structures, cultures, discourses, procedures, criteria and practices legitimate differential access to and valuation of those who occupy hierarchical positions. At the systemic level, the state through funding mechanisms and regulation can inhibit or promote gender and

other intersectional equalities (Ferree, 2008; Yuval-Davies, 2006) through allocating resources differently. The cultural level includes discourses which legitimate such patterns at individual, interactional and organisational levels. Thus, gender inequalities, typically rooted in a valorisation of hegemonic masculinities versus the rest, are embedded at every level.

The European Research Area (EC, 2012) involving 34 countries has defined gender equality success in terms of three pragmatic political goals: firstly, gender equal representation in all fields and hierarchical positions; secondly, the abolition of structural and cultural barriers to women's careers; and thirdly, the integration of a gender dimension in all teaching and research content. These goals envisage breaking down vertical and hierarchical segregation and embedding gender in teaching and research. Gendered change at the organisational level is not only indicated by the presence of women in positions of academic and managerial power, but also by structural and cultural changes that facilitate the transformation of hegemonic male-dominated masculinist structures, culture, procedures and practices. Furthermore, since HEIs are ultimately about knowledge, one would expect to find an attempt to offset the gendering of knowledge in their purpose, their core teaching and research function, and the interests and values of stakeholders. It is widely accepted that progress in creating gender equality in HEIs globally has been slow, despite considerable investment and encouragement by the European Union over the last 25 years (Linková & Mergaert, 2021).

This chapter focuses on the 14 countries which are included in the book—Australia, Austria, Germany, India, Ireland, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, Sweden, the Czech Republic, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom, the United States and Turkey. They comprise the Women in Higher Education Management (WHEM) Network which was established in 2007 as a feminist research consortium with a vision to analyse the challenges for women in university management and to develop strategies that can empower them to apply for and succeed in senior management roles (Bagilhole & White, 2011). The chapter examines the ranking of these 14 countries on the World Economic Forum's (WEF's) Global Gender Gap Index (GGGI) and on a sub-measure which specifically relates to the position of women in power, viz. the Advancement of Women to Leadership Roles (AWLR). It also examines indicators of gender equality in HEIs in these 14 countries; that is, the gender profile of top leadership positions and the proportion of women at professorial level.

The chapter suggests that without organisational transformation, the effect of any intervention is being continuously undermined by processes and practices which are part of the taken-for-granted structure and culture of HEIs and which are underpinned by legitimating discourses.

2 GLOBAL RANKING ON GENDER EQUALITY IN THE 14 COUNTRIES IN THE STUDY

While there are limitations to ranking schemas, they do provide an indicator of a country's commitment to gender equality and facilitate crude international comparisons. We therefore looked at global rankings to examine where the 14 countries in the WHEM Network were positioned. Since only half of the countries are in Europe, the most appropriate global measure of gender equality is the GGGI (WEF, 2020). This overall measure consists of four indices. The first relates to economic participation and opportunity (measured by the difference between men and women's labour force participation rates, estimated male to female earnings and an assessment of wage equality for similar work). The second focuses on educational attainment (measured by the ratio of men to women in primary-, secondary- and tertiary-level education as well as the ratio of male to female literacy rates). The third relates to health and survival (measured by the sex ratio at birth and the gap between men and women's life expectancy), and the fourth to political empowerment (measured by the ratio of men to women in ministerial level positions, in parliament and in national executive office in the last 50 years).

