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Centre of Gender Excellence
Gendering Excellence – GEXcel

Towards a European Centre of Excellence in Transnational and Transdisciplinary Studies of:

- Changing Gender Relations
- Intersectionalities
- Embodiment

Nina Lykke,
Linköping University, Director of GEXcel

In 2006, the Swedish Research Council granted 20 million SEK to set up a Centre of Gender Excellence at the inter-university Institute of Thematic Gender Studies, Linköping University and Örebro University, for the period 2007–2011. Linköping University has added five million SEK as matching funds, while Örebro University has added three million SEK as matching funds.

The following is a short presentation of the excellence centre. For more information contact: Scientific Director of GEXcel, Professor Nina Lykke (ninly@tema.liu.se); GEXcel Research Coordinator, Dr. Silje Lundgren (coordinator@genderexcel.org); GEXcel Research Coordinator, Dr. Gunnel Karlsson (gunnel.karlsson@oru.se); Dr. Sofia Strid (sofia.strid@oru.se); or Manager, Gender Studies, Linköping, Berit Starkman (berst@tema.liu.se).
Institutional basis of GEXcel

Institute of Thematic Gender Studies, Linköping University and Örebro University

The institute is a collaboration between:
Department of Gender Studies, Linköping University;
Gender and Medicine, Linköping University
&
Centre for Feminist Social Studies, Örebro University;
Gender Studies, Örebro University

GEXcel board and lead-team

– a transdisciplinary team of Gender Studies professors:

• Professor Nina Lykke, Linköping University (Director) – Gender and Culture; background: Literary Studies
• Professor Anita Göransson, Linköping University – Gender, Organisation and Economic Change; background: Economic History
• Professor Jeff Hearn, Linköping University – Critical Studies of Men and Masculinities; background: Sociology and Organisation Studies
• Professor Liisa Husu, Örebro University – Gender Studies with a Social Science profile; background: Sociology
• Professor Emerita Anna G. Jónasdóttir, Örebro University – Gender Studies with a Social Science profile; background: Political Science, Social and Political Theory
• Professor Barbro Wijma, Linköping University – Gender and Medicine; background: Medicine
• Associate Professor Katarina Swahnberg – Gender and Medicine; background: Medicine

International advisory board

• Professor Karen Barad, University of California, St. Cruz, USA
• Professor Rosi Braidotti, University of Utrecht, The Netherlands
• Professor Raewyn Connell, University of Sydney, Australia
• Professor Emerita Kathleen B. Jones, San Diego State University, USA
• Professor Elżbieta Oleksy, University of Lodz, Poland
• Professor Berit Schei, Norwegian University of Technology, Trondheim, Norway
• Professor Birte Siim, University of Aalborg, Denmark
Aims of GEXcel

1) To set up a temporary (five year) Centre of Gender Excellence (Gendering EXcellence: GEXcel) in order to develop innovative research on changing gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment from transnational and transdisciplinary perspectives.

2) To become a pilot or developmental scheme for a more permanent Sweden-based European Collegium for Advanced Transnational and Transdisciplinary Gender Studies (CATSgender).

A core activity of GEXcel 2007–2011

A core activity is a visiting fellows programme, organised to attract excellent senior researchers and promising younger scholars from Sweden and abroad and from many disciplinary backgrounds. The visiting fellows are taken in after application and a peer-reviewed evaluation process of the applications; a number of top scholars within the field are also invited to be part of GEXcel’s research teams. GEXcel’s visiting fellows receive grants from one week to 12 months to stay at GEXcel to do research together with the permanent staff of six Gender Studies professors and other relevant local staff.

The Fellowship Programme is concentrated on annually shifting thematic foci. We select and construct shifting research groups, consisting of excellent researchers of different academic generations (professors, post doctoral scholars, doctoral students) to carry out new research on specified research themes within the overall frame of changing gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment.

Brief definition of overall research theme of GEXcel

The overall theme of GEXcel research is defined as transnational and transdisciplinary studies of changing gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment. We have chosen a broad and inclusive frame in order to attract a diversity of excellent scholars from different disciplines, countries and academic generations, but specificity and focus are also given high priority and ensured via annually shifting thematic foci.

The overall keywords of the (long!) title are chosen in order to indicate currently pressing theoretical and methodological challenges of gender research to be addressed by GEXcel research:

–By the keyword ‘transnational’ we underline that GEXcel research should contribute to a systematic transnationalizing of research on gender relations, intersectionalities and embodiment, and, in so doing, develop a reflexive stance vis-à-vis transnational travelling of ideas, theories
and concepts, and consciously try to overcome reductive one-country focused research as well as pseudo-universalising research that unreflect-
edly takes, for example ‘Western’ or ‘Scandinavian’ models as norm.
– By the keyword ‘changing’ we aim at underlining that it, in a world of rapidly changing social, cultural, economic and technical relations, is crucial to be able to theorise change, and that this is of particular impor-
tance for critical gender research due to its liberatory aims and inherent focus on macro, meso and micro level transformations.
– By the keyword ‘gender relations’, we aim at underlining that we define gender not as an essence, but as a relational, plural and shifting process, and that it is the aim of GEXcel research to contribute to a fur-
ther understanding of this process.
– By the keyword ‘intersectionalities’, we stress that a continuous re-
fection on meanings of intersectionalities in gender research should be integrated in all GEXcel research. In particular, we will emphasise four different aspects: a) intersectionality as intersections of disciplines and main areas (humanities, social sciences and medical and natural scienc-
es); b) intersectionality as intersections between macro, meso and micro level social analyses; c) intersectionality as intersections between social categories and power differentials organised around categories such as gender, ethnicity, race, class, sexuality, age, nationality, profession, dis/ ablebodiedness ); d) intersectionality as intersections between major dif-
ferent branches of feminist theorising (for example, queer feminist theo-
rising, Marxist feminist theorising, postcolonial feminist theorising etc.).
– Finally, by the keyword ‘embodiment’, we aim at emphasising yet another kind of intersectionality, which has proved crucial in current gender research – to explore intersections between discourse and materi-
ality and between sex and gender.

Specific research themes of GEXcel
The research at GEXcel focuses on a variety of themes. The research themes are the following:

Theme 1: Gender, Sexuality and Global Change
On interactions of gender and sexuality in a global perspective.
Headed by Anna G. Jónasdóttir.

Theme 2: Deconstructing the Hegemony of Men and Masculinities
On ways to critically analyse constructions of the social category ‘men’.
Headed by Jeff Hearn.
Theme 3: Distinctions and Authorisation
On meanings of gender, class, and ethnicity in constructions of elites.
Headed by Anita Göransson.

Themes 4 and 5: Sexual Health, Embodiment and Empowerment
On new synergies between different kinds of feminist researchers’ (e.g. philosophers’ and medical doctors’) approaches to the sexed body.
Headed by Nina Lykke (Theme 5) and Barbro Wijma (Theme 4).

Theme 6: Power Shifts and New Divisions in Society, Work and University
On the specificities of new central power bases, such as immaterial production and the rule of knowledge.
Headed by Anita Göransson.

Themes 7 and 8: Teaching Normcritical Sex – Getting Rid of Violence. TRANSdisciplinary, TRANSnational and TRANSformative Feminist Dialogues on Embodiment, Emotions and Ethics
On the struggles and synergies of socio-cultural and medical perspectives taking place in the three arenas sex education, critical sexology and violence.
Headed by Nina Lykke (Theme 8) and Barbro Wijma (Theme 7).

Theme 9: Gendered Sexualed Transnationalisations, Deconstructing the Dominant: Transforming men, ‘centres’ and knowledge/policy/practice.
On various gendered, sexualed, intersectional, embodied, transnational processes, in relation to contemporary and potential changes in power relations.
Headed by Jeff Hearn.

Theme 10: Love in Our Time – a Question for Feminism
On the recent and growing interest in love as a subject for serious social and political theory among both non-feminist and feminist scholars.
Headed by Anna G. Jónasdóttir.

Themes 11 and 12) Gender Paradoxes in Changing Academic and Scientific Organisation(s).
Theme on gender paradoxes in how academic and scientific organisations are changing and being changed.
Headed by Liisa Husu.
In addition, three cross-cutting research themes will also be organised:

a) Exploring Socio-technical Models for Combining Virtual and Physical Co-Presence while doing joint Gender Research;
b) Organising a European Excellence Centre – Exploring Models;
c) Theories and Methodologies in Transnational and Transdisciplinary Studies of Gender Relations, Intersectionalities and Embodiment.

The thematically organised research groups are chaired by GEXcel’s core staff of six Gender Studies professors, who together make up a transdisciplinary team, covering the humanities, the social sciences and medicine.

**Ambitions and visions**

The fellowship programme of GEXcel is created with the central purpose to create transnational and transdisciplinary research teams that will have the opportunity to work together for a certain time – long enough to do joint research, do joint publications, produce joint international research applications and do other joint activities such as organising international conferences.

We will build on our extensive international networks to promote the idea of a permanent European institute for advanced and excellent gender research – and in collaboration with other actors seek to make this idea reality, for example, organisations such as AOIFE, the SOCRATES-funded network Athena and WISE, who jointly are preparing for a professional Gender Studies organisation in Europe.

We also hope that collaboration within Sweden will sustain the long-term goals of making a difference both in Sweden and abroad.

We consider GEXcel to be a pilot or developmental scheme for a more long-term European centre of gender excellence, i.e. for an institute- or collegium-like structure dedicated to advanced, transnational and transdisciplinary gender research, research training and education in advanced Gender Studies (GEXcel Collegium).

Leading international institutes for advanced study such as the Centre for the Study of Democracy at the University of California Irvine, and in Sweden The Swedish Collegium for Advanced Studies (SCAS at Uppsala University) have proved to be attractive environments and creative meeting places where top scholars in various fields from all over the world, and from different generations, have found time for reflective work and for meeting and generating new, innovative research. We would like to explore how this kind of academic structures that have
proved very productive in terms of advancing excellence and high level, internationally important and recognised research within other areas of study, can unleash new potentials of gender research and initiate a new level of excellence within the area. The idea is, however not just to take an existing academic form for unfolding of excellence potentials and fill it with excellent gender research. Understood as a developmental/pilot scheme for the GEXcel Collegium, GEXcel should build on inspirations from the mentioned units for advanced studies, but also further explore and assess what feminist excellence means in terms of both contents and form/structure.

We want to rework the advanced research collegium model on a feminist basis, including thorough critical reflections on meanings of gender excellence. What does it mean to gender excellence? How can we do it in even more excellent and feminist innovative ways?
Editors’ Foreword

This volume includes papers presented at the International GEXcel Conference *Gender Paradoxes in Academic and Scientific Organisation(s): Change, Excellence and Interventions*, Örebro University, 20–21 October 2011.

The report is structured in three parts, which overlap with the three conference workshops: 1) Change, 2) Excellence and 3) Interventions.

The report is of a work-in-progress character, and the papers presented here are to be elaborated further. The reader should also be aware that due to the fact that this is a report of working papers, the language of the papers contributed by non-native English speakers has not been specifically edited.
Introduction
Gender Paradoxes In Academic And Scientific Organisation(s): Change, Excellence And Interventions

Liisa Husu

How are academia, science and scientific organisations changing and being changed in Sweden, Europe and globally, and how are these changes related to gender?

Seen from a historical perspective, it becomes evident that feminism has changed academia, science, and academic and scientific organisations (Schiebinger 1999). However, current views on changes in gender relations in academia and science frequently appear as contradictory, claiming a persistent male dominance on the one hand, or an emerging new imbalance in women’s favour on the other. Recent European gender and science statistics demonstrate how women continue to be a minority of European researchers in higher education, the business sector and in governmental research, and how the gatekeepers shaping the research agenda, and the heads of universities and research institutions are overwhelmingly male (EC 2009a, 2009b). Paradoxically, we are simultaneously warned that women are about to ‘take over the universities’ (see Husu 2005; Quinn 2003; Morley 2011).

Academic and scientific organisations are key sites of societal, academic and scientific knowledge production. These sites, as well as the nature of much academic and scientific work, have experienced rapid changes in recent decades. Such changes include: globalisation and increasing internationalisation of institutions, policies and academic and scientific work; rapid technological change; new forms of governance and increased accountability; new stratifications of institutions and professions with increased emphasis on competition, excellence and top performance and; and prioritising STEM fields in research policy. These changes are increasingly shaping the contexts of academic and scientific work, careers, organisations and knowledge production, nationally, regionally and globally.

Despite such rapid changes, it can be argued that it is rather a lack of change that characterises the gender patterns in many, even most, academic and scientific organisations and settings. Gender patterns in academia and science have been shown to be highly persistent and resistant
to change, regardless of cultural setting. Horizontal, vertical and even contractual gender segregations continue to characterise the academic and scientific labour force. Men continue to be over-represented among the gatekeepers who set the academic and research agendas. Workplace cultures, networks and interactions in academic and scientific organisations continue to show highly gendered patterns (see Currie et al 2002; EC 2009b; ETAN 2000; Eveline 2004; Hearn 2004; Husu 2001, 2005, 2007; Husu et al 2010; Husu and Koskinen 2010; Leemann and Stutz 2010; Morley 2007; Pellert and Gindl 2007; Riegraf et al 2010; Sagaria 2007; Siemienska and Zimmer 2007; Van den Brink 2010).

This wide range of gender inequalities remains so despite the fact that the recruitment pool to academia and research has been rather heavily feminised/feminising in several fields, such as medicine, and despite a wide variety of interventions aimed at changing academia and science towards greater gender balance and gender awareness. The evidence accumulated on the dynamics of gender equality interventions in academia and scientific organisations, and the experiences of different change agents, show significant organisational gender inertia and various forms of resistance, implicit and explicit, against attempts of changing the asymmetric gender order (see Blanplain and Numhauser-Henning 2006; EC 2008a; Fogelberg et al 1999; Higher Education in Europe 2000; Morley 1999, 2005; Müller 2007; Pincus 2002; Riegraf et al 2010).

Indeed, promoting gender equality in academia and scientific research is currently strongly on the agenda of various major stakeholders, nationally and internationally. This has occurred in:

- Universities (see, for example, Fogelberg et al 1999; MIT 1999; Higher Education in Europe 2000; LERU 2012);
- National research councils and major funding organisations (see Husu et al 2010; NSF 2007; EC 2009b);
- Leading science journals such as Nature and Science (see Barres 2006; Bhattacharjee 2007; Nature 1999, 2009, 2013; Stevenson 1997); and

Gender paradoxes in how academic and scientific organisations are changing, and are being changed, have been the main focus in GEXcel research themes 11 and 12. Science is here understood in its wider meaning, as in the German term ‘Wissenschaft’ or the Swedish ‘vetenskap’, including all disciplinary areas, and referring not only to natural sciences.
Changes constituted both by long-term macro trends and by more immediate policy interventions are of interest here. Many changes seemingly appear as non-gendered, or are represented as such. GEXcel research themes 11 and 12 interrogate the gender dimensions and gender impacts of both these sets of changes on academic and scientific organisations, on academic and scientific work, and knowledge production.

The GEXcel research themes 11–12 were addressed by three subthemes, which are partially overlapping:

(a) **The paradox of change**: How can we understand the contradiction between rapid ‘non-gendered’ changes, on the one hand, and the widely observed gender inertia or lack of change in gender relations in academic and scientific organisations, on the other? In what ways are various seemingly ‘non-gendered’ change processes gendered, such as globalisation, technological changes (see, for example, *Journal of Technology, Management and Innovation*, 2010), or changes and ‘reforms’ in governance? What is the role of various gatekeepers and gatekeeping processes and practices in promoting, facilitating, or blocking and preventing change towards more gender equal academic and scientific organisations?

(b) **The paradox of excellence**: What kind of gendering processes can be observed in new and emerging stratifications of academic and scientific organisations, disciplines and professions? What kind of gender impacts can be discerned in the design, implementation and developments of different initiatives and programmes bearing the ‘excellence’ label in different national and organisational contexts? In what ways are the policies and actions promoting excellence, and promoting gender equality perceived and presented as contradictory?

(c) **The paradox of interventions**: How can we understand the contradiction of long-term gender equality promotion in academic and scientific organisations in many cultural settings, and the slow change in gender relations in academia and science? Can gender equality interventions inadvertently enhance inequalities and how? What kind of contradictions and resistance do gender equality change agents experience in science and academia? How to analyse the gender dynamics and impacts of seemingly non-gendered interventions such as reforms in appointment, evaluation, funding or salary systems?

All in all fifteen GEXcel Visiting Scholars from nine countries were invited to spend a visiting period from a few weeks up to four months in GEXcel at Örebro University during Spring and Autumn 2011, to work on their research, interact intensively with other GEXcel Scholars around the GEXcel research themes 11–12, to give and receive collegial feedback, and discuss and develop potential future collaborations.
The Visiting Scholar positions for the doctoral students and postdoctoral researchers were internationally advertised, and the Scholars were selected in competition and by peer review to pursue their research projects related to the theme. The selected Visiting Scholars were Dr. Marieke Van den Brink (Radboud University Nijmegen, Netherlands), Dr. Jennifer de Vries (University of Western Australia, Australia), Professor Heike Kahler (Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich, Germany), Dr. Mia Liinason (Lund University, Sweden), Dr. Paula Mählck (Stockholm University, Sweden), Irina Nikiforova (Georgia Institute of Technology, USA), Dr. Maria do Mar Pereira (London School of Economics, United Kingdom, and Universidade Aberta, Portugal), Dr. Helen Peterson (Linköping University, Sweden), Helene Schiffbänker (University of Vienna, and Joanneum Research, Austria), Monica Wirz (University of Cambridge, United Kingdom), and Dr. Angela Wroblewski (Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna; University of Vienna; Vienna University of Economics and Business, Austria). Three of the Visiting Scholars were selected as doctoral students: Irina Nikiforova, Helene Schiffbänker and Monica Wirz, and two of them, Nikiforova and Schiffbänker, have subsequently obtained their Ph.D. Four scholars were invited as Senior GEXcel scholars to Örebro: directrice de recherche Suzanne de Cheveigné, CNRS, Centre Norbert Elias, France; Professor emerita Jan Currie, Murdoch University, Australia; Professor Louise Morley, Sussex University, United Kingdom, and Professor Teresa Rees, Cardiff University, Wales. In addition to working on their own research the senior Scholars provided advice and individual mentoring and coaching to the junior scholars. The composition of the group of Visiting Scholars enabled ongoing in-depth international comparisons between regions, countries, institutions, career systems and welfare regimes.