It is clear from Table 1.1 that the countries included in this book vary in their ranking on the GGGI (WEF, 2020). Four of them are in the top ten places (Sweden, New Zealand, Ireland and Germany), three are ranked lower than the 100th position (India, the United Arab Emirates and Turkey) and several are between the 30th and 50th positions (Austria, Portugal and Australia). Surprisingly, the United States is ranked below these at 53rd and the United Kingdom is at 21st, far below the top group. Although this overall measure does provide some indication of gender equality at the national level, it can be skewed by excellent performance on one of these sub-indices (such as health) or strong performance on elements within a sub-index (such as literacy). It also takes into account the position of all women and therefore is affected by

Table 1.1 Global ranking of 14 countries and percentage of women among university Heads/Rectors/Presidents/VCs

<i>WHEM Countries</i>	<i>Ranking on Global Gender Gap Index (GGGI) 2020^a</i>	<i>Advancement of Women to Leadership Roles (AWLR)^a</i>	<i>Proportion of Women among Heads/Rectors/Presidents/VCs: (date of most recent data)^b</i>
Sweden	4th	5.43	48 (2019)
New Zealand	6th	5.24	50 (2020)
Ireland	7th	4.89	0 (2019)
Germany	10th	4.96	15.8 (2017)
South Africa	17th	4.06	15 (2020)
United Kingdom	21th	4.82	29 (2018)
Austria	34th	4.62	27.6 (2017)
Portugal	35th	4.34	22.7 (2017)
Australia	44th	5.14	24.3 (2021)
United States	53rd	5.25	34.3 (2017)
Czech Republic	78th	4.81	6.5 (2017)
India	112th	3.92	17 (2016–17)
United Arab Emirates	120th	5.51	N/A
Turkey	130th	3.63	8.5 (2019–2020)

Sources: ^aWEF, 2020; ^bSweden, SS 2020; New Zealand, UNZ 2020; Ireland, HEA 2020; Germany, Austria, Portugal, Czech Republic, EU 2019; South Africa, Khumalo 2020; UK, HEPI 2018; Australia, UA 2021; United States, ACE 2017; India, NL 2018; UAE, Not Available; Turkey, TCOHE 2019-2020

intersectional inequalities such as those experienced by black women in the United States or in South Africa. Nevertheless, it does locate these countries on an overall gender equality continuum and shows the extent of their variation.

One focus of this book is on the relationship between women and public power and the existence of what Brandser and Sumner (2020, p. 122 and p. 124) referred to as a ‘Medusa’ effect; that is, ‘the sanctioning and stereotyping that take place when women ... enter positions of authority and disrupt the established gender order’ ... ‘alluding to the emblematic status the mythological Medusa has in symbolizing men’s fear of powerful women’. Hence, we looked at the scores of the 14 countries

on the Advancement of Women to Leadership Roles (AWLR), a contextual indicator in the Global Gender Gap Report (2020) assessed on the basis of responses to the question: ‘In your country, to what extent do companies provide women with the same opportunities as men to rise to positions of leadership’. While the data is limited and focuses on leadership in companies rather than HEIs, it is clear that there is considerable variation (see Table 1.1). The high score of the United Arab Emirates is surprising and might reflect positive attitudes to Emiratis who comprise only a minority of the population (see Chap. 6 in this volume). Sweden follows the UAE, with Turkey scoring lowest on this measure among the 14 countries.

Focusing on the seven European countries in the WHEM Network, EIGE’s (2020b) economic power scores produce some similarities, with Sweden having the highest score out of 100 (71.7), followed by the United Kingdom (57.1) then Germany (56.5), Ireland (50) and Portugal (44.9), with Austria (24.4) and the Czech Republic (16.4) at the lower end. It is worth noting that the EU average economic power score is 46.8 out of 100, which could illustrate the strength of the ‘Medusa’ effect in the EU.

There appears to be little relationship between the ranking of the 14 countries on the GGGI and on the AWLR. Some countries such as Sweden and Turkey have broadly similar relative rankings on the two. Others such as Ireland score higher on the GGGI than the AWLR, suggesting less positive attitudes to women in leadership than to more broadly based indicators of gender equality, while the United States scores higher on the AWLR than on the GGGI as an overall measure of gender equality, arguably reflecting the highly individualistic nature of that society. Many of these countries have National Gender Equality Action Plans to promote gender equality (Wroblewski, 2020). While the countries which rank highly on the GGGI tend to be those with plans, there is no clear relationship between the two (e.g. Austria with a national plan has a relatively low ranking). This may indicate that the existence of such plans does not guarantee their effective implementation.