The topics of the GEXcel 11–12 scholars research projects covered a wide range of approaches and issues related to theme 11–12: from science and research policy to leadership, management and career advancement, from analysis and reflections on gender equality interventions and gender equality change agents to exploring the paradoxes of the status of gender studies in different cultural settings.

A major event of GEXcel theme 11–12 was the international conference Gender Paradoxes in Academic and Scientific Organisation(s): Change, Excellence and Interventions that took place at Örebro university on October 20–21, 2011. The conference gathered 60 participants from thirteen countries, including all fifteen GEXcel theme 11–12 scholars. GEXcel scholar Professor Louise Morley delivered the keynote presentation and most other GEXcel 11–12 scholars were involved in the plenary panel discussions around key conference themes. All in all 30 pa-
pers were presented in three parallel sessions, addressing the paradoxes of change, excellence and interventions from a multitude of perspectives and national and organisational contexts, demonstrating the wide and vital interest in this research area internationally. The programme of the conference and of parallel sessions, the list of abstracts as well as the list of affiliations of the contributors can be found as appendixes in this publication.

This volume includes thirteen papers presented in the conference by junior and senior scholars from eight countries. All fifteen GEXcel 11–12 scholars also presented their work-in-progress in the conference; these work-in-progress papers are published in two other volumes in this series, all available also online on the GEXcel website (see Strid and Husu 2013; Strid, Husu and Gunnarsson 2012). The contributions in this volume, which were presented in the three parallel conference sessions on Change, Excellence and Interventions, mainly draw from various European contexts. Geographical contexts less explored in international research literature on gender in academia and science are highlighted by Kifayat Aghayeva who discusses the state of the art for women in academia and science in contemporary Azerbaijan, and by Yemisrach Negash Mengstie, who critically reviews the university senate legislation in Ethiopia from a gender perspective.

The other papers from the Change sessions in this volume discuss the Bologna process which initiated a large reform of the European universities, and its implications on the politics of knowledge, applying Italian feminist theory (Federica Giardini); Swedish academic vs. industrial research environments from a Ph.D. and gender perspective (Minna Salminen-Karlsson); and gendered initiation of students into the male-dominated field of engineering in Sweden (Gunilla Carstensen).

The papers on Excellence in this volume explore the gender aspects of the criteria of a Swiss National Science Foundation excellence funding instrument called Junior Professors (Farinaz Fassa and Sabine Kradolfer); gendered conditions in gaining academic excellence in the entrepreneurial university in the German and Austrian context (Kristina Binner and Lena Weber); uncertainty evoked by gender mainstreaming approaches applied in a Swedish research excellence centre (Anna Fogelberg Eriksson, Linda Schultz and Elisabet Sundin); role of gender in the impact assessments in research funding in European funding organisations (Inger Jonsson); and agency in institutionalisation of feminist pedagogy in Finland (Kirsti Lempiäinen).

The papers on Intervention in this volume discuss structural reforms in terms of Equality Action Plans in European universities (Evanthia Smith); the above mentioned Mengstie paper on Ethiopian university
legislation; the resistance encountered by feminist scholars engaged in gender equality work in Sweden (Anna Wahl and Charlotte Holgersson); and professionalisation of gender equality actors in German higher education (Andrea Löther and Linda Vollmer).

The papers amply demonstrate the importance to continue theoretically and empirically interrogating the gendered dimensions and impacts of on-going changes on different scientific and academic arenas, and comparing results and insights transnationally. Gender scholars need to continue their critical assessments of the implementation of the “excellence” label in different academic and scientific settings, and to assess the impacts of recent governance reforms, specifically those inspired by new public management, on gender relations and gender inequalities in academia. Several inspiring examples for further research in this direction are included in this volume.

References


Part I: Change
University and globalisation. 
Some reflections in political theory 

As many aspects of our lives, the institutional ones too are deeply involved in the processes gathered under the general concept of globalisation. Looking at the changes in University requires the analysis on the largest scale.

Globalisation entails an abrupt transformation of sovereignty, the foundational and final form of our political systems. Globalisation, as the process of progressive interdependence – if not integration – of the different economies of the world, affects the very fundamental elements of our citizenship, especially the role played by the State on a bordered space, the Nation. In fact, the end of both the Modern couples State-nation and State-society affects the realm of citizenship, especially the legitimating Contract establishing the circuit obligations-rights (Sassen 1996 and 2006; Butler, Spivak 2007). Among these we find the progressive social right to education, but also the specific relationship that, since the Nineteenth century, has been connecting State and University (Der-rida 2001).

Today Europe has to be considered a region of the globalised world, that is to say a space looking for an inner ‘harmonisation’ within a larger framework of transformations. This is the point of the conceptual map where we can find the new and peculiar European institutions – no more national and statual ones – such as the European Higher Education Area.

In 1999 the so-called ‘Bologna process’ – started in 1999 with the signing of the Bologna Declaration by the Education Ministers from 29 European countries – initiated a large reform of the European Universities, developing the different Conventions on ‘Equivalence of Diplomas’, on ‘Equivalence of Periods of Study’ and on the ‘Academic Recognition of Qualifications’ (Bologna Process official website). On the inner side, the purpose of the Bologna Process was the creation of a European Higher Education Area by making standards more compa-
rable and compatible throughout Europe, fostering students’ mobility and employability through the introduction of a homogenous system based on undergraduate and postgraduate studies with easily readable programmes and degrees. On the outer side, the Bologna Process was meant to strengthen the competitiveness and attractiveness of the European higher education in respect to other regions. The undergraduate/postgraduate degree structure was then modified into a three-cycle system, and further outlined following some ‘qualifications frameworks’ and ‘learning outcomes’. In fact, it was meant to ensure the promotion of qualifications with regard to the job market.

The rationale for the Bologna Framework was thus to provide a mechanism to relate national frameworks to each other, that is:

International recognition of qualifications (...) will be assisted through a framework which provides a common understanding of the outcomes represented by qualifications for the purposes of employment and access to continuing education (Bologna Process website).

The key elements of this overarching framework can be best understood by reference to internationally acceptable descriptors, the so-called ‘Dublin descriptors’ (see below).

The crisis, a crisis of measure

It is easy to see that the key used to achieve the ‘harmonisation’ between different educational cultures and histories, has been ‘standardisation’, a quantitative criterion.

In fact, this is a specific case of the more general crisis of sovereignty and the related conceptions of citizenship. In this very recent period, we are all aware that Europe is lacking of a political dimension – we do not have a new institutional form for Europe, substituting the state’s sovereignty – and that, instead, economical institutions are providing for decisions. This is true for Europe – the European Central Bank (ECB) decides about the relationships among the European partners and about the domestic policies, as for example in the dramatic case of Greece –, but it is also true worldwide: financial institutions like Moody’s or transnational yet financial institutions as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are the effective agents of general and specific policies.

The OECD standards

Let’s come to the specific area of education. The European institution giving the ‘glances’ on education in each partner country is the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). The name
of this European institution – the council of OECD, vesting the decision-making power, is made up of one representative per member country – is signifying itself, as it points out that cooperation is conceived on an economical ground. Its history is even more clarifying: its birth goes back to Europe after World War II, in 1947, when the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) was established to run the US-financed Marshall Plan for reconstruction, recognising the interdependence of the economies of the individual governments.

OECD is now 50 years old. Here is an excerpt from its self-presentation:

In today’s globalised, interdependent world, multilateral co-operation is more important than ever.

(...) our mission is to promote policies that will improve the economic and social wellbeing of people around the world (...) we work with governments to examine what drives economic, social and environmental change. We produce high-quality internationally comparable data and indicators and develop key statistics used to understand the economy. We measure productivity and global flows of trade and investment. We analyse and compare data to predict future trends. We track dynamics of growth and development at the international scale, at countries’ and at the regional level. We set international standards on all sorts of things, from the safety of chemicals and nuclear power plants to the quality of cucumbers. We compare how school systems are (OECD 2011a).

OECD experts’ vocation is to produce comparable data and indicators, to develop key statistics to understand the economy, measure productivity, and set standards on ‘all sorts of things’ and, moreover, these are intended to establish effective processes for ensuring their implementation. We could stop here. There is enough, and shortly expressed too, to understand the final philosophy by which the European university has been dealt with: according to standards that are fit to measure all sorts of things, from school to cucumbers.

Let’s go closer. Which are these standards? The OECD itself formulates the standards, the authority expressing from year to year the ‘value’ of each country’s educational system. In ‘Education at Glance 2011’ OECD gives the state of each country according to the following indicators:

- Indicator A4: To which fields of education are students attracted?
- Indicator A7: How does educational attainment affect participation in the labour market? (An indicator on labour market outcomes of students from vocational and academic programmes).
• Indicator A8: What are the **earnings premiums** from education?
• Indicator A9: What are the **incentives to invest** in education? (OECD 2011b).

The **quantitative relation between input and output is thus fundamental** and it affects both students’ academic experience and academia itself, as the public funding is distributed – since 2008 – according to the attained level in production (how many graduated students? How many products – articles as well as symposia?).

Public funding is thus going to decrease for the majority of public universities that will have to increase the students’ fees. The economical weight insisting on families is corrected by the introduction of a ‘loan’ that the student – once occupied in the labour market – will pay back to the State. Many Italian academics have underscored that the loan mechanism will have a backward effect on the attractiveness of the different fields of education: the student will choose the one giving the more opportunities to find a job and to pay back the loan (Sylos Labini 2011). Thus another main point is coming out: **studying has become a dependent variable of labour market**.

As I will examine in the next paragraphs, this dependency deeply affects not only the students’ choice, but also the professors’ conception of what they are teaching, especially in Humanities.

**The Dublin descriptors**

The Dublin descriptors were developed by a group of European higher education specialists, and cover all three cycles. Not only must they accommodate a wide range of disciplines and profiles but they must also accommodate, as far as possible, the national variations in how qualifications have been developed and specified. Qualification descriptors are usually designed to be read as general statements of the typical achievement of learners who have been awarded a qualification on successful completion of a cycle.

Qualifications that signify completion of the higher education short cycle (within or linked to the first cycle) are awarded to students who:

• have demonstrated knowledge and understanding in a field of study (...) such knowledge provides an underpinning for a field of work or vocation, personal development, and further studies to complete the first cycle;

• can apply their knowledge and understanding in **occupational contexts**;

• have the ability to identify and use data to formulate responses to **well-defined concrete and abstract problems**;
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• can communicate about their understanding, skills and activities, with peers, supervisors and clients;

Qualifications that signify completion of the first cycle are awarded to students who:

• have the ability to gather and interpret relevant data (usually within their field of study) to inform judgements that include 
  reflection on relevant social, scientific or ethical issues;

Qualifications that signify completion of the third cycle are awarded to students who:

• can be expected to be able to promote, within academic and professional contexts, technological, social or cultural advancement in a knowledge based society (Appendix, Bologna Process website).

The European Higher Education Area works for integration by the means of standardisation and the creation of a general framework by which mobility can be achieved. Mobility is one of the fundamental rights of citizenship. But, because of the peculiar origins of the idea of Europe, citizen’s mobility has been shaped according not to a political conception of it, but to an economical principle: citizens can move as long as they circulate as goods do. Moreover, as goods enter in the exchange system through a general equivalent – money – so citizens will enter in the exchange system by being standardised.

It appears quite clearly that market is the model for European citizenship in education.

Human sciences? Practical knowledge/professional skill versus embodied theory

Knowledge is thus redefined in relation to the keyword ‘skill’: its value is strictly depending on the achievement of practical abilities and these practical abilities are tested according to the demands of the labour market. Reading again these descriptors and indicators, and finding that they also stress the achievement of a more general education making students able to judge on social and ethical issues, I realised that – as it always happen with general norms – part of the responsibility on the style of the application of these criteria is due to the content of the norms themselves, but part of it is due to the interpretation given by each State (Cover 1993).

Going thus back to what has been said at the beginning of this paper, we can see that the general criteria related to quantity and market, privileged as the main mean to realise the integration, are not a necessity, nor
due to an objective cause, but are the result of a political choice. On a large scale, measurement by standards is easier to grasp and to manage.

The effects of this choice are under our eyes everyday. Politics in education is no more conceived as a political issue endowed to the State, but as a matter of multilevel governance, that is to say, a management issue, optimising the questions at stake as they emerge from one time to another. As the contingency of contexts is quite disturbing, there has been an effort to foresee the behaviours of the agents by the means of statistics. Thus a fair distribution of opportunities in education is fostered through standard procedures.

Students’ intelligence is not considered as a living process, but is measured as a quantity one can test in a due moment; time is reduced to the measurable time of production and its value is dependent on productivity; therefore Humanities – I haven’t stressed yet that the whole reform of the three cycles is conceived on the base of the hard sciences model – are less valuable disciplines as they are scarcely classifiable on the base of their production and outcomes relating to a specific professional profile; and, finally, each single university is valued and sustained on the only base of its capacity of ‘producing’ graduates fit for the labour market.

The very challenge is thus another conception of measure – as long as in a globalisation era the traditional ones, State, national culture, traditional ethics, rights, etc., do not fit anymore – a new conception of the principles regulating the relationships and the exchanges: among different cultures, among different educational programs, among State and citizens, among the different realms of the living together, school, university, society, labour market, market itself. In these last decades we have been living under the mainstreaming ideology of neoliberal democracy: freedom and rights are accomplished through the exchanges conceived as market dynamics. In education this can be called ‘the pedagogy of the Capital’ (De Vita 2003).

Women and higher education

Facing this European and worldwide process – that is, the direction or the political response given to a need for change – we have also to consider the historical period, within the women’s social expansion, in which it is taking place.

The long ending of the modern conception of university and academic studies – university as the space where to reproduce the elites – was firstly initiated by the social and students’ movements in the late Sixties. Italian analysts see the result of these struggles in ‘the democratization of university itself and of its functions’ and, connected to this, the raise of a less triumphal ‘mass university’ (Grasiosi 2010). In those decades
(1970–1990) we lived a double-sided phenomenon: on the one hand, the ‘feminisation of university’ – that is, the massive entrance of women to the higher levels of education both as students and teachers – and on the other hand, the ‘feminist critique of the academia’ – that is the impressive multidisciplinary literature, claiming for and enacting an epistemological and institutional change of the contents and of the organisation of the academic knowledge. The general principle of this claim was both to reveal the biases of the disciplines and to connect knowledge to the lives and experiences of the subjects involved in teaching, studying and researching processes (Scott 1986). In Europe and in the Anglo-Saxon area this process led to the creation of Women’s/Gender studies departments, while in Italy things went in a quite different way.

The non-case of women’s studies in Italy

Imposed from the above, accepted quite passively by the academic establishment, welcomed with mixed feelings by the ones who were not persuaded by the idea of an institutionalisation of feminist politics and knowledge (Di Cori and Barazzetti 2011: 15), Gender studies took a long time to enter in the universities and never saw a real accomplishment. The fact is that in Italy – like in France but for different reasons – there has been a strong attitude against ‘representative/institutional politics’ for women (Cigarini 1995). The leading idea was that women do not have to be represented as such, as a social group or any equivalent, but that they are the bearers of a ‘difference’ affecting any level of knowledge and of social organisation. Therefore, women are due not to ask for a share in the existing academic order – such as Gender/Women’s studies departments –, but rather they have to ask and foster a change at the very core of each academic discipline, method and situation.

The outstanding subject of this conception has been the philosophical community ‘Diotima’ at the University of Verona, who started to revision topics and approaches.

Being a sexuate subject entails ‘another way of entering into relation with oneself, with the world, with the other(s)’ (Irigaray 2004: XII). In teaching, specifically, this has meant to me that sexual difference is an approach rather than a topic: one does not teach sexual difference, she teaches starting from it and showing it. This new position – that affects the very sense of the relation to oneself: who am I? I am the one represented? With which other words can I tell the story I am coming from? – affects the relation to others, to students. As it has been stressed, the peculiarity of Italian feminism resides in its dual nature, namely its mobile position between theory and practice, academic research and politics (Pravadelli 2010: 61).
Gendered difference in a globalised education

Since their very beginning, Feminist, Women’s and Gender studies have fostered a ‘situated knowledge’ (Harding 1991; Haraway 1991). In Italy this was called ‘thinking experience’ (IAPh 2006; Buttarelli and Giardini 2008). Can we welcome the University reform as an answer to this inspiration (Despret and Stengers 2011; Alvanoudi 2009)?

The contemporary situation in academia is double sided, at least.

a. The idea of a sexuate – that is both historical (gendered) and material(embodied) – knowledge has been largely accepted, but the implications of sexuation have been reduced to the practical and functional dimensions of knowledge.

b. The idea that university is no more a closed and elitist male citadel is definitely accepted, but opening to the changes in society addresses society as the equivalent of market exchanges, according to the neoliberal conception of democracy and politics.

Thus the ‘pedagogy of the Capital’ perverts an event many women welcomed as liberation and fairness: the opportunity of studies keeping together life and knowledge. The fall of the walls of the Academic citadel hasn’t meant an addition of life and citizenship, but an addition of market.

At the same time we, in the Western countries, can see the radical change that has affected the social (and political) discourse on gender differences in respect of the original feminist inspiration. Italy is especially relevant in order to perceive the contradictory aspects of contemporary times, showing what Braidotti calls a ‘proliferating discourse on reified difference’ (Braidotti 2005).

a. Women are once again the topic of public interest and knowledge as far as they are victims. This can be a good thing for public opinion, but scarcely for the academic situation, unless one becomes the expert of the disgraceful situation of the others (see the rising of such a discipline as ‘victimology’).

b. In a strange short circuit the Pope and the IMF are happy to recognise women’s difference, but as the ones preserving the social order (‘feminine genius’ in family, love, care and relationships, women repairing the human mess after wars, women as peace builders).

c. In the specific horizon of the new model of market enterprise, Maurizio Ferrera, Italian professor in Economics at the private university ‘Bocconi’ in Milan, has written Il fattore D, (The W(women) factor, Ferrera 2008): women are a resource for the economic – that in the views of the author is synonymous of social – development of a country. Women are welcome as the perfect subjects in the neoliberal order: more ambitious, less claiming and more enthusiastic, relationally
skilled, flexible and multitasking. (A critical reading of this situation interpreted as a progress for feminist politics is provided in Power 2009).

Some options within this frame

Going back to the worldwide changes in higher education with its relations to social changes, we thus come to some clearer options.

Sexuate subjects in academia can:

- defend the part they gained in the Seventies-Nineties decades. Nevertheless in a period of reified/functionalised difference, Women’s and Gender studies are less attractive; students looking for critical knowledge turn towards the Queer studies, as more innovative, promising and descriptive of the current loss of identities.

- foster and accompany the ‘skill oriented knowledge’, a betrayal, as we have seen, of the more general principle of a connection between knowledge and life, knowledge and citizenship. Moreover, this leads to the downgrading of ‘non useful knowledge’, that is to say, non productive ones, in respect of the useful ones, the disciplines supporting management issues.

Or, and this is the point for a new approach and struggle, in order to empower the original feminist inspiration:

- foster the connection between university and society by the idea that higher education is a democratic value and a principle directly relating not to labour market or market, but to citizenship.

What does this mean in practical terms?

La universidad fértil, ‘institutions of the common’ and politics of translation

In order to develop an analysis, a distinction has to be made between the practical and the generative dimension of knowledge. If the former responds to the criterion of professionalisation, the latter responds to the criterion of citizenship. Knowledge is a matter of embodied intelligence, embodied in relations; it is a matter of biopolitics rather than a matter of becoming a citizen-worker, as the Twentieth century was conceiving it. This statement can be transformed in some foundational questions:

- To whom are we teaching?

- In which order of discourse are we writing and making research? Is it for the labour market, or is it in the wider horizon of becoming citizens?
Can the social actors be plainly identified with workers?

How do we put in question the relation between knowledge and the social realm?

Italian Feminist Theory – all along with what has been recently defined ‘Italian Theory’ (Esposito 2009; Negri and Hardt 2010; Negri 2011) – offers some clues to reconsider the relations between knowledge and its agents, knowledge and participative politics, knowledge and its institutional forms.

*Education and biopolitics*

If the whole range of living experience is concerned with democracy, if we have to conceive anew what democracy is, if university is no more a citadel of knowledge, separated from society, then we have to reformulate what education is. Education has to be placed in the larger frame of what I call ‘cosmopolitics’, that is the dis/order of relations among human and non human beings. As we have seen lately, claims for democracy – from the *Indignados* to the *Arab spring* and the students movements – are not defending a past conception of social rights, they do ask for a new conception of what a worthy life is. Water, green power as well as education are the very first needs for each human being (Giardini 2009).

University has then to conceive itself in its ‘fertility’ (Piussi and Arnaus 2010), according to the ways in which it is responding to this new consciousness, this new conception of human needs and of new ways in living together (Raparelli 2010).

In order to enact this change in function, sexuate subjects in university have to put in question their relation to what they are teaching and studying: and this questioning concerns the hard as well as the human sciences. As politics is no longer an institutional matter, but a biopolitical one, how are we relating to and conceiving the contents of our disciplines? As I explained above, the answer cannot reside in a change of topics only, but in a change of attitude, of what is showed while teaching and studying. The capability in resituating oneself and the topics according to the social/political requests is crucial.

Moreover, the one teaching has to listen to the urgencies of the ones attending university courses. This happened to me when I was asked to cooperate with students in their ‘self- formation’ seminars, where the topics are decided by politically aware students, putting forward their own peculiar need of knowledge according to the problems they are confronted with.
Streets, squares and theatres beyond University

But not only. The one teaching has to care about the connection with extra academic places where knowledge is asked for.

As ‘enterprise university’ is producing market oriented courses, the need for a truly social knowledge finds less and less satisfaction. This can have a depressive effect. I have in mind the double fetishism about ‘utility’ and ‘objectivity’, represented by the new title of a degree in ‘Sciences of tourism’ – ‘tourism’ being the useful knowledge, and ‘sciences’ granting its ‘objective’, serious (in the Foucaltian sense) disciplinary status. What will be the fate of your cheerful, fuzzy Italian holidays in the hands of a ‘scientist of tourism’? Does a tourist operator need to attend university in order to achieve that skill? And, in fact, the educational office of Confindustria (the Entrepreneurs Italian Association) is deciding to invest not in University but in Professional Schools – more precisely, this was the plan before the unemployment rate among younger attained 35%, a kind of Nemesis for the University conceiving itself as related to labour market.

But a different reaction is at hand if one connects to the places where social knowledge is demanded and generated.

The example I can present concerns the most ancient theatre in Rome who was due to close because of public funding cuts. The theatre has been occupied since June 2011. The young people, mainly artists, who occupied it at first weren’t especially aware in politics, rather they were moved by the consciousness that culture is a ‘common good’, a non-marketable value (Teatro Valle 2012). When they started discussing together, the first question that aroused was that their language, the words they used, were colonised by the mainstreaming imaginary: merit, productivity, efficiency, value, and so on. They then decided to start some seminars in which they could make the double work of deconstructing and enrooting the words in their concrete experience.

I was invited to direct this common work. I think it happened for two reasons: because I have learnt from feminism that ‘useful’ knowledge has to do with its power to express the singular experience – ‘starting from oneself’ (Diotima 1996) is the Italian version of the practice in the consciousness rising groups – and because the possible differential in knowledge I can have is not played in a leader/professor mode, but according to the practice of ‘autorità’ (authority), that is the relational capacity of augmenting the shared intelligence (Arendt 1954; Diotima 1995). Last but not least, this kind of demands leads right back to the original inspiration of feminism: a peculiar way of keeping together knowledge and politics.
I want to add a more scholarly consideration. University as an institution is not eternal, although very ancient. What happened to knowledge before its establishment? Generation and transmission of it took place in ‘Schools’, gathering around religious centres, in the medieval times, or in bigger cities (Riché and Verger 2006). Shouldn’t we look for and recognise these extra University spaces, where knowledge, the one we value, is demanded nowadays?

Higher research sites
Another effect of the new model of the ‘enterprise university’ is that research is somehow separated from university itself: according to the Dublin parameters it may concern the very last cycle of higher education. Moreover, research is valuable as long as it produces results which are mainly outcomes for the market. This may function for the hard sciences – although many protests were made against the idea that basic scientific research must directly produce goods – but what about the so-called human sciences? If we follow these criteria, maybe the only productive knowledge will come from the social sciences – and in fact that is the case, according to the disappearance of such disciplines like Philosophy in the European Research Council Sectors – whose results and reports can be used as tools for the management of statistical populations.

Here too I can draw a counter example from the IAPh-Italia website we founded in 2010 – the website originated from the IAPh Symposium held in Rome in July 2006, see www.iaphitalia.org. Women of different generations are cooperating in order to provide tools for studying, researching but also for information. This work entails a consistent update of what is generated in academic and non-academic spaces. There is thus a high flexibility according not to the University curricula, but to the social questions at stake in public debates and researches.

The younger women came to work on the website because of a first experience of study and research for their academic degree. Because of the connections with extra academic spaces of knowledge, they are now agents of researches on contemporary issues, such as work, sexuality, etc. They are ‘politically’ active, though with a strong intellectual and theoretical preparation (DWF 2010, 2011 and Diversamenteoccupate).

Of course, funding for this kind of researches is a main problem. We are working at a cross fundraising – university, local institutions, EC, research foundations – so to maintain the independence of the urgencies we are focusing on. Nevertheless these young women started to take jobs, and this fact points out another question to confront with.

In a ‘life long learning society’ what happens to the time for learning, when precarity leaves no time for doing anything else than looking for a
job? During our research on the experience of work we thus connected with the debates and campaigns for Basic Income (Bin-italia.org; Pateman 2004).

I can tell that, while transmission of sexuate knowledge at the University can be the first step, the core of this transmission happens in the middle of the everyday social life.

**Transdisciplinarity and politics of translation by narration**

Finally, we have seen that the interaction among differences, in a globalised world and education, has been promoted through standardisation. On this point Feminist/Gender/Women’s studies have a lot to teach. All of us have worked on the questions arising from difference(s), and we never concluded for a quantitative solution. Rather, we know a lot about what can be called ‘politics of translation’. Translation is a relational practice involving both different subjects and different languages/codes. The principle is, as Chakrabarty puts it:

> starting from what appears to be incommensurable, translation generates (...) precisely that partly opaque relation that we call difference (Chakrabarty 2007).

Difference is thus the capability of communicating beyond the idol of immediate and total transparency and commensurability. What does this mean in teaching and research?

It would mean that a student going abroad will not have to find the same topics she finds in her own university, but she will have to narrate to her new pals and to a teacher the questions she is working on or studying.

It would mean that we can work together starting from an experience rising from an urgency or a theoretical question. As an example: what means having/being/treating a ‘hormonal body’? One will have to narrate the triggering experience: using the pill, using psychic drugs, undergoing a hormonal treatment in a transsexual process...

Thus narration appears to be the practice by which we can achieve communication and mobility in education and knowledge (Young 1996), without recurring to quantitative criteria and standardisation.

Sexuate subjects – connected in a genealogy to the epistemological and political radical change enacted by feminism – know that life has measures that the market does not know. It is an ancient knowledge, endowed to the ones who have some proximity with (mindful)bodies and their needs. We have both to learn from non Western countries – who were able to contest the GDP (gross domestic product) as a measure of the wealth of a country and to propose the idea of measuring the social
wellbeing of a country as the effective wealth – and we have to enact again what feminism once knew so well: *culture and its means are fully implied in the suffering and the pleasure of our bodies, in their re/generation.*

**References**


Bologna Process (no date) http://www.ehea.info/


Bin-italia.org (Basic Income Network Italia).


Diversamenteoccupate.blogspot.com

DWF (2010) Diversamente occupate; Lavoro se e solo se (Differently occupied; Work. If and only if), nn. 1 and 2.

DWF (2011) Questo sesso che non è il sesso (This sex which is not the sex), nn. 1 and 2


IAPh -Internationale Assoziation der Philosphinnen, www.iaph-philoi.org

IAPh Italia – www.iaphitalia.org


Negri, A. (no date) The Italian Difference (www.iaphitalia.org)


Sylos Labini, F. (no year) www.ilfattoquotidiano.it


Chapter 2
Choosing Between Academy and Industry. Industrial PhDs and Their Supervisors Speak About Gendered Research Environments

Minna Salminen-Karlsson

Introduction

In several countries PhD education or part of it is undergoing a change and becoming not only a professional education for future academics, but something that one should be able to use in certain positions outside the academy as well. In Australia there are Cooperative Research Centres (Harman 2002), in Great Britain as well as in the USA the interest of private industry in cooperating with universities in PhD education is increasing (Garcia-Quevedo, Mas-Verdú and Polo-Otero 2012; Gemme and Gingras 2004; Slaughter et al 2002), and in Sweden there are a number of industrial research schools, where the PhD students are expected to spend a number of their work hours at an industrial company, doing their thesis on a problem relevant for the company and benefiting the company along the way (Schild and Hanberger 2000).

However, the increased production of new PhDs has also created new concerns. An increased number of academics but less increase in research funds implies that more and more academics are competing about the available research money. The labour market for PhDs outside the academy is opening up. Research intensive industries have always employed PhDs, but in the face of international competition even other industries are employing PhDs. This has led to concerns about too many excellent researchers leaving the academy. In particular, female PhDs leaving the academia has been a concern (Hanström 2000; Huismann, de Weert and Bartelse 2002; Kulis, Sicotte and Collins 2002; Mason, Gouden and Frasch 2009).

This paper is based on a study which asks how female industrial PhD students, with experience from both academic and industrial setting, view these as sites for making a career, and how these settings are discursively created by their seniors.
Previous research

Comparisons between the academia and industry as working environments for researchers have become more interesting in the last decade, because of the increasing cooperation and traffic between these two environments.

When it comes to the often fundamental decision of choosing a path after acquiring a PhD, it can be noted that especially industrial PhD students are prone to leave the academy (Harman 2002; Falkenberg 2003; Gemme and Gingras 2004). Gemme and Gingras assume that industrial PhD students have a different attitude towards the academy from the beginning, while Harman observes that what they learn about the academy during their PhD study, such as the working situation of their professors, contributes to their disinterest in academic careers.

When it comes to Scandinavian studies, Falkenberg (2003) agrees with Harman and finds that this is even truer for women than for men. She studied a university department in business economics and found that women to a higher degree than men moved to the industry after getting their PhD degrees. There were both push and pull factors, which were gender specific. Aspects that were pulling women to the industry were a perception that industry suited their interests and abilities, that the status was better, and the salary as well. Jobs in the industry were also expected to be more exciting and challenging. Aspects that were pushing women away from the academy were the feeling that the department did not offer them satisfactory social relations, that their research area was not valued in the departmental context, and that the organisation was dominated by men and by masculine values. The women felt that they did not fit in the kind of selfishness, rationality and performance orientation that were prevailing in the academic culture.

Hanström (2000) made a questionnaire study of the career patterns of male and female PhDs from the Swedish Royal Institute of Technology (KTH). There were both similarities and differences in women’s and men’s experiences of the academic and the industrial environments. The main reasons for those who had started in industry were an expectation of a better work environment and salary. Especially the women had felt a lack of interest and support at their department, they complained about the salary and about the temporary contracts. The men did not state motivations for their decisions as clearly. They more often just answered that they were tired of the academy and wanted a change. Several of the men also said that they had moved for family reasons and found a job in industry in connection with that – which indicates that they would otherwise have continued in the academy.
In general, in the studies from Scandinavia family reasons do not emerge as important for pushing PhD’s out from the academy, even if they are important in an international perspective (Godfroy-Genin 2009; Mayer and Tikka 2008). In Hanström’s (2000) study having children was not a major problem among the Swedish PhD students. She found that the problem of having a family is primarily connected to making a post doc abroad. In her study both women and men wished that doing a post doc abroad would be less important for one’s subsequent academic career.

In earlier studies based on interviews with senior representatives in the academia in Sweden, the reasons for women’s scarcity on the higher levels of academia were most often told to lie with the women themselves: lack of motivation, lack of self-confidence, not knowing the strategies of advance, not adapting to the competitive environment, prioritising family, having other values (Hultman 1995; Iversen 1996). The senior representatives in the academy often lament the fact that there were so few women, at the same time as they conserve the normative masculinity, by comparing women to the ordinary masculine norm (Barata and Hunjan et al 2005). In Scandinavia the official rhetoric of the academy puts emphasis on the importance of increasing the percentage of women in higher levels, as they are said to enrich the academic environment with their viewpoints. Aas (1997) points out that that if university departments want to have these ‘female qualities’, trying to achieve a balance in numbers is not sufficient, but the departments must also work in encouraging and enhancing such qualities long before a numerical balance has been reached. When research on gender in academia now points at problems in the academic environment rather than the women themselves (for example, Husu 2001; Bagilhole 2002; Gender and excellence in the making 2004; Hearn 2005; Riegraf 2010), this discourse of the deficient women is seen as one of the problems in the academic environment.

Sample and method

This article is based on an interview study of 23 Swedish industrial PhD students, 11 women and 12 men. They were attached to three industrial research schools: one in bioinformatics, one in building and indoor environment and one in management. These research schools were grounded to provide graduate education in cooperation with industry, with financial sponsoring from industrial companies, and thesis work with a connection to company interests (Schild and Hanberger 2000). The graduate students were supposed to share their time between the university department and the company, even if did not work that way for all of
them. However, most of them did experience both an industrial and an academic environment during their graduate study. Thus, it could be expected that their views on both industry and academy had experiential background.

The sample was formed by first choosing three different industrial research schools. From every school we chose four female and four male students – in spite of the fact that male students were a majority in all the three research schools. The 17 academic and 14 industrial supervisors of these students were also interviewed. One of the academic supervisors and three of the industrial supervisors were women.

The interviews were conducted by one or another of two interviewers. They covered several areas of interest, for example cooperation between industry and academy, PhD supervision, being a member in two intellectual communities and the concept of knowledge. But even the future careers of the PhD students were discussed, as well as gender issues at the workplace.

The most common way of starting to discuss gender issues in the environment was a question about the numerical gender balance and then a question about whether the imbalance had any consequences. The answers of the male PhD students were often short, and they were sometimes probed to reflect on the situation. The gender issue was introduced the same way when interviewing the supervisors. They were also asked whether there were differences in supervising women and men. There were even other occasions when the interviewees commented on gender – for example when the supervisors were commenting on individual PhD students or when the female PhD students were describing their career plans or themselves as PhD students.