The conclusion from this overview of the rankings of the 14 countries is that they vary both in their scores and in rankings on the GGGI and on the AWLR, with no clear relationship between the two. We now turn to indicators of the position of women in higher education.

3 INDICATORS OF GENDER EQUALITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The most common indicator of gender equality in higher education is the proportion of women in senior academic positions (O'Connor, 2017). Its selection partly suggests its accessibility and attractiveness as a numerical indicator, reflecting the impact of global neo-liberalism and managerialism. However, it also reflects a framing of the problem in terms of gender parity and so fails to problematise Fraser's (2013) misrecognition-related gender inequalities and implicitly limits policy responses to affirmative action, rather than to transformation (Sidelil, 2020).

It is clear that HEIs remain male dominated (see Tables 1.1 and 1.2). Across the EU, men made up 76% of full professors in 2016 (Grade A: Table 1.2) and the proportion of all men at that level was over twice that of women (EU, 2019). Because the most recent EU figures are five years old, where more up-to-date data is available at national level, it is used with implications as regards potential loss of comparability.

Table 1.2 Women as a percentage of full professors (Grade A) in the 14 countries: 2000, 2010, 2020 (or nearest approximate date for the data)

<i>Country</i>	<i>%2000</i>	<i>% 2010</i>	<i>%2020</i>
United States	22.7 (2001)	28.0 (2009)	33.5 (2018)
Turkey	25.5 (2000)	28 (2010)	32 (2020)
South Africa	14.5 (2001)	25.6 (2012)	27.5 (2016)
Australia	16	20	30.1 (2019)
United Kingdom	14.4 (2002/3)	19.8 (2006)	27.4 (2018/9)
Portugal	23.9 (1999)	22 (2009)	26.3 (2016)
New Zealand	12.9	17.5	26.6 (2017)
Sweden	14 (2001)	20 (2009)	29 (2019)
India	18 (2000)	18.5 (2006)	24 (2018/9)
Austria	7 (2000)	17 (2009)	22.7 (2016)
Ireland	7.5 (2000)	19 (2012)	26 (2019)
Germany	8.3 (2001)	15 (2009)	19.4 (2016)
Czech Republic	8.7	13 (2008)	15.4 (2018)
UAE	N/A	10.3	12 (2016)

Sources: **United States:** NCES (2002, 2009, 2018); **Turkey:** EU (2006, 2013), TCOHE (2020); **South Africa:** Boshoff (2005), HEIMS (2016); **Australia:** UA (2015, 2020); **United Kingdom:** HESA (2004, 2019, 2020); **Portugal:** EU (2006, 2013, 2019); **New Zealand:** NZMoE (2019); **Sweden:** EU (2010), SS (2001, 2020); **India:** Singh (2008), Gov of India 2018/9; **Austria:** EU (2004, 2013, 2019); **Ireland:** EU (2004), HEA (2013, 2020); **Germany:** EU (2004, 2013, 2019); **Czech Republic:** EU (2013), Hasova and Oliverius (2018); **UAE:** 2000 N/A—Not available, FCSA (2016)

In New Zealand, drawing on a comprehensive data set, Brower and James (2020) found that a man's odds of being at professor or associate professor level were more than double a woman's among those with a similar research score, age, field and university. And the odds were even higher when attention was focused only at full professorial level. In Irish universities women's 'chances' of accessing a professorship remain much lower than men's (1:13 for women as compared to 1:5 for men) (O'Connor, 2020). Assumptions that this simply reflects women's maternity leave, caring activities or lack of ambition are difficult to sustain in the face of variation in 'chances' in Irish universities, for women from 1:9 to 1:27 while men's 'chances' varied little (1:4 to 1:6) (O'Connor, 2020).