**Push and pull factors in choosing a career after PhD**

The backgrounds of the PhD students varied. Some had had a long career at a company before starting on a PhD program. Others were recruited directly after their undergraduate education. As to the decision to move from the academy to the industry, basically those who had not made a career yet were interesting. There were 7 such women and 8 such men among the PhD students interviewed. The PhD students in the research school for management (3 women and 4 men) as well as one of the women in the research school for building and indoor environment, all had made careers at their companies, and thus, their situation was different. However, even if they were not in a situation of choice themselves, their comments on the two alternatives completed the picture on how PhD students view the academy as an employer.
The women were more definite in their plans, and it was not difficult to find out in which environment they wanted to continue after their PhD. The men were much more indefinite and more open to both options. The women seemed to be more aware of the importance of career planning and had reflected more on their options after the PhD.

While the choice of staying in the academy followed naturally from the research interests of the two female PhD students, several reasons for change were given by those who preferred industry instead. There were factors that were pulling them towards the industry, and others which were pushing them away from the academy. The pull factors were the wish to do something concrete and useful (confirming the findings of Trojer & Guldbransen 1996). The wish to have more cooperation with one’s colleagues was another pull factor. The low salary level was also given as a reason by the female PhD students to move over to industry. (The male industrial PhD students in this study did not comment on the salary level. In Hanström’s (2000) study the salary level in the academy was a concern for both women and men).

There were a number of push factors, which were commented on by the female PhD students. Some of them were explicit: the need to do a post doc, the need to raise money for one’s research and the difficulty of climbing the academic hierarchy. Issues of combining work and family were not stated directly as push factors, but were touched upon when discussing, for example, the post doc, and were elaborated on when discussing the academic environment in general.

The need of doing a post doc abroad after the PhD was commented as a problem by several of the women:

But I’m not the type who wants to continue in the academic world. If it’s hard to get a job and if I find an interesting project as a post doc, but I’m a bit too much of a home loving person to be willing to cross the Atlantic, and when you have a baby I don’t think the grandparents would like that, and I wouldn’t, either. (Female PhD student)

Those women who wanted to stay in the academy commented on doing a post doc, but in positive terms. Getting a chance to be acquainted with research at another laboratory and making contacts was perceived as an opportunity by these two women, while it was a problem to the others. One of men also declared that he did not find it possible to move abroad. Thus, the requirement of moving as a natural part of one’s career was one important aspect which turned the eyes of particularly female students away from the academy. This is also in accordance with the results of Hanström (2000) and Ackers (2004).
The need of raising research money for one’s subsistence was another important problem. In Sweden there is no tenure track system, and the scarcity of research funds means that for a foreseeable future a new PhD will be employed on temporary contracts, which are dependent on the future inflow of research money. In Hanström’s (2000) study 61% of the women but only 37% of the men at the Royal Institute of technology mentioned this as a disadvantage in their work situation. Even among the industrial PhD students in this study, the women but not the men criticised the insecurity of the situation and the press of finding money as a game that they were not willing to play. The fact that the male PhD students had no comments on that matter is somewhat surprising, as they are affected by the system as well. It seems that, in general, they expect things to straighten themselves out.

One more aspect that was commented on by the female students was the academic hierarchy and the difficulty of climbing it as a woman. ‘It is not easy for men or women, and so I think it’s even more difficult for women,’ as one of the interviewees said. The female PhD students were conscious of these problems already during their PhD study, and it is possible that this partly was a result of their being able to compare the academic and industrial environments.

The picture of career conscious women and more undecided men is contrary to the general assumption about differences between the sexes, and previous research gives few clues to understanding it. One reason might be that as women had realised that the environment for their PhD study was not what they were looking for on a permanent basis, they already had started to think and plan their careers. But the difference may also be due to the group of women and the group of men not being quite comparable: There was one woman but five men who had been asked to stay and do a PhD directly after their undergraduate study. This indicates that the women had been more goal-oriented already when entering the PhD study. In the interviews many of the women confirmed that they had been active in seeking a PhD position. The men who had been recruited by their supervisors had not made great efforts themselves. If they expected the future to uncover itself in positive terms without previous planning, they had some experiential background for this attitude.

Combining research and family – a general problem

Family issues can be seen as a push factor, even if they often were not directly referred to when discussing the choice situation. Apart from the one very academically oriented female PhD student who did not think a child would be a problem for travelling abroad or in any other way, the female PhD students expected industry to be a more convenient place for
combining work and family. It was expressed very clearly by a female PhD student who had made a career in industry:

One thing I can say spontaneously, now that I’m standing with one foot in each, it is about parental leave. I mean, that’s not a problem at [my company]. Both mothers and fathers take leave, and most of them seem to share the time. So, we have many fathers who stay at home for a long time, so to say. I noticed that here, when I started on this program, so to say, it will be difficult for me to combine with a family. […] There’s one woman who had a baby during this program. And poor [name] who had, who had her newborn with her when she was defending her thesis. You cannot really say that she has had a leave, she has had no leave at all. […] So at [the company] it has been no problem at all, even if you’ve changed bosses or so, to take a leave, to combine it with a family. (Female PhD student)

The possibilities of combining research and family were also discussed with the academic supervisors. In their statements, having children was most often described as problematic. One of the two academic supervisors who were positive to PhD students in his group probably soon starting to become parents, still seemed to regard research as most important, and children being acceptable as long as they did not disturb the scientific work.

They don’t get children during their time as PhD students? That is quite usual. Many of them threaten to do that right now. We had lots of marriages, they got married one after the other last summer, so I suspect that some of them are going to have children in the near future, and I have absolutely nothing against that. I think that’s quite OK. But I haven’t experienced that yet. No. O, yes, I experienced that for many years ago, and it worked out just fine. It was [name and description of a person] who was my PhD student, and she actually got a baby, and there were no problems at all with it. I hardly remember it. She must have got the child while she was a PhD student. It is possible that we have to furnish some kind of kindergarten here at the department in a year or so. But right now we don’t have any.

Most academic supervisors saw the fact than women have children during the PhD study as problematic. If the woman did not time her birth-giving well, it disrupted the planned PhD process. The structure of academic work was seen as given, and the problem that it did not go well with being a parent was only to be lamented.

This study cannot answer the question whether industry actually is a more family-friendly environment for future researchers, but it does show that female PhD students who have experiences from both environments perceive industrial research environments to be better in this
respect. The senior representatives in the academic environment in general tend to find the junior members’ family responsibilities as problematic, but can offer no solutions to this.

**Supervisors’ perceptions of gender issues in the different environments**

There were differences in how academic and industrial supervisors discussed gender issues in the interviews. A fundamental difference was seeing those issues as individual or structural.

Some of the industrial supervisors had an academic career behind them and could compare industry and academy, while the academic supervisors did not comment on industry. In general, the industrial supervisors perceived industry as being more gender equal than academia. This can partly be due to some personal bias: as the industrial supervisors had changed careers from academy to industry, it can be regarded as quite natural that they considered industry to be superior to academia.

Different expressions stating ‘there may be gender issues which I do not notice’ only emerged in the interviews with the industrial supervisors. When asked whether there were any problems related to gender at their workplace they usually said that there were none, or that they had not noticed any. But some of them also said that they could not be sure. This was different from the attitude and discussions of the supervisors (and male PhD) students in the academy.

> It is possible that if you talked with one of the two women who are here now, they would have lots of opinions about [gender issues], but that is nothing I think of. I have not lived with the issue the same way as I suppose they do, being a minority. Of course I want to believe that there are no big differences, but I cannot really say that….// I hope and I believe that there would not be too awful stories if somebody came to this department and asked. Apart from the few women who work here we have had some female students doing their degree work here during the years, and I have supervised some of them. My experience is that it has worked well, as well as with the male degree students. My experience is that they have been able to help themselves and be included in the activities. But as I said, there is always a risk that you see more when you are directly affected by the problems.  

(Industrial supervisor)

Being critical one could say that if it can be suspected that there might be gender issues at the department, they should be taken up to the open, and that this kind of statements actually show a gender blindness which is problematic for women employees. But compared with the academy
the attitude of these industrial supervisors is a step forward: in recognising that there might be gender issues they were much closer to accepting the possibility of bringing them out to the open.

In general, academic supervisors verified that women in higher levels of the hierarchy are scarce. However, this was not attributed to cultural or structural gender problems in the environment. A striking example is one academic supervisor who refers to the famous article of Wennerås and Wold (1997) about gender bias in the allocation of research funds by the Swedish medical research foundation. The study shows that the allocation of research funds was gender biased, but the supervisor is reluctant to believe that. According to the supervisor, the working methods of research foundations disfavour men as well:

> The study showed two things. For the first that men were favoured and for the second that one’s pals were favoured. And when they write about comraderie, I think they are quite right, that has, unlucky, a strong influence in the scientific world. Devastatingly great influence. Being pals, keeping somebody in high esteem and such. You choose your mates and your mate’s mates and if there’s somebody, you mention that person to be polite and kind and so. I believe a lot of that is happening all around. But I do not think that there’s some kind of overall conspiracy, so that the gentlemen who sit and evaluate proposals would give higher points to other gentlemen. I cannot exclude the possibility, but I would not, I can honestly say, do such a thing. (Academic supervisor)

The traditional academic collegiality is individual-based, and thus, problems also tend to be individualised: an issue embedded in the organisational structure itself gets perceived as a ‘conspiracy’ of some individuals towards others. The idea of gender issues being something special, a ‘conspiracy’, makes it difficult to see gender aspects in ordinary institutional practices, and a male supervisor who knows that he is not part of any conspiracy can easily shrug off any responsibility for sustaining gender structures. This attitude has also been found in industry (Acker 1990; Collinson and Hearn 1996; Gherardi 1995). However, in this study the industrial supervisors could more easily see gender as one organisational issue among others. Their probably better training in thinking in organisational terms might account for this.

Conclusions

To conclude, the female PhD students in this group were much more reflective about their future careers than the men. They were very clear about why they did not want to stay in the academy, the main reasons
being the insecure employment situation, the competition for research money and the perceived difficulty of climbing the academic ladder as a woman. Difficulties in combining academic research and family life also contributed to their decision. Their male peers were more undecided. They generally often regarded their current academic environment as good and a future in the academy as a natural choice.

Universities fit quite well the description of Kvande and Rasmussen (1994) of male-dominated organisations (even if they are writing about industry). If the organisation is one where older men hand over their positions to the younger generation of men, who compete for them and make alliances, and where women are more or less outside this power play, it is understandable that the younger women have to make other kinds of strategic decisions than the younger men. It seems that the industrial PhD students in this study have an implicit understanding of these conditions.

From the interviews with supervisors in both the academic and industrial spheres, it can be concluded that there seem to be differences that may make the academy a difficult place for these women to make a career. One fundamental difference, which can be seen as an indicator of more deep laying cultural differences between the academy and industry, is the awareness of structural gender issues. In the academy, gender issues are discussed more on an individual basis and the balance in numbers is often seen as a decisive factor. The organisational culture in the academy puts great emphasis on individual freedom and individual relationships. Thus, structural gender issues, as well as other structural issues, become more difficult to see. In industry, leadership training and professionalism in organisational issues is more common for those who hold managerial positions, which may give them a different outlook on structural issues in the organisation, of which gender may or may not be one.

The same pattern as in the earlier studies about female and male PhD students’ career expectations and career requirements emerges even in this study. The impression that experience from industry increases the interest for a career in industry also holds for this group (indicating the question whether part of the reason for some PhD students to plan an academic career is that they do not know enough about the advantages of the alternative). The gender pattern in the future plans of the PhD students is not very different from earlier studies either, except for the fact that the women were more decided in their plans than the men. In the light of this study it is no wonder why female PhD students plan to leave the academy. Rather, it would be interesting to make a deeper investigation into the reasons of the male PhD students for staying.
In this study, not only the PhD students but also the senior members of their academic and industrial communities were interviewed, which gave some further enlightenment to the gender issues in the contexts which the PhD students discussed from their perspectives. In those interviews the academy emerged as a rigid context, where the preparedness of make use of women’s competence in the same terms as men’s competence, was smaller than in industry.

The sample of interviewees in this study is small, and thus the study serves mainly as an indicator of features of the academic culture that should be studied and preferably compared to other cultures in other research organisations in greater depth. But if the differences between goal-oriented women wanting to leave the academy and undecided men seeing the academy as a comfortable workplace can be seen even in a larger material, they pose interesting questions about the future research force in the academy. Facing this future image, gender equality reforms in the academy might have something to learn from industrial organisations.
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Chapter 3
Tradition and Equality in Engineering. An Analysis of Initiation Rites, Male Dominance and Change in Academia

Gunilla Carstensen

The problem
The aim of this article is to explore how the reception of one engineering program at a Swedish university both reinforces and challenges traditional gender orders. The article indicates that it is possible to analyse the reception as a reproducer of gender stereotypes, as well as an alternative way of un-doing gender (cf. Pullen and Knights 2007; Powell et al 2009; Van den Brink and Benschop 2012).

The article draws on the idea of hegemonic masculinity where engineering (professionally and educationally) salutes masculine ideals (in the understanding of Connell 1995; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). The rites by which individuals are initiated are viewed in the frame of hegemonic masculinity, which is the basic gender structure of the field.

Academia is characterised by traditions and rituals. These differ between universities and countries, but a common feature is that they are attributed importance in academic life. At several Swedish universities, initiation rites are a mandatory part of commencing studies, particularly within STEM (Science, technology, engineering and mathematics). In those fields, ‘rites of passage’ provide students with knowledge on standards and norms; the initiation serves the purpose to make the students aware of which courses of behaviour it is important to adopt and which courses they are supposed to refrain from.

Since the relative number of women is characterised by a persistent under-representation in these disciplines, it is of great importance to analyse initiation from a gender perspective. Submitting initiation rites in the field of STEM to the analysis, may not only shed light on the causes of the small number of women in this field, but also why this number, despite attempts to increase it, is decreasing (Schiebinger 2010). From this perspective, the reception weeks is a potential instrument for keeping and attracting women in the field of engineering, turning the negative trend. The rituals performed as part of the initiation have the effect
of strengthening the group of ‘engineers’, as a whole, within as well as outside of the academic society.

Feminists have been busy to bring about gender equality in organisations (Ferguson 1984; Acker 1992; Ainsworth et al 2010). This has also been an important political issue with different instruments such as equal representation and gender quotas. Beginning some decades ago, there is an explicit movement for change in academia, away from traditional ideals of hierarchy, discipline and difference, towards ideals of equality and inclusiveness.

Thus academia seems to be squeezed between two opposing sets of values: while disposed to maintain the traditional academic value structure, it also has to adapt to the requirements of modern society and its explicit demand for equality. Despite efforts to ascertain women’s participation in academia on equal terms, academic life, perhaps particularly in the field of natural sciences, is still characterised by a significant degree of gender inequality (Demaiter et al 2009; Gill et al 2008; Rhoton 2011).

In this article I draw upon qualitative interviews with 7 engineering students (5 women and 2 men) who participated in the organisation of the reception 2008 at Uppsala University. During two weeks new engineering students are welcomed into the community of engineering culture by senior students. The reception is as a dramaturgical play with 20 individuals (senior engineering students) acting according to a ‘script’; for instance they may have to act that they come from outer space with a mission to teach the freshmen ‘to have fun’. Every role in this drama has a specific character and outfit regarding clothes, hair-style and make-up. Some attributes are shared by all acting senior students, like sunglasses, black capes and strange voices. The senior students play different games with the group of beginners and they make some practical jokes. Thus, they organise the reception and perform it as a drama. Since the senior students are outnumbered by the new students (20 individuals to 600), it is important that they are in control of the situations that occur during the reception.

Method and design

The study is based on 7 semi-structured interviews, 5 women and 2 men, who participated in the organisation of the reception at a university in Sweden 2008. The participants were senior students between 20 and 25 years of age, some of them were midway through their education and some of them studied the final year at the engineering program. The interviews lasted for 1–1½ hours and were tape-recorded, transcribed and analysed according to a hermeneutic approach often used in qualitative research (Haavind 2000; Bryman 2008). The transcribed interviews
were treated as texts where the analysis focuses on the relations between the parts and the whole (Alvesson and Sköldberg 2000).

In addition to the interviews, I also carried out observations. These were made during the reception. Due to ethical reasons I have chosen not to explicitly process and analyse the observations. Still, the observations provided greater insight and understanding of the phenomenon and constituted important points of reference in the interviews.

The aim of the article is to map the dominant themes from the interviews and relate them to a wider context of gender equality in academia.

Theorising gender and engineering

The theoretical point of departure is a doing-gender-perspective on gender, academia and engineering (West and Zimmerman 1987; Connell 1995; Gherardi 1994; Korvajärvi 1998, 2003). In her classical article ‘Hierarchies, jobs and bodies’, Joan Acker (1990) claims that organisations are gendered, not gender neutral, although there is a dominant assumption or image that organisations are run by meritocratic ideals. In fact, Acker, among many feminists, argues that these ideals are linked to images of a male worker:

...the abstract worker is actually a man, and it is the man’s body, its sexuality, minimal responsibility in procreation, and conventional control of emotions that pervades work and organisational processes (Acker 1990: 152).

From a doing-gender perspective it is stressed that gender is an integral part of the processes of organisations, not an isolated part. Therefore hierarchies and gender are intertwined and established simultaneously (Acker 1990; Gherardi 1994).

The profession of engineering has been analysed as a position of power and associated with a specific hegemonic masculinity which tends to be enforced through a frame of reference between masculinity and technology (cf. Schiebinger 2010). R. W. Connell who first introduced the concept (1995) defines hegemonic masculinity as ‘the configuration of gender practice which embodies the currently accepted answer to the problem of the legitimacy of patriarchy, which guarantees (or is taken to guarantee) the dominant position of men and the subordination of women’ (Connell 1995: 77). This does not mean that all men embody a hegemonic masculine ideal, but rather that these ideals are culturally and socially normative ideals for male behaviour within a gender hierarchy. In a subsequent article Connell together with Messerschmidt (2005) reformulate the concept and emphasise the importance of understanding gender as relational, i.e. that hegemonic masculinity is shaped in relation
to femininity: ‘Gender is always relational, and patterns of masculinity are socially defined in contradistinction from some model (whether real or imaginary) of femininity’ (Messerschmidt 2005: 848).

The frame of hegemonic masculinity makes it possible to analyse the relations between gender hierarchy and gender equality in an engineering context. Since engineering (professionally and educationally) is masculine and salute masculine ideals (in the understanding of Connell et al), the rites by which individuals are initiated into this field must be viewed in the light of hegemonic masculinity which is the basic gender structure of the field. According to Connell (1995) and Messerschmidt (2005) hegemonic masculinity subordinates other masculinities and femininity.

Women who claim professional roles as engineers can be stuck in a dilemma between performing professionally according to the script of engineering and performing as ‘real’ women according to the cultural script of gender. According to Dryburgh (1999), female engineering students gradually learn to adjust to the masculine engineering culture. Dryburgh discusses the process of professionalisation where especially women have to adjust and adapt to professional ideals associated with the engineer (Dryburgh 1999: 666).

The identity of engineers is construed by way of demonstrating distance to social sciences; the ideal engineer is engaged in the taming of nature and technology. Dryburgh puts it: ‘They [the engineers] are strong, action oriented, and ready to make a difference in the physical world of concrete realities’ (Dryburgh 1999: 678). Besides the ideal of ‘hard work’ there are also ideals of ‘hard play’ characterised by ‘heavy drinking and partying’ (Dryburgh 1999: 678). Dryburgh argues that the solidarity with the professional role of engineering is of greater importance than the individual.

Powell et al (2009) point out that despite several attempts to achieve gender equality and encourage women to become engineers, engineering is still male marked, that is men are in the majority and furthermore, it is easier for men to adapt to the professional role. In their study of women engineering students’ experiences of the workplace, they focus on gender performance and how gender is being done and undone (Powell 2009: 412). Similar to Dryburgh, Powell et al found that the women devoted a lot of energy to gain acceptance by the males. The women used several coping strategies, for instance acting like one of the boys, accepting gender discrimination and adopting an ‘anti-woman’ approach (Powell 2009: 425). In the doing gender perspective, from which Powell et al (2009) depart, there are multiple masculinities and femininities, there is not one way to perform gender. On the contrary it is important to make visible the heterogeneity regarding gender. But in relation to the
engineering culture there is only one traditional masculinity performed in the professional role. On women’s part this creates a role conflict between being perceived as a ‘defect’ woman because choosing a male profession and as a ‘defect’ engineer because lack of masculinity (Powell 2009: 423). To be accepted, women are inclined to do gender in expected ways and therefore there is a ‘rejection of femaleness’ (Powell 2009: 426). Rhoton (2011) argues that gendered barriers are subtle and that there is a part of the socialisation process in STEM disciplines. Rhoton finds that women scientists are engaged in the process of reproducing gender inequality, especially through distancing from other women and ‘...devaluing femininity and supporting occupational ideals that obscure structures, cultures and practices that frame women as outsiders and impede their success’ (Rhoton 2011: 711).

There is a theoretical discussion in gender studies on doing and undoing gender. The critics of doing gender oppose the perspective’s focus on the reproduction of gender inequality, in the sense that it only allows for narrow sighted views on stable and inert structures and institutional elements, which, in turn, reinforces and recreates gender inequality. Deutsch (2007) points out the importance to identify and recognise ‘cracks in the wall’ where gender is being done in unexpected and perhaps more liberated ways.

There are only a few research reports in the area of gender and rituals of initiation to academic studies, initiations which have features and functions common with the reception weeks. But initiation in the field of sports has attracted more research (Johnson 2002; Waldron and Kowalski 2009; Clayton 2012). A Swedish study on the reception weeks among active sportsmen and women shows something similar to my results (Svender 2005). That is, the phenomenon is characterised by contradictions; on the one hand warm welcomes and inclusion, on the other hand, exclusion through discipline and obedience (Svender 2005: 27). Katarina Nilsson-Ek (1990) analyses the reception at engineering programs at the Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden, as a modern ritual of initiation to a specific kind of knowledge. According to Ek-Nilsson it is clear that the women adopted the masculine norm, at the same time as they expressed that being a woman could be an advantage.

Analysis and discussion
An analysis of the themes emerging from the interviews and observations reveal gender paradoxes and dilemmas that come into play during the reception at the engineering program at the university. I have observed three conflicts between hegemonic masculinity and gender equality, two of which can be seen as paradoxes and one as a dilemma.
The first paradox concerns the manifest purpose of the reception of beginners at universities (which promotes inclusion) and the more informal effect (which is about exclusion of deviations). The formal agenda and aim is to create good conditions for the new students so that they get to know each other and also understand what it means to be a student and participate in the engineering educational environment. The word respect is recurrent in the interviews. It is apparent that the students attribute different meanings to respect. One meaning has to do with control. Respect is important due to majority/minority aspects. The group of new students is big and the organisers few: ‘…[W]ithout respect, it would not work, it would be chaos’. There are certain rules for keeping the order, for instance concerning alcohol and the safety of the group of organisers. The rules create control and discipline. But respect is also important for bonding the new students together.

From the point of view of the manifest purpose, the reception is as an activity of team building. On the other hand, it is possible to interpret the reception as a lesson in learning an academic order of hierarchies, power and submission.

In order to enjoy respect from the new students, the organisers play roles of idols. The idols are built from the character each person in the group of organisers play; common features of the idol are for instance coolness, distance and seriosity.

From the respondents perspective it is important that the organisers make themselves idols, because that maintains order and contributes to their control of the situation. The relation between being idols and the need for control indicates how the process of ‘making of respect’ maintains a hierarchy and relations of superiority and submission.

Furthermore, there is a strong connection between the performance of respect and the use of attributes. The greater the cohesion between some symbols and their attributes, the greater the appreciation of the performance. A male respondent explains why the attributes are so important in creating respect:

When you wear the sunglasses, no one sees what you’re looking at. It creates some mystic around you. To look and see each other’s eyes is of great importance for forming contact but [the group of organisers] do not want to form contact, on the contrary – you want distance, both physically and more abstract. You don’t want to get the impression of being a sweet cuddly teddybear. As [an organiser] you want distance, respect, you want to give the impression that you are special. The glasses makes it impossible to get in contact, as well as the cape. You can do a lot with the cape, you can wrap yourself up or you can unfold it [spread it out]. (male organiser)
The attributes signal both distance and playfulness and they are powerful in the performance. The cape is a symbol of power and control and the sunglasses mark distance and control. Other important symbols are colours; red, pink, green, yellow are associated with less power than black, brown etc.

During the reception weeks, the group of organisers play different kinds of games with the new students. It is necessary that the organisers (senior students) interact with the beginners and establish some kind of contact but the interaction should not be on equal terms. The organisers, who are in superior positions vis-à-vis the new students, define the situation and therefore control it and the interpretation of the attributes (cf. Goffman 1959).

...if you turn around with your cape, you get a space around you. It gives you respect. It's the same with the police and police horses. They have their horses and we have the cape...it creates respect. (female organiser)

The reference to the police indicates that power and control are important. The police have horses (big powerful animals) which create a distance and space between the general public and those who control the situation. The senior students have their capes that symbolise something similar; the cape creates distance, space and control vis-à-vis the beginners. The symbolic meaning of the reference to the police indicates that there is a symbolism of dominance in the performance acts; ‘you should know your place’.

The symbolic meaning of the attributes emphasise the importance of power and hierarchy. It is through using attributes associated with authority respect is produced. Respect is also produced by demonstrating distance from symbols and attributes associated with softness and childishness. By way of adopting powerful symbols and rejecting symbols of weakness, a traditional academic order is (re)produced. The meaning of respect is linked to a hegemonic masculinity connoted to strength, toughness and authority. That is not to say that biological women cannot perform this kind of desired performance, but what seems to be crucial in this process is to mark and demonstrate a distance from female symbols and attributes. Those who do not succeed in performing respect – men as well as women – are perceived of as soft and wimpy. Still, it would seem like there is a gender difference in the opportunity to correct a bad performance. For instance, one of the men I interviewed was told he was too soft in his performance; he had to go tougher otherwise the beginners would lose respect for him. Therefore he performed a rough and violent practical joke – he took a camera from a woman student,
who was aware of the joke, and stamped on it and threw it out of the window.

Thus, even if the reception has the explicit purpose to include new students, the inclusion is implicitly qualified by requirements to meet a certain standard. When this standard is not met, the consequence is exclusion. Consequently, the paradox concerning the explicit purpose of inclusion and the practical effect of exclusion dissolves when you consider the implicit qualifications of inclusion.

From a doing gender perspective this could be seen to indicate that hegemonic masculinity preserves itself and its standards; women are accepted only if they accept the attributes and ways of masculinity.

The second paradox concerns the contradictory aims of the reception. It both establishes and challenges a traditional academic order and gender patterns and gender stereotypes; it is about obedience and challenge.

There is a rule regarding physical contact between the organisers and the group of new students. In the written (formal) information to the beginners it is stated: ‘To physically touch the organisers is strongly forbidden’. A woman in the interviews says: ‘There is only one taboo really, that is do not touch the organisers’. To use the word taboo indicates the seriousness of this rule. Respect is therefore important, otherwise: ‘… they paw on women organisers’. When I ask how the beginners learn about this rule, it becomes clear that it is something they get reminded of all the time: ‘We tell them all the time’.

Despite of this, it does happen that the organisers are pawed on – especially women organisers are subject to this, but as will become clear all women students are vulnerable targets. Some quotations from the interviews with women respondents follow: ‘Someone pulled my hair’, ‘Someone pawed my butt […] another time someone pulled my hair’, ‘… he came right up in front of me and another woman organiser, and he said things like ‘oh, I can surely touch you if I want to and I will’, he tried to physically touch us’.

It can be that someone has heard that some guy is planning to violate or threaten women students (senior students and new students):

There was a guy who talked about carrying [name of a woman organiser] away, she is so short, he should lift her away, he thought that was funny. (female organiser)

I heard of a guy who planned to get a woman drunk in the evening and then have her, I don’t remember any details but something like that, it should have been very bad for the girl. (female organiser)

Even if these threats are never carried out (they may not ‘happen’ physically), they create a sense of insecurity during the reception, espe-
cially for women. In an interview a male respondent tells me that it is common ground that women want company at nights going home because of fear of getting violated.

The organisers of the reception takes safety seriously; there are different preparatory exercises and emergency plans. For protection, women are encouraged and requested to have male guardians during the reception weeks, or, as one woman interviewed puts it, ‘body-guards’. Especially during evenings and nights:

I am very short so I was not allowed to go by myself at nights. I had always company because you never know what can happen. The new students are of all ages, they drink alcohol, and some get drunk. I was afraid to go by myself. They told me that too: ‘Do not go by yourself’. (female organiser)

This quotation exemplifies an assumed correlation between bodysize and risk of violation. That is, being short or being tall is described as an important factor when determining the risk of being subject of harassment.

In my opinion the women who got harassed were the women who looked less respectful. These women were quite short, had more clown-like clothes, they looked more cute than cool, so therefore I think that they got harassed because of how they looked. (female organiser)

Another interview person express something similar: ‘...girls are more interested in how they look, they are more concerned with looking sexually attractive while guys are not concerned in the same way. Therefore, women get problems because their appearances encourage guys to touch them’. There are assumptions between what kind of impression women want to make and what kind of treatment they get. In the research field of gender and violence, this kind of reasoning is familiar; women tend to be held blamed for provoking male violence. And in this process, women also tend to get responsible for what happens to them (cf. Lindberg 2006).

The interviews reveal that women as a group is construed as a vulnerable category that need protection preferably from male students. But at the same time the individual woman can get blamed or even responsible if she gets violated and harassed because then she has failed to perform according to the ideals of the strong and independent individual. Body-size, mixing of clothes and colours, hair etc. are all important tools in performing according to desired values and ideals. It may not be possible to change body-size but there are some tricks to use for instance to make the body look bigger and maybe most important – to mark distance from feminine symbols.
When the respondents try to explain or reflect on why some men harass women during the reception, they refer to society in general. In every aspect of the modern society, a few men take the liberty to harass women. Therefore, you have to expect the same behaviour from a minority of men at the reception. In comparison to society in general, harassment of female engineering students is considered to be a minor problem.

Furthermore, harassment during the reception is explained with reference to some men being provoked by women in command, that is, women breaching stereotyped and expected cultural femininity. This explanation, like the former, is based on an assumption that male harassment is a behaviour that is not tolerated but must be expected, in the context of engineering education as in society in general.

During the first days of the reception it is very important that the beginners respect us but some guys don’t accept that, so they have to show that ‘I can pull your hair as much as I want’. Guys don’t want to be inferior you know. (female organiser)

Guys who paw on women [during the reception] act like that in general I think. They think it is okay. Maybe it has to do with guys’ attitudes in general or it could be that they think the girl try to rise above and that they should have the freedom to paw on whoever they want to. (female organiser)

Due to a cultural gender order or manuscript, harassment of women is perceived of as an expected behaviour for some men, and the academic space is not seen as different from other spaces outside academy and the engineering education. According to the same gender order or manuscript harassment is interpreted as an act which occurs because the gender order is challenged. Women get harassed because they perform gender in unexpected ways, and from this perspective the gender order is disrupt.

When women in the interviews talk about the role of organiser of the reception, it seems like the role makes it possible to act in different ways than they are used to do. There are aspects in the role that may challenge the traditional gender order:

I was the bartender, I often said no to big and tall guys, first they just laughed and thought I was stupid but I insisted ‘No, you do not get another drink’, I am serious. They just dropped off. There is one thing which is so good with this outfit, the glasses, the hair, the cape, you look so hard. If I didn’t have these clothes, and had said ‘no’, the guys would not have dropped off, they would have laughed even more. You don’t have to be big when you can make an impression of being big through the clothes and how you move. (female organiser)
The role of organiser makes it possible for young women to be authoritative, to be listened to and respected in a context where women are expected to be ‘good girls’. From this perspective the role, which is not associated with a cultural ideal of femininity, may therefore challenge deeply rooted norms of gender. For women, the reception can be understood as an opportunity to bend gender norms in unexpected ways.

Still, it must be observed, that the students’ explanations to male harassment contain an assumption of rigid male behaviour which is unchangeable. Therefore, specific cases of harassment are viewed in respect of the individual women subject to harassment. When a woman is subject to harassment that means she does not meet the requirements of a senior student in charge of the reception. Notwithstanding, the actual cause of the harassment is considered to be a failure on behalf of the woman harassed.

In order to ascertain women’s participation in the reception, and thus their equal opportunity to be initiated in academia, certain measures have to be taken; women are encouraged not to move by themselves at campus and women have to be accompanied by male guardians during the two weeks. On the one hand, such measures make change possible; women can participate in a masculine environment. But on the other hand, these measures confirm the traditional academic hierarchy including the inequality between men and women in respect of participation.

The aspect of challenge in the paradox comes visible in respect of the parts played in the ‘drama’. The role of organisers is described by the female respondents as an opportunity to challenge traditional gender patterns and themselves for that matter. The qualities and characteristics of the organisers are not associated with cultural (stereotyped) notions of femininity; on the contrary the role is a role of authority, dominance and leadership, and yes, qualities which are referring to perceptions of hegemonic masculinity. Especially for women the experiences of raising the voice, shouting out loud in public rooms, claiming physical space and insisting on respect at the same time, can be analysed as important signs of on-going challenges and changes regarding oppressive gender patterns in academia. Is it because of these challenges women get harassed?

The dilemma emerges when comparing a woman’s claim for position of authority as organiser and the students’ explanations of harassment. The respondents’ descriptions of how respect should be performed show implicit assumptions that the individual by herself or himself, is in control of the performance and of what kind of impression the individual gives. Women’s experiences of harassment tend to be explained as the individual woman’s failure to deliver an ‘accurate’ performance. Yet, the
explicit need for male protection seems to acknowledge the existence of male violence as a part of the underlying gender structure.

When the respondents talk about how to express and perform respect, it becomes clear that the making of respect is perceived as something over which the individual possesses control. Both men and women can be corrected by their co-students if they fail in their performance to create respectfulness, but there is a gender difference here. For instance, women who have been harassed are seen as if they have failed – and are blamed – in their making of respect. They have not succeeded to act as authorities in the performance. There is a strong individualisation underlying this kind of reasoning. If an individual (man or woman) does not get respected, it is possible to correct this by changing composition and use the right mix of symbols. These frames for interpretation make the academic context of engineering, the hierarchies and gender order invisible and illegitimate and therefore not challenged in practice.

In order to attain positions of accepted organisers, the students have to meet a number of requirements which have been mentioned above, but female students have to meet the extra requirements of not being harassed. Thus, the dilemma consists of the fact that although the prohibition on harassment is set out to protect individual women, in practice it is required to be a person who does not get harassed. Given the engineering context, that seems to advocate ideals of dominance, autonomy and authority, ideals which do not recognise harassment.