Global processes are increasing the proportion of women professors in HE. It is clear from Table 1.2 that between 2002 and 2016, the proportion of women at full professorial level became more homogenous and increased overall. Although there is still some variation in the proportion of women at full professorial level, there is a good deal of similarity; in eight of the 14 countries the proportion of women at full professorial level around 2020 was between 22% and 29%. However, all 14 countries are below 40% gender representation which can be seen as a minimal definition of gender parity. The pace of change since 2002 as reflected in this indicator has been fastest in Austria, Ireland, Germany, New Zealand and Sweden, where the proportion of women full professors more than doubled over the period, and almost doubled in South Africa, Australia, the United Kingdom and the Czech Republic (Table 1.2). It is striking that in countries such as Turkey, Portugal and the United States, which started at a higher level in 2002 the growth has been more modest, suggesting that increases are not inevitable (O'Connor, 2020).

Since Wenneras and Wold's (1997) classic study, there has been increased awareness that the purportedly gender-neutral discourse of excellence (widely used to legitimate the under-representation of women in senior positions, see Chap. 3 in this volume) is problematic and without a clear definition (Campbell, 2018; Ferretti et al. 2018). There is also bias in evaluation of women's CVs (Moss-Racusin et al., 2012) and recognition of how organisational criteria, procedures and practices effectively discriminate against women. Despite rhetoric about the importance of excellence in a meritocratic system, in some HEIs professorial positions are not publicly advertised, criteria are narrowly defined to suit an

individual (sometimes local) candidate and even where detailed criteria are available, gendered micropolitical practices persist (van den Brink & Benschop, 2011; Nielsen, 2016; O'Connor et al., 2020; O'Connor & O'Hagan, 2016).

The gender profile of top leadership in universities can also be seen as an indicator of gendered change (Wroblewski, 2020). It is clear from Table 1.1 that it varies a great deal; it is highest in New Zealand and lowest in the Czech Republic and Ireland (where the first woman in 428 years was appointed as president/rector on an interim basis in 2020 and within six months three further women were appointed, so that by 2021, 40% of those at presidential/rector level in Irish public universities were women). Reflecting the greater prestige of universities, the proportion of women who are in Rector/President/Vice Chancellor positions across the EU is lower than in HEIs which are not universities (EU, 2019).

Much EU attention has focused on gender parity at full professor and senior management level, particularly in Austria where there has been considerable progress in altering the gender profile of management structures, and some progress at full professor level. It will be shown that this falls far short of institutional transformation (see Chap. 8 in this volume).

Wroblewski (2020) found no relationship between EIGE's (2017) measure of gender equality and the proportion of women at full professor level. Among the 14 countries in the present study, there also appears to be no relationship between the proportion of women who are full professors and that country's rank on the GGGI or AWLR (Tables 1.1 and 1.2). Thus, Turkey's proportion of women professors is high at 32%, but it ranks 130th on the GGGI and is the lowest of the 14 countries on the AWLR.

4 WHY IS THE PACE OF CHANGE SO SLOW? THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Feminist institutionalism is the underlying theoretical perspective for this book (Mackay et al., 2010; Krook and MacKay 2011; Verge et al., 2018). Building on the work of Acker (1990, 2006) on gendered organisations and Connell (1987, 2002) on gender regimes, feminist institutionalism sees gender operating at both the structural and cultural, and formal and informal levels (O'Connor, 2020). Acker (1990) highlighted the gendered nature of organisations and suggested that their processes

create and/or sustain gender segregation within paid work, gendered segregation between paid and unpaid work, gendered income and status inequality, stereotypical cultural images and individual gender identity. Acker (2006, p. 443) described organisational regimes as: ‘loosely inter-related practices, processes, actions and meanings that result in and maintain’ gender inequalities that are themselves ‘gendered processes’ (Acker, 1990, p. 140). They are typically ‘care-less’ (Lynch et al., 2012), premised on paid workers who are unencumbered by caring responsibilities.