Conclusion

This article contributes to knowledge on gender and engineering by analysing the reception of engineering students as an arena where embedded values and norms are performed and expressed, making it possible to both visualise and question them. The terms for attaining prestigious positions in the community of engineering education are not equal; the order maintains a number of obstacles which particularly affect women. This is similar to what several scholars have described (cf. Dryburgh 1999; Powell et al 2009; Demaiter et al 2009; Rhoton 2011).

Value conflicts and paradoxes are apparent where measures are taken to create equal terms in contexts where inequality exists within a hierarchical order, e.g. in order to strengthen the position of individuals belonging to subordinate groups. Measures to promote equality have the effect of strengthening a structure which is basically unequal. From the perspectives of masculine hegemony and doing gender, this is not a paradox. Measures are taken when the hierarchical order needs adjustment to new societal values, but the measures chosen are such that causes least interference with the inherent structure of the order. Therefore, it
is not surprising, and no paradox, that the effect of the measures taken to impair structural inequality preserves the prevailing order by minimal interference.

If you focus the measures taken to enhance equality and consider alternative measures *not* taken, it is clear that the initiation ritual serves the underlying purpose of submission to a given order. Thus, the paradoxity of measures both enhancing and impairing equality is merely illusory since the prevailing value is preserving a hierarchical order including structural inequality.

Gender stereotypes are reproduced by upholding masculine ideals and qualities such as physical strength, physical size, a determined attitude, leading and protective capacity etc. The space to do gender in more unexpected and perhaps more liberated ways – undoing gender – are limited. And the hegemony seems destined to self-preservation and to avail itself.

From an undoing gender perspective, gender issues must be addressed with a view to the context of the specific area of investigation. The very fact that female students – and other marginalised groups – actually exist in the engineering field and the education, is a challenge to the hegemonic order and its boundaries. From this perspective, the reception is an arena where there is constant negotiation of meanings, and in these processes stereotypes and prejudices are challenged and change is possible. The reception may be seen as an opportunity for individuals to bend gender in ways which deviate from attitudes culturally coded as masculine respectively feminine. Thus, the reception ritual both reinforces prevailing gender structures and opens up for developing alternative interpretations and meanings of gender over time.

This study is of exploratory character – the results do not aspire to be generalised. Still, the study clearly indicates that there are a number of important points of conflict between male-dominance and the promotion of gender equality which require further research on hegemonic masculinity in engineering education and profession.
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Chapter 4
Gender, Science and Education in the Contemporary Azerbaijan Society*

Kifayat Aghayeva

The 20th and 21st centuries have been the time marked by the emergence of the struggle for gender equality as one of the priorities of both global politics and global science. The problem of the relation between the sexes, known as ‘gender relations’ in modern science, which includes issues of gender inequality, became one of the most important political, ideological and scientific targets of the ‘new world’ – the world which merged socialist and capitalist ideals. In all areas of the social and cultural life (science and education included) of the Azerbaijan society, the transition period displayed both positive and negative facets. Women Studies and then Gender Studies appeared as social needs of society.

Taking into consideration the changing status of different social groups and categories, as well as very important social-cultural and political changes in Azerbaijan society during the last decades, the changes in the sphere of gender become apparent. These changes led to changes in the structure of the family, changes in the social guarantee, and changes of women’s positions in the economic and political spheres. Real gender inequity problems in public discourse led to increased scientific research and public interest in the subject.

The importance of the intellectual-cultural climate in contemporary Azerbaijan society draws attention to post-modernist and post-structural paradigms. Modern feminist critics are an integral part of the post-modernist discourse, which contributes to the development of gender theory in the Azerbaijan context.

In Azerbaijan, Gender Studies started in the 1990s. The development of the women’s movement was the main influencing factor. The women’s movement has never been massive or politically powerful but this movement triggered the development of intellectual interchange and contributed to formulating researchers’ and activists’ networks, which were interested in the elaboration of this subject. The women’s movement influenced feminist enlightenment, promoted the carrying out of research projects, and formed associations.

Among the main factors promoting the development of Gender Studies is globalisation; Azerbaijan women’s organisations and centres have many international contacts. These centres were formed as a result of the
second wave women’s movements in the USA and Western Europe. Today’s political atmosphere enables Azerbaijan researchers to learn more from foreign researchers, to publish internationally and to participate in international conferences and projects. This interconnection allows access to professional literature, benefiting from the experience of joint research and discussion, and financing possibilities.

The interest in Gender Studies is connected to the conjuncture of the research market, i.e., gender programs are started and supported by international funds, and international research associations support this subject, which compensates for the insufficient financing from the national budget. Thus, the Azerbaijan Crisis Institute of Science is in the hands of international organisations and the institute tries to lead social science in a new direction using these international sources. Even conservative thinking administrators confirm and support the new programs, which depend on the inflows of material resources to the education and research structures.

Organisational opportunities, creating conditions for the institutionalisation of new professions, were exceptionally important in the first stage. The formulating of the new educational structure made the possibility for a new program. It is easy to institute the new disciplinary subjects in the frame of the new schools and education institutions. Many of universities include new subjects, and Gender Studies is also included in the curriculum as one of the innovative subjects.

According to recent studies, women’s professional activities exercise a significant influence on the growth of the economy and national income. In the changing terms of society’s gender role stratification, gender is one of the essential research topics in the field of social sciences. Education is one of the most important means to achieve gender equality and to the development of women’s rights and equal opportunities. The Azerbaijan education system is governed by the Constitution; the law on education; the program of reforms in the area of education; and other normative official acts. Article 42 of the Azerbaijan Constitution establishes each citizen’s right to education. Article 3 of Azerbaijan Republic Education Act ensures the citizens’ right to education, regardless of sex.

Since the period of the Azerbaijani Enlightenment at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries and further in the course of the Soviet period, Azerbaijani society has gone through a difficult transition in terms of changing traditional sex stereotypical behaviour. The Soviet regime destroyed the foundations of traditional culture and this regime caused remarkable changes in Azerbaijani images of women and women’s lifestyle: the successful process of women’s unveiling, putting an end to illiteracy, women’s entry into the social and political spheres, and,
consequently, their work and financial independence. Since that time, women’s education has become synonymous with modernisation and progress. Unfortunately, changing gender stereotypes within education is not accepted by men.

At the present time Gender Studies is an attempt to recognise the social process on the basis of changes in the social-cultural pattern of behaviour. Gender Studies scrutinises interconnections between social aspects of public morality and the realities of behaviour which really make up contemporary society. Gender Studies is an attempt to look at the new problems based on the principle of how changes of social-cultural identity lead to the transformation of social roles. Men and women are not determined because of their sex, but by the actual process of social status, individual opportunity in the field of education and occupational activity, and access to power, economy, education, policy, domestic role, reproductive behaviour etc.

In Azerbaijan and in the West ‘Gender Studies’ is based on this discursive combination – the inclusion of ‘social’ and not denying ‘biological’ factors. Rapid changes in all fields of cultural life in society make the international scientific community approach difficult in the assessment of harmony in the relations of sexes. Women’s strengthened role in the social governance, in the science, medicine, culture and art is so obvious that there is no need for the proof.

It is noted in the ‘the Universal Declaration on Higher Education in XXI Century: Approaches and Practical Measures’ that the final achievement of the higher education is to build a new society where everybody is free from violence and exploitation. As in the education system, aspects related to gender equality are to be included into the majority of subjects. In the declaration it is also noted that the contribution to the development of Gender Studies should be not only as a field of science, but also as a strategically important sphere in the direction of education and society reconstruction. Gender equity in access to education can clearly help eliminate other forms of gender inequality, forming more egalitarian intra-family relations and increasing women’s participation in social life.

Gender equity in education is one of the urgent requirements of the realisation and achievement of human rights and women’s rights. Education is not only for personal advantage but also a vital prerequisite for the progress of society. If in society individuals’ intellectual development opportunities are lacking, society is not able to develop successfully and it is condemned to deterioration. Hence, the government – as the reflector of general public concern – is to be the official, institutional and ma-
terial guarantee for getting a sound education for its citizens, regardless of their sex, social position, living places and other differences.

Even though in the Azerbaijan Republic Constitution gender equality law is fixed and the government sets forth equal opportunities in getting education regardless of the sexes of its citizens attaining education regardless of sex, women’s educational resources are still not effectively used in patriarchal Azerbaijan society. There are many barriers to and reasons for realisation of women’s potential. Education is the only possibility for women to increase their competitiveness in the labour market, although even well-educated women’s salary is considerably less than men’s salary (it is frequently mentioned in the job vacancy advertisements). In spite of women’s high level of education and their professional experience they occupy more inferior positions, get less salary in comparison with men. This phenomenon constitutes an institutional sexism. Although from the first day of independence, the Azerbaijan Government issued gender equity orders in the different fields of society, the gender stereotypes existed and exist in the different fields, education included.

Institutional inequality and social-economic consequence of devaluation of women’s human potential are not taken into consideration in the process of education reforms. Currently, the gender gap in salaries and the professional segregation in the labour market mean that poorly educated men achieve more than better-educated women. When we look at the following table we see a real danger for the growth of the gender imbalance in favour of men.

Table 1. Number of teacher staff of state higher educational institutions at the beginning of 2009/2010 academic years, distribution by category and by sex, % : Numbers and sex distribution, as % to total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage distribution</th>
<th>Sex distribution, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectors</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-rector, branch directors</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of laboratory and division</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty deans</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of department</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors among department staff</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docents among department staff</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main teachers</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers, assistants</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>6135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: www.azstat.org/statinfo/demoqraphic/
In spite of the education system being one of the most problematic spheres, gender problems in the education is not still included into the agenda of political and professional discussions. The lack of official gender expertise in textbooks and manuals, acquisition of professional knowledge in the field of gender theory and methodology, problems of including gender component into the government education standards, have a serious impact on the quality of the education. Thereby, existing system for specialists' training contributes to the reproduction of gender stereotypes; subsequently, it destructively influences specialists’ world-views and leading staffs’ activities in the different government education spheres. A reasonably substantial body of methodological materials for specialists in the field of education, academic institutions, as well as public at large, has been accumulated.

The following publications represent some of the most interesting works of the Azerbaijan specialists investigating both general and gender problems of education and science: Gender Aspect in the History of Azerbaijan, F. Mamedov, Gender Aspects of Politology, F. Orduhanov, Gender aspects of the philosophy, A. Azimov, Gender Sociology, A. Akhundov, Gender and Culture, F. Faradjeva, Gender: New stages of Women's Problems, Gender Expertise of the Legislation of Azerbaijan, Ali Seid Abbas oglu, Rena Seid Rza gizi, Ethic-Gender Analyse of Social-Moral Behavior, Kifayat Aghayeva and others).

Science plays a valuable role in the life of the society. Over many centuries not only in Azerbaijan but also all over the world men dominated in the science and education, despite the presence in these areas of the certain amount of women representing elite society. The same was in Azerbaijan in the Soviet, pre-socialist and in the contemporary period of its development. During the Soviet regime, there were great achievements overcoming the gender imbalance in the science and education. The steady implementation of the science and education development programs at the state level provided real opportunities for compulsory participation of both sexes (regardless of age, religion, nationality, social status, etc.) in the education process and in 1970s it was put the end of population illiteracy all over the country.

Research and development have been a comparatively low priority for Azerbaijan in recent years, even falling from 0.34% of GDP in 2000 to just 0.17% in 2007. About one-fifth of R&D is performed by the private sector. However, the country has a fairly strong scientific base on which to build: 1339 of every million inhabitants are researchers, a higher proportion than the world average of 1081. Moreover, just under half (45%) of researchers are women. In terms of scientific publications indexed in international journals, Azerbaijan has also increased its vis-
ibility in the Science Citation Index from 160 papers in 2000 to 292 in 2008.

The development of science and education and the attempts to achieve gender balance in this field should be at the centre of the work of the government officials. The right to intellectual property fixed in the Constitution (the Article 30.I, II) and the incentives for free enterprise (the Article 15.II) were comprehensively interpreted in the private legislation (laws on science, education, culture, etc.), which is a legal basis for the further extensive development of Azerbaijan Republic of science and education.

However, it cannot be said that Azerbaijan women do not play any role in the development of science. According to the statistical data (Azerbaijan Statistic Committee, 2010) 48% of all scientific workers are women. 9766 from 129001 women in the leading scientific-technical work are professional researchers. 158 women from them are Doctors of Science, 2618 women are Doctors of Philosophy and 2 women are academicians of the Academy of Science. These are the realities of the present-day situation in the area of science and in the way it is now there is no hope for either quick achievement of the gender balance or future achievement of the high level of the national science.

Women’s declining economic stance in the science causes to growing gender inequality. The diffi- cultness of the female scientists’ economic condition is verified by the reality that there are to a larger extent low salaries (unlikely men, they cannot afford to work in several places). It is characterised by the main reasons: 1) she is not capable to pay for the services of the cleaning lady, (engaging in the endless domestic responsibilities: doing laundry, cleaning the house, cooking, caring ill, very young and elderly members of the family, managing home economy etc.,) and 2) the scarcity of jobs for female-scientists. Worldwide, women account for slightly more than a quarter of all scientific researchers – an increase compared to previous decades but still very far from parity’ (World's Women, United Nations New York, 2010).

A very serious problem, the marginalisation of women within academia or slow inclusion of women or into the National Academia of Azerbaijan Republic has been raised by women researchers, but the situation remains unchanged. Nevertheless, cultural factors within academia are suggested as significant barriers, and if male and female applicants are under evaluation for PhD degree male applicants are preferred. Women encounter specific difficulties in trying to get PhD degrees or making careers in academia. The process of doing a PhD demands very important sacrifices; having someone to sponsor you, spending unlimited energy and sufficient money, enduring efforts, excluding of the private life (tak-
ing into consideration the patriarchal society in Azerbaijan; men could marry at any age without problem but even young women choose their partners for marriage among those men who offer to marry).

How many women researchers struggled for a doctoral degree and most of them could not complete because of one reason a: ‘violent rule of the main gatekeepers’ of academia that are inclined to preserve the ideals that authorise their positions.

‘Science is for a man, a woman is a woman, and woman’s main responsibility is her family and her house’. This is the main mythology about an ideal Azerbaijani woman. Attitudes toward gender stereotypes might be changed by teaching and learning new gender roles, persuading people to abandon myths and misconceptions that restrict girls and women from fully participating in science. But this cultural change will become more possible with each educated girl and woman who challenges these myths and fallacies and stops them from being passed on to the next generation.

Moreover, by establishing economic development and overall social progress, no country can afford to ignore gender inequality in science. To establish social justice is to establish gender equality. We do not have to forget that, the most chief contributors to change are the families, communities, school teachers, academic supervisors, and mentors of women scientists, the female scientists themselves and unquestionably, responsible governmental officials. An army of female scientists who are appropriately provided and authorised, can direct their capacity towards their countries’ development.

Better laws and improved policy might be effective to diminish gender inequality; altering traditional opinions about gender roles might be more significant in Azerbaijan. Practice confirms that in the most complicated issues the mechanism of equal rights does not work. Laws on the paper are one thing, and real opportunity is different thing (de-jure, de-facto). Enhancing gender equality within the family without breaking intra-family order and national identity can be a challenge. Sound debates on gender attitudes among state, civil society, and mass media agencies can play a significant role in meeting this challenge.

‘We cannot walk with one leg; we have to walk with both legs. Men and women have to be all given their rights, allowed to participate in building their societies, we are all humans, there are no divisions in humanity’ (Abdulaziz Othman Altwaijri 2011).
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Part II: Excellence
Introduction

Like other European academic institutions, Swiss universities are going through rapid and profound changes (massification, internationalisation, globalisation, etc.). This context helps to promote ‘academic excellence’ as the central criterion for selecting among candidates for academic careers and in particular in one of the instruments that the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF) has implemented to promote excellence among ‘young researchers’, namely the SNSF Professorships.

In this paper, we examine how the more precise criteria that confer the quality of ‘excellence’ on this programme are gendered and may undermine the policies aimed at establishing (more) equality among the academic staff and mending the ‘leaky pipeline’. This point is crucial since, for more than ten years, the SNSF has also been working to increase the participation of women in the making of science. In the case of the SNSF Professorships, this translates into the fact that this institution has set a target of at least 30% women among the selected candidates.

Our comments are based on the critical discourse analysis (Van Dijk 1993, 2001) we performed on this institution’s website, as the ‘black box’ of the selection practices was impossible to open because neither the names nor the positions of the experts are made public. Based on our previous research on academic careers (Fassa et al 2012; Fassa and Kradolfer 2010; Fassa and Gauthier 2010, 2012), we will mainly discuss the transfer to the humanities of criteria commonly accepted in the data-based sciences and their consequences for the gender of science and consequently on women’s careers. Therefore, we will first provide some information about the context and structure of research in Switzerland, then examine the SNSF Professorship Programme and discuss the criteria for qualifying for such a bursary. The discussion of the criteria will be focused on age and/or velocity and the scientific portfolio, as these two requirements were changed during our work on academic careers, giving...
testimony that what is said to be excellence is subject to revision. The academic age (reckoned from the PhD) replaced the biological age in 2008 and the definition of the type of publications desired changed from ‘publications in scientific journals with high impact factors’ to ‘publications in high-level journals’ during winter 2011–2012. The last part will discuss the fact that the Professorship Programme is presented as ‘gender friendly’.

Context and structure of research in Switzerland

Unlike France, for example, with the CNRS, Switzerland has no quasi-university institution devoted exclusively to research. As a consequence, apart from private laboratories offering career opportunities to researchers in chemistry and some engineering sciences, all fundamental research takes place in the universities and other higher education institutions. There, all researchers have both teaching and research commitments and there is no other setting enabling persons with a doctorate to pursue high-level scientific research on a full-time basis. Moreover, the Swiss academic landscape is strongly fragmented (ten cantonal universities, two federal institutes of technology and universities of applied studies) because the universities and other higher education institutions are governed by a great variety of local, mainly cantonal rules. In this landscape, the Swiss National Science Foundation is ‘the most important Swiss agency promoting scientific research. It supports, as mandated by the Swiss Federal government, all disciplines, from philosophy and biology to the nano-sciences and medicine’ (see SNSF no year). The SNSF supports scientific research (both freely chosen and targeted) as well as the academic relève (relève has multiple uses and meanings in the Swiss university system. We have adopted a broad definition of the term, as given by the Swiss Science and Technology Council (SSTC): ‘The relève universitaire consists of students preparing their thesis and young post-doctoral researchers seeking a professorial post. This second category is often referred to as the “intermediate corps”’ (CSST 2001: 8)) through various instruments that fall into essentially two categories: financing of research projects and teams (within which doctoral and postdoctoral grants are funded); and individual support of persons, which since 1999 has included the Professorship Programme. More than half the resources allocated to the support of persons by the SNSF were assigned to this programme in 2011 (73.2 million Swiss francs, see SNSF 2011: 38). It awards ad personam grants, to around 30 persons each year, which are predominantly research-oriented (80% of working time), to fund junior professors and their research teams for a period of four to six years. Thus, as the SNSF operates as a central actor in Swiss scientific policy,
the norms and models it promotes are diffused in the universities, although not uniformly.

It should be added that Switzerland has quite a peculiar situation concerning the participation of women in the labour market, especially as regards highly qualified professions. Due to the lack of care infrastructure and the tax policies, the majority of working women occupy their position on a part time basis. This situation, sometimes interpreted as a waste of money and talents, is partially at the roots of the rapid emergence of equality policies that also respond to the fast increase in the proportion of women in tertiary education and to the demands of feminist organisations for a reshaping of the labour market on fairer basis. Different types of initiatives have subsequently been taken to attract women in the field of STEM (Sciences, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) and to help those who want to stay in sciences to accomplish a career as academics. Despite these efforts, the participation of women in science is still marked by a double segregation: first, women remain in a very small minority in STEM sciences (according to the Swiss Statistics office, in 2011, they amount to 20.2% of the students in the ‘exact sciences’ and 14.3% in ‘engineering sciences’ (BFS 2012a)) and second they still face more obstacles on their way to an academic professorship than their male colleagues, representing only 17% of the professors and 25.5% of the other teaching bodies (BFS 2012b) (for more analyses of the reasons for their exclusion see also Fassa and Gauthier 2010; Fassa and Kradolfer 2010; Leeman et al 2010; Studer 2012).

The SNSF professorships

In order to organise the passing-on of professorial posts – since half of the professors were due to retire around 2000 (Fleury and Joye 2002) – the SNSF Professorships Programme followed on in 1999 from another tool for supporting teacher-researchers, the federal relève programme, which ran from 1992 to 2004, funding postgraduate assistant posts, junior postdoctoral lecturer posts and assistant professor posts. Designed to reintegrate Swiss researchers who were abroad and to attract ‘brains’ from the international academic market (Bashung et al 2011; Leresche et al 2009), the SNSF Professorships Programme follows a more ‘competitive’ logic than its predecessor, since it funds persons rather than posts as under the federal relève programme. The search for excellence mainly through research results also shows the competitive turn taken by the SNSF in the context of the development of the so-called knowledge economy: the needs of local universities and their students are evaluated in terms of what most contributes to visibility in an internationalised market. As a consequence, this programme is seen as an intervention by the
Confederation in appointments (albeit only for limited-term contracts) at universities that are normally themselves responsible for making appointments to professorial posts and which advertised vacancies on the basis of their teaching and research needs as opposed to the research profiles of individuals to be funded. In the appointment procedures, the aim of the SNSF is to remain sovereign so as to assess applications only on the basis of the academic quality of the individual candidates without regard to the local interests of the universities.

The SNSF had set itself a ratio target of at least 30% of women among the grant-funded professors. It nearly meets this target, as 28% of the 485 programme beneficiaries for the period 2000–2012 were women (SNF 2012). It should be noted that their appointment reflects the horizontal segregation whereby they are strongly represented in the human and social sciences, less present in the exact and natural sciences, medicine and pharmacy, and very little active in economics, law and the engineering sciences (Goastellec et al 2007: 43). This programme could thus help to raise the low percentage of women in senior positions in the academic hierarchies (16.4% of tenured professors in 2009) (UoG no year) despite the fact that since 2001 women have been in the majority in the Swiss student population.

In the evaluation of the Professorship Programme conducted in 2006 ‘four profiles of beneficiaries, which represent the plurality of the trajectories leading to scientific excellence’ (Goastellec et al 2007: 5) could be distinguished:

- ‘A first group [23% of the beneficiaries] is made up of foreign researchers in engineering and the exact and natural sciences. These are for the most part men with very strongly internationalised academic trajectories.
- A second group [38%], again consisting mostly of men, represents a national relève in the experimental sciences, economics and law.
- Two other groups are marked by a stronger representation of women: one of them, relatively ‘classic’ in terms of profile, is in its majority made up of Swiss female researchers working in the human and social sciences [25% of the beneficiaries]. The other, more unusual, group [14%] consists entirely of women and is characterised by a lower average age than the other groups. Foreigners are over-represented there and, with the exception of the human and social sciences, all disciplines are concerned’ (Goastellec et al 2007: 6).
Gendering excellence, motherhood and academy

The elements that are presented as decisive in proving the excellence of a candidature are autonomy and the capacity to lead a research team in the framework of a freely chosen problematic, and the scientific importance of the research projects already accomplished and the related publications, but some less academic criteria also appear, such as the importance of age and the speed with which Professorship candidates have completed the initial tasks inherent in the academic career (completing the doctoral thesis – or *habilitation* thesis in German-speaking Switzerland – and a postdoctoral research project, preferably abroad).

**Velocity**

The search for ‘young’ researchers (in the biological sense) was clear until 2008, since the rules of the programme required candidates to be no older than 40. It is particularly interesting in this context to note that between 2002 and 2007 the SNSF removed the biological age limit for female candidates (only women could benefit from the lifting of the age limit, because they were regarded as ‘late’ in career terms and therefore having atypical trajectories relative to their male counterparts) for other programmes supporting the academic *relève*, such as the schemes for supporting doctoral and postdoctoral researchers – but not for the Professorship Programme. Since 2008, for all grants programmes, the criterion has been the ‘academic’ age limit, meaning that candidates for Professorships have to have a minimum of two years and a maximum of nine years of postdoctoral research experience. This shift is interesting as such since it shows a new understanding of what Equality Programmes should aim to do. Following the ‘gender mainstreaming’ line, it endorses the reality that women and men professional trajectories do not follow the same patterns and therefore allows partially people with different backgrounds to apply for such bursaries. Despite this opening to alternative individual trajectories, it has to be acknowledged that the introduction of competitive models of knowledge production on the ‘academic markets’ and ‘university staff markets’ (Leresche et al 2009) favours the profile of ‘meteors’ (cf. Marry 2007, or ‘precocious excellence’ in Goastellec et al 2007), ‘more susceptible than others to the virus of excellence’ (Joseph 2009: 31) and perhaps more likely, in the eyes of the FNS and faculty authorities, to develop into ‘knowledge entrepreneurs’ (Kleiber 1999) on account of their young age and/or their velocity at the time of their first appointment to a professorial post.

This ‘meteor’ model is currently privileged in the data-based sciences where theses are conventionally written in the framework of research groups strongly structured around a common project and supported by
subsidies – or commissions from other bodies – assigned to a senior figure. In this type of research structure, competing to maximise their ‘impact factors’, doctoral students collaborate to produce collectively a knowledge whose orientation has been decided by the professors who have secured the funding, and set themselves in hierarchies whose members find the division of labour convenient for themselves. Such an organisation of research also has a very favourable effect on the output of publications since the various members of the team co-author and respond to one another in processes that help to drive up their citation indexes. In addition, the junior researchers benefit from association with the professors who oversee their individual work in the framework of much broader research projects. They thus learn the formal and informal rules of the craft and are integrated into networks that favour the diffusion of their publications. Tutoring by seniors is less commonly afforded to women, as shown by Leemann et al (2010) in a study of the SNSF, by Dafflon Novelle (2006) on the Economics and Social Science Faculty of the University of Geneva, or Backouche et al (2009) on the Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales in Paris.

**The research portfolio**

The central importance that the SNSF gives to the research portfolio as a criterion for the award of the Professorships, and especially the type of measurements initially proposed to assess their quality (‘publication in scientific journals with high impact factors’), correspond on the one hand to disciplines that are relatively unfeminised (horizontal segregation) and on the other to methods that often privilege quantitative and experimental approaches leading to relatively short texts such as journal articles. These unexpected outcomes are probably at the roots of the change made in the labelling of the type of publications desired. Since winter 2011–2012, the phrasing changed and what used to be ‘publication in scientific journals with high impact factor’ became ‘publications in high-level journals’ to avoid the exclusion of less specific profiles. While this change suggests that the bias that prevents a real ‘parity of participation’ (Fraser 2003: 36) is beginning to be taken into consideration, it remains very difficult to know how far this textual change will influence the judgement of the experts, who were appointed before this change.

Prior to the shift of wording, different research undertakings, as in the work of researchers in the social and human sciences – which sometimes have very local scope (Swiss history, French-Swiss literature, etc.) – and which publish their findings in monographs (as in history or anthropology) were consequently often relegated to a less prestigious category.
giving less scope for ‘profiles of excellence’. Thus, this type of measurement – and the organisation of research that goes with it – integrated perfectly the ‘publish or perish’ trend that constitutes the core of the new mantra of excellence. Beaud, discussing the influence of such an obligatory velocity and of these types of measurements on the social sciences, observes that ‘today, sociology is seeing its academic requirements largely shaped by standards that are imposed from the outside by the so-called ‘exact’ sciences, disciplines that are more dominant than ever in these times of the omnipotence of Shanghai ranking’ (2012: para. 17). He adds that they will tend to select the candidates on social grounds, since “inheritors” have more of the dispositions needed to cope with the acceleration of the research and publication time’ (2012: para. 20). In this regard, Goastellec et al. significantly remark that the figure of the outstanding young female researcher ‘is found in all disciplines except those of the human and social sciences’ (2007: 54).

Such a statement makes it possible to grasp one very specific dimension of the ‘leaky pipeline’, the one that causes its leaks to be greatest in the most feminised disciplines. For some observers they are related to disciplinary traditions, for others to the ‘gendered scripts’ (Le Feuvre and Lapeyre 2005) attached to the academic professions. In the academic world, and in other highly qualified and prestigious occupations, the gendered scripts which form ‘stereotyped models of the ‘prototype’ of reference in [a] segment of the profession’ (Le Feuvre and Lapeyre 2005: 112) prescribe that a total commitment to one’s occupation must be the core quality of candidates for academic careers. Marry and Jonas (2005) show in their study of biologists that such a requirement is more demanding for women due to the fact that it generates a conflict between their ideal of motherhood and their profession. The research we conducted in Lausanne University shows that this quality is presumed (this point emerged during the interviews that we conducted with the management of the seven Faculties that form Lausanne University) to be lacking by definition in women who are seen above all as (real or potential) mothers, unlikely to be able to commit themselves wholly to their jobs (Fassa and Kradolfer 2010). The insistence on speed in the completion of the postdoctoral accomplishments clearly expresses the demand for total commitment to the occupation, a commitment that can only be given by delegating the activities of daily life to others. Selections thus emerge that have their roots in the social and financial capacity of individuals to delegate these tasks to others – to the spouses of men involved in the academic world and/or to a woman hired to deal with everyday contingencies. While female academics are seen first and foremost as real or potential mothers, the question of men’s real or potential
paternity is very rarely considered. As a consequence, the difficulties of the academic career and the ‘delays’ attributed to women are presented in terms of that vision.

Our argument is that the extension to social and human sciences of the model of data-based science is therefore a gendered choice, as it forces women of all disciplines to conform to norms that are mainly produced and reproduced in the more masculinised fields of science, even if the conditions of scientific work are not the same. Furthermore, the previous research we conducted on the University of Lausanne (Fassa et al 2012) shows that postdoctoral posts are more numerous in masculinised faculties and that their beneficiaries have more time to build up a solid research portfolio which then enables them to apply for professorial posts (Fassa et al 2012). The results of Studer (2012) follow the same line as he remarks that the opportunities for the very few female doctoral students to finish their PhD are greater in the masculinised disciplines, due to the organisation of work and possibly to the fact that these women may benefit from some kind of tokenism, ‘an intergroup context in which the boundaries between the advantaged and disadvantaged groups are not entirely closed, but where there are severe restrictions on access to advantaged positions on the basis of group membership’ (Wright 2001: 224). Thus the beneficiaries of the SNSF Professorships present an image of excellence that the Faculties endorse all the more readily when it corresponds to the tradition of their discipline.

**SNSF professorships as a ‘gender friendly’ reference model?**

Beyond the weight of the Professorships within the SNSF, it should be noted that in a good number of universities this programme is perceived as an example to be followed. Thus, parallel to the setting up of the programme, the Swiss Science and Technology Council (SSTC), ‘the advisory body to the Federal Council for issues related to science, higher education, research and technology policy’ (SSTC no year) recommends the setting up of posts of similar type to the SNSF Professorships, but combined with a conditional appointment – a tenure track – so as to be able to offer working conditions that can attract and/or retain the best junior professors in Switzerland (CSST 2001). In practice, the *Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne* (EPFL) had already led the way in 2000 by creating a scheme for assistant professors on tenure track, imitating the British and American model; it was subsequently followed by the other Swiss universities. The similarities between the logics of the SNSF Professorship and the assistant professorships are moreover perfectly clear when one knows that in most universities the holders of SNSF Professorships have been given the status of assistant professor.
Moreover, some actors in the Swiss scientific landscape declare that the tenure track schemes are beneficial for women’s careers. For example, Charles Beer, the State Councillor in charge of the Department of Public Education, Culture and Sport of the Canton of Geneva, announced in a speech on 12 November 2004 that: ‘The University has proposed to the Department of Public Education that it create the new position of ‘tenure track’ to advance promising young scientists, which will make it possible to better advance women in the academic career’ (Beer 2004) The website of the Equal Opportunities Office of the University of Geneva (EOG no year) presents the tenure track in these terms:

The ‘Tenure Track’ is the possibility for a professor starting his or her career to be appointed as Assistant Professor for a limited period of four to six years maximum, with the quasi-guarantee of promotion to a post of permanent professor (Full Professor or Associate Professor) if he or she meets conditions defined at the outset. Evaluation is generally conducted by a committee.

One notable advantage is the possibility of career planning, as well as autonomy (during the ‘probationary’ years) and the transparency of the evaluation. For women, this type of functioning is favourable, given that it generally provides for a pause for maternity; moreover, it counters co-option by a boys’ club.

On account of its valorisation of early excellence, the Professorship Programme – as the tenure tracks procedures – is presented as favourable to women because it allows them to desynchronise career imperatives from questions related to what is commonly called the ‘biological clock’ (see Löwy (2009) for a critical reflection on this concept) and the possible wish to build a family. But, on the contrary to the tenure tracks, it disrupts the strategies of appointment by consensus that may prevent recognition of ‘excellence’ in ‘others’ (Cockburn 1983; Hacker 1981; Kanter 1977).

Thus, the SNSF Professorship programmes, like the tenure track appointments – for example at the University of Lausanne in 2011, women make up 45% of the corps of assistant professors, 19% of the associate professors and 15% of the full professors – are associated with support for female profiles. We must recall some of their central features before considering their vision of careers and its gendered dimension: both of them keep individuals in a precarious position for several years and so require women to provide proof that they are as excellent as the men, if
not more so, and that they possess the ‘stuff of a researcher’, of which Stengers points out the gendered dimension:

The ‘stuff’ that makes the ‘test pilot’, his ‘worth’, seems to me to have the constitutive feature of a ‘gendered’ category in the sense that, unlike the ‘worths’ of Boltanski and Thévenot, it is defined by the negative, i.e. does not found a ‘polity’, but much rather defines a binary, hierarchising contrast that defines the superior gender as non-marked. It is not known what makes a good pilot. The ones who are marked are the ones who have killed themselves. The crash shows they did not have what the others have. But it is also important to stress that the stuff that one has, or does not have, is a construction in the strong sense, in the sense that a construction ‘holds things together’, it implies an ethos, it produces a particular relation to oneself and to others (2010: 27).

Conclusion

With evaluation of the scientific quality of SNSF Professorship candidates being conducted by comparing portfolios from different disciplines and different regional origins, it can be observed that it applies criteria of excellence transposed from those prevalent in the data-based sciences, which are tending to colonise all disciplines, including the social and human sciences. The categories mentioned by the evaluation report on this programme by Goastellec et al (2007) show that the implicit norm of excellence relates to the specificities of the data-based sciences, and more especially the physical and natural sciences.

Thus the publication of monographs is less and less valorised in the face of the need to publish scientific articles in journals with high impact factors. It also becomes increasingly difficult to aspire to an academic career when the candidate’s trajectory is marked by hesitations, bifurcations, even new directions or professional experience outside the academic milieu. Mobility has become a necessity whereas it appeared ‘only rarely [as] an explicit criterion of excellence in the university appointments committees in the social and human sciences’ (Merz 2009: 25). As the author explicitly states a little later, ultimately: ‘the SNSF is moving towards a comparative multidisciplinary norm and tending to align itself on an evaluation practice established for the natural sciences, which for the social and human sciences represents a shift from the established models’ (Merz 2009: 25).

Women have endeavoured, as Stengers puts it, to show that they have ‘the stuff of a researcher’, and, like their male colleagues, have had to ‘accept truly sacrificial working conditions, in a merciless competition.
They are expected to grit their teeth and bear it, because that is the price to be paid, a price that discourages those who do not have the vocation, who cannot renounce the temptations of the world to devote themselves to it body and soul (2010: 26). But the price to be paid to conform to this ethos whose historical construction is androcentric becomes even heavier when ‘excellence, which is the new mantra both for universities and for research groups and individual researchers, is measured by such data’ (Stengers 2010: 30) and may not have much to do with what makes the attraction towards the sciences: curiosity and the taste for discovery, questioning and doubt. The rapidity, the unbroken velocity demanded of academic careers to make them ‘excellent,’ is much better suited to ‘the data-based or evidence-based sciences [that] seek to define a situation in terms of objectively measurable data that make it possible to evaluate and decide’ (Stengers 2010: 30) than more fundamental questionings that might challenge a conception of science more concerned with proving its efficacy than addressing the questions that arise outside the academies.

Inspired by the logics of New Public Management, the SNSF Professorship Programme targets a new type of researcher whose profile responds to the changes confronting the academic world, since they are regarded as ‘knowledge entrepreneurs’, i.e. ‘mobile young researchers, capable of holding their own against competition and therefore as capable of pursuing a university career as of pursuing high-level research activity outside the universities’ (Kleiber 1999: 134). The requirements of this programme are particularly demanding for women since the single profile of excellence designed by the criteria to apply for such a bursary asks them to adapt to norms that are derived from disciplines in which they are a clear minority. Is this really what we want? Can we really regard such demands as gender friendly?
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Chapter 6  
(Re)Searching the Excellent Academic  
Kristina Binner and Lena Weber

Introduction

In recent years the public sector of several OECD-countries has been re-structured, due to the implementation of New Public Management tools and mechanisms. The academic field is also affected by the ‘economic shift’ and universities changed from an ‘academic oligarchy’ (Clark 1986) to become ‘entrepreneurial’ (Clark 1998).

The political guidance aims to increase the efficiency of academic work and want(s) to promote ‘excellence’ in academia. Employment conditions, especially for academics in their career passage between promotion and professorship, have changed. On the one hand there are increasingly more short term and part time job positions, on the other hand high prestige and attractive new job positions emerge, which should educe ‘excellent’ academics. Also the criteria, which define excellence, are shifting from or overlying more informal evaluation by the academic community to stakeholder guidance and quantitative criteria, i.e. the amount of acquired third party funds.

Some of the current discourses of academic excellence tend to ignore the gendered dimension of academic work and the life context. We argue that the organisation of academic work has to be taken into account in combination with other forms of work in private life. Our aim is to answer the following questions: How are gender arrangements in academia affected by the new reforms of academic work? How are the opportunities of male and female academics to achieve and be rewarded as ‘excellent’? With our approach of the everyday and biographical work arrangements (Aulenbacher and Riegraf 2010), we will show some possible tendencies with the focus on criteria of excellence, career tracks, job positions as well as private life arrangements of post-docs. Therefore we will take a closer look at the work and life conditions of the new post-doc positions of assistant professors in Austria and junior professors in Germany. Candidates on those positions are supposed to be the next generation of academic ‘excellence’. Both countries have an academic career system which implicates the ‘habilitation’, similar traditions in
national regulations of academic labour (de Boer, Enders and Schimank 2007) and gender regimes (Pfau-Effinger 2005) but different interpretations of employment relations (Tepe, Gottschall and Kittel 2008).

Gender changes in academia?

The noticeable restructuring of the public sector in the OECD-countries has in Austria and Germany also reached academia and the universities. A so called ‘economic shift’ can be witnessed: the relationship between university and state is being reorganised by the implementation of new public management tools and mechanisms (Riegraf et al 2010). Public administrative control is reduced in favour of operational and market-based principles. In addition, mechanisms of competition are established within and between academic organisations in new ways (Aulenbacher and Riegraf 2010). De Boer, Enders and Schimank (2007) describe such reorganisation of universities as a change of the governance pattern from a self-governed to a management model. The aim is to increase the academic output of the workforce by implementing management tools and maintaining competitive mechanisms. These processes go along with the transformation of the humanist notion of the university which in German is expressed in the term of the ‘Humboldt Ideal’, where the academic profession was seen as a powerful actor, into the idea of the ‘entrepreneurial university’, which is primarily concerned with its market value, evaluation and competition and goes along with a strengthening of the organisational level (Clark 1998; Musselin 2007). The reforms of the ‘University Act’ in Austria (‘Universitätsgesetz’, UG, 2002) and the ‘Framework of University Act’ (‘Hochschulrahmengesetz’, HRG, 1998) in Germany introduced the changed political guidance. New control mechanisms like evaluation systems were implemented and strengthened stakeholder guidance for more politically initiated competitive pressure through objective agreements. Alongside this, competitions for third party funds increasingly gain importance.

In both countries the employment conditions have been changed and it can be described as a devaluation of the academic profession (Weber, Binner and Kubicek 2012). For graduates between promotion and professorship there is an augmentation in atypical, temporary and unsecure employment conditions (Metz-Göckel, Selent and Schüermann 2010; Klencha and Krumbein 2008; Pernicka, Lücking and Lasofky-Blahut 2012; Pechar 2005). At the stage of professorship for German professors a performance-based salary has been introduced (‘W-Besoldung’). The devaluation in Austria looks differently: Professors now have the possibility to negotiate their salaries with the university, so that it is not clear yet
if salaries on average have got higher or lower. But professors lost the status of civil servants and consequently the pensions are lower.

Parallel to this situation, Austrian and German universities are characterised by a slowly rising access from women to the academic profession, but still not at the large scale as expected. For example in the last decade, the proportion of female professors increased in both countries from around 10% to approximately 19% (destatis 2007, 2010; Statistik Austria 2006, 2009, 2010, 2011). Whereas at student level gender relations are more or less equal, only a third of PhD-postgraduates and simply 25% of persons with a habilitation are female (destatis 2012; Statistik Austria 2011). The ‘habilitation’ has long been a major bottleneck for women in Austrian and German academia.

Additionally the gender segregation varies over the different disciplines. In both countries, female students are mainly in the social sciences, medical science and humanities, where they form the majority. In contrast, in technical studies and most natural sciences predominantly men are enrolled. But in every discipline the number of females decreases with every step upwards in the hierarchy.

A broad perspective of work

As recently established by Aulenbacher and Riegraf (2010), a look at the internal changes of organisations is not sufficient to assess how and to what extent the transformation of the university is gender-based. Therefore, we present the approach of the ‘everyday and biographical work arrangements’ (Aulenbacher and Riegraf 2010). We argue that researchers are engaged – apart from their academic work – in additional societal necessary forms of work, like work for themselves, subsistence and voluntary work or socio-civil commitments. According to Regina Becker-Schmidt’s (2002) feminist concept of extended work, paid and unpaid work forms are contradictory to each other regarding their societal organisation. They are structurally incompatible, insofar as the demands, aims and daily rhythms from one area, like to be able to spend time caring for children, clash with the demands from another area, for instance efficient time management in paid work. The bringing together of the so-called ‘work arrangement’ is delivered to the individuals and historically primarily to women. They are expected to ‘hold together (…), what is societally parted: private life and working life’ (Becker-Schmidt 2003: 14). The consequence of this achievement of compatibility is that the work and life contexts of women are more conflicted in everyday (Jurczyk and Voß 1995) and biographical (Krüger 2001) perspectives than those of men. The historically androcentric ‘nexus’ (Becker-Schmidt 2000: 39) ends up in a positive way for men as male workers and family
heads, whereas women are confronted more strongly with the question of whether and in which phases of their life they should give preference to family or to professional work.

Germany and Austria are classified as so called conservative gender regimes with a strong male breadwinner model (Pfau-Effinger 2005). Even though in the last years the male breadwinner model lost importance through increasing labour participation of women and implemented policy of work and family reconciliation, there is still a clear picture of gendered employment pattern.

Our thesis is that through the increase of women’s employment in academia, the new job positions and more and more atypical employment conditions, gender arrangements in academia will be in transition. We encounter this exemplary for the working and everyday life conditions of post-docs in Germany and Austria. We argue that they find themselves in a specific biographical and very demanding phase of life. They have to establish themselves in the academic world, struggle for secure job positions and have to make decisions in their private life, like living together with a partner or founding a family. Academics at this career stage are under pressure to deal with those demands of different life spheres in their daily life and have to integrate them in their individual biographies.

By referring to an approach with an extended concept of work it is possible to explain tendencies in the academic work not only from the perspective of paid work, but also from the perspective of unpaid work and how it is organised in different welfare state systems. In this sense, we understand the restructuring of academic work as part of a reorganisation of the societal division of labour, which takes place in the context of employment relations, welfare state and way of life. The approach also makes it possible to link the relations in academia with different national strategies of restructuring academia (Aulenbacher and Riegraf 2011).

(Re)searching excellence: what is meant by ‘excellence’?

‘Excellence’ is not a genuine concept for the German speaking academic world (Bröckling 2009). At a time, when political actors were trying to avoid the term ‘elite’ to be attributed to their new research funding programs, Ulrich Bröckling argues that the discourse of ‘excellence’ enters in Germany through Anglophone New Public Management literature. The so called ‘excellence initiative’ (introduced 2004) was implemented to establish ‘elite universities’ like in Northern America, but ‘elite’ in German is associated with the national socialist past. So the way was free for the
‘elusive’ excellence, ‘an entity not easily identified or readily measured’ (Zuckerman 1987:7). We argue, what is meant by excellence is socially constructed, depends on the societal and historical context (Münch 2007) and is gendered (European Commission 2004).

For a long time, the academic profession had high autonomy, which guaranteed that the ‘peers’ of the academic community could evaluate, in freedom and independence, who has earned reputation. Robert K. Merton (1973) described this as the meritocratic academic ethos, which can be – in Pierre Bourdieu’s words – identified as an illusion of the academic field (Bourdieu 1988). Feminist research revealed a ‘gender bias’ in the evaluation processes. Women have been discriminated against through for example peer reviewing (i.e. Wennerås and Wold 1997) or they ‘seem’ to not be suitable for a certain position (Van Brink and Benschop 2012). Margeret W. Rossiter (1993) described this effect of systematic non-recognition of merits from female academics as the ‘Matilda-effect’.

The new criteria of academic excellence are citations indices, impact factors or the volume of third party funds. On first sight they seem to be more formal or ‘objective’, because they are quantitative measurements. But they still integrate peer reviewing evaluation processes with their ‘gender bias’ and advantage academics who are already internationally accepted scholars.

Nowadays evaluation processes gain more and more importance, because academics’ salary and universities’ resources are measured by their output. This affects especially academics in their post-doctoral phase who earn their living with the new job profiles ‘junior’ (D) and ‘assistant’ (A) professorship, as they are supposed to be the next generation of academic excellence, which fulfils the new criteria of excellence. What are the gendered implications of these ‘excellent’ positions?

Work conditions for the next generation of excellence?

Although both German speaking countries share the ‘habilitation’ as a second book after the doctorate, they established historically different career systems in academia. Permanent employment was for a long time the guiding principle of the Austrian academic career system. In former times the greater part of academics in universities had the status of civil servants, which guaranteed a nearly secure and linear tenure track within mostly the same university. For young academics it was very hard to gain access into the universities, because of such immobile, ‘crusty’ staff structure and the Austrian university system showed a lack regarding ‘innovations’.

Under the new legislation those career tracks have been abolished. Now post-docs have greater possibilities to get in the university system as
before, but the conditions have dramatically changed (Pasternack 2008; de Boer, Enders and Schimank 2007; Pechar 2005). The position assistant professor existed already under the ‘old’ law, at this time academics became assistant professors after the doctorate, the habilitation was not demanded. The process of getting an assistant professorship resembles the tenure track in Northern America and is accompanied by challenging competition between and assessments of the candidates (Kreckel 2012). Nowadays, post-docs who are at the position of an assistant professor have to do the habilitation and other proofs of qualifications additionally. The assistant professorship is limited to six years, after two years will be decided, if the candidate gets a performance agreement (Qualifizierungsvereinbarung) about the aims which should be reached within the following four years. The points of the agreements are set up by the rector but the precise content is negotiated between the post-doc and the head of the department. In the case of the University of Vienna such agreements include: the establishment of an autonomous profile in research and teaching, activities in teaching and supporting young researchers, publishing in high quality journals, international presence and visibility, attracting third party funds (Universität Wien 2010). Working in international cooperation and being mobile is seen as an important factor for academic excellence and some universities (for example six months of external experiences in the case of the University of Linz) demand from their staff extended stays abroad in these agreements (Bmbwk 2006; Universität Linz 2011). In this sense being abroad is part of the career path of an assistant professor and could be seen as a precondition to get tenured as an associated professor. If the agreements are not be reached by the candidate, the position ends after the sixth years. Until now the position as an assistant professor is very exclusive and attractive, they only make up 2.3% of the academic personal and they have a low teaching duty (four hours per week). Further the assistant professor is the only ‘left over position’ that opens the gate for a permanent and tenured job position as an associated professor. Currently in these promising positions men are clearly overrepresented with 67.9% (BMWF 2012). At present the first assistant professors become associate professors and this shows if this ‘excellent’ career track will be more open for women. Women are with 19.4% underrepresented in this personal category which is similar to their distribution at the stage of (regular) professorships (19%; BMWF 2012). The new career track strengthens the habilitation as formal precondition to get in leading positions in academia. At this stage, we can conclude that this ‘excellent’ career track implies old barriers for women in a new guise.
Traditionally, the career path in Germany towards professorship was precarious and insecure for only the promise of an autonomic, powerful and good salaried position as a professor in the future. But through the restructuring of academia getting a professorship became less attractive in financial terms and respectively of academic freedom (Weber, Binne and Kubicek 2012). Next to this the junior professorship has been introduced in Germany. This position has been created to establish the possibility for post-docs to do autonomous research in an earlier stage of their career, brought up the example of the ‘assistant professor’ in Northern America. Until now less than 1% of the academic personnel are junior professors.

In contrast to the Austrian case, it is formally no more expected to write a habilitation in this position. It is also the first position in German academia which can be associated with a tenure-track option. Historically the German academic career system is characterised by the ban to become a professor at the same university where the person reached successfully the habilitation (‘Hausberufungsverbot’).

Junior professors have to negotiate a performance agreement with the dean. They are evaluated after three and after six years, when the employment ends, about how they meet the negotiated objectives and the expected quality of work. But it is not universal that a junior professorship is connected to a ‘tenure-track’-option, even if s/he has become positively evaluated. Only 18% of junior professors had a tenure-option in 2007 (Federkeil and Buch 2007). A tenure-option depends upon the universities’ financial resources and their practices towards junior professorships. For a tenure-option deans have to assign a regular professorship until the junior professor has been positive evaluated. In former days it was common that post-docs worked on a research assistant position. For the deans it is more attractive to get junior professors, because for nearly the same salary budget as a research assistant, junior professors have a higher teaching amount and administrative tasks. In the perspective of the post-docs it is an attractive position, if it is combined with a tenure track option. Without this option it is quite risky, because not in every discipline the junior professorship is acknowledged equivalent to a habilitation. Especially in the humanities – where most of the female post-docs work – a second publication is still expected (Lind and Löther 2006). Many junior professors still write their habilitation in the time as a junior professor to optimise their career chances (Federkeil and Buch 2007).

Recent studies show that the quota of females (38%) under the junior professorships is higher than in any other professorship position in Germany (in average 19%). The amount of professorships varies very
much between the disciplines: they are more common in mathematics and natural sciences (32%) and in linguistics, humanities, and sport sciences (24%; Federkeil and Buch 2007). Unfortunately no recent studies or studies which differentiate more between disciplines exist.

If the relatively high quota of female junior professors can be seen as a success story is very questionable, because these are positions which do not necessary end up in a secure position as regular professors. If the candidate fails, s/he loses the status as a professor and has to find another position. We claim that there is a need for studies, which investigate the biographical ways of junior professors after they have finished the employment of six years.

What about an 'excellent' life?

We argue that the expectations in the academic world which post-docs are confronted with have a high impact on their 'private' life, in a daily and biographical perspective. To achieve a high research and publication output and additionally a habilitation, the academic work has to be displaced ‘contra the job’; especially leisure time, weekends or the semester break is time for writing. Whether this time can be devoted to writing, thinking and reading depends on everyday duties, which are still far from being equally distributed among female and male academics.

Male professors predominantly live in traditional partnerships (Austria: 92 %; Germany: 90% are married) and 77% of the Austrian and 80% of the German male professors have children (Buchholz 2004; Zimmer, Krimmer and Stallmann 2007). They are almost freed from family obligations, 67% of the Austrian and 66% of the German male professors stated that the care of children is undertaken by their partners. Female researchers still have to decide between a life where they are more often required to integrate the conflicting demands of academic work, housekeeping and child care or to life alone, rather childless. 44% of female professors in Austria and 20% in Germany are unmarried and half of them are childless (A: 47%; G: 50%) When they do live in a partnership and have children, female professors are seldom relieved from childcare by their partners – only 8% of the German and 11% of Austrian female professors declared that they were relieved from childcare by their partners. Overall, 27% of the Austrian and 18% of the German female professors affirmed that besides their main profession they performed most of the care of their children (Buchholz 2004; Zimmer, Krimmer and Stallmann 2007).

These different life arrangements count also for junior