In HEIs women appear to have equal rights and privileges in what purports to be a gender-neutral world. The reality is more complex. Each organisation has a particular gender order or ‘gender regime’ involving ‘a set of *relationships*—ways that people, groups and organisations are connected and divided’ (Connell, 2002, p. 53). For Connell (2005) the gender order is a structure that benefits men who have a vested interest in upholding it. Hence, gender inequality is embedded in the structure and culture of organisations and shapes and is shaped by the individuals in it. Feminist institutionalism (Mackay et al., 2010, p. 580) sees gender as an element constituting ‘social relations based upon perceived (socially constructed and culturally variable) differences between women and men, and as a primary way of signifying (and naturalising) relations of power and hierarchy’. Thus, it involves the devaluation of women and of areas of predominantly female employment in HEIs. It is reflected at both a structural and cultural level.

At a structural level it is evident in the under-representation of women in senior positions with men dominating senior posts, and predominantly male areas having better resources, working conditions and access to promotion than predominantly female ones. Such male-dominated areas typically have a higher ratio of senior to junior posts, better staff/student ratios, greater access to research funding, more highly valued research output and are considered more highly skilled and strategic than predominantly female ones (Steinþorsdóttir et al., 2018; White et al., 2011; O’Connor, 2020). While the time-line for accessing permanent positions in HEIs appears gender neutral, it is unhelpful for women as it conflicts with the peak time for bearing and rearing children (Caprile, 2012; HOC Science and Technology Committee, 2014; White, 2014).

At a cultural level it is reflected in the legitimacy of discourses and practices that value men and facilitate their access to top positions. Indeed, the

organisational culture of HEIs frequently reflects the wishes and needs of powerful men, underpinned by gendered discourses which legitimise women's position at lower hierarchical levels (Benschop & Brouns, 2003). Increasingly in HEIs in Western Europe, undergraduate teaching and pastoral care are considered 'housekeeping' (Heijstra et al., 2017), and devalued and disproportionately allocated to women (El-Alayli et al., 2018; O'Meara et al., 2017; Santos & Dang Van Phu, 2019). Frequently this reflects underlying assumptions about women's 'nature' and patronising attitudes about what is best for them (O'Connor, 2015). Activities that are considered high profile and status (e.g. postgraduate teaching and research) tend to be allocated to men. The net effect is that women are less likely to be the 'obvious' next-level person when opportunities for recruitment/promotion appear.

The day-to-day interaction—what Martin (2006, p. 254) called 'the literal *practicing* (sic) of gender that is constituted through interaction'—including through the enactment of informal power or micropolitical practices (O'Connor et al., 2020) also perpetuates gender inequality. Thus, senior managers with influence leverage off their own power and reputation to advance the careers of their (typically male) protégés through sponsorship (De Vries & Binns, 2018; Ibarra et al., 2010). Microaggressions which ultimately impact on women's careers have also been identified, including gendered devaluation (O'Connor et al., 2020) reflected in incivility, denigration, threats, invisibility, condescension, disparagement, ostracism, ridiculing, 'catch 22' evaluations, blaming, withholding key career-related information, and taking unearned credit for others' work and sexual harassment (As, 2004; Miner et al., 2017; Naezer et al., 2019). 'Doubt raisers' such as questioning women's intellectual independence and devaluing their achievements in informal asides have been observed even on Swedish funding boards (Ahlqvist et al., 2013). Schraudner et al.'s (2019) survey of staff at the Max Planck Society found that one in three women had experienced unequal treatment on the basis of gender in the previous 12 months (three times the corresponding number of men)—rising to almost 60% of women in senior leadership (compared with less than 12% of comparable men). Chapter 7 in this volume argues that gender-based violence and harassment exist on a continuum from microaggression to rape and its eradication requires transformation of HEIs and their organisational culture.

Leadership positions are typically seen as gendered ('Think Manager, Think Male': Schein et al., 1996). Such stereotypes create challenges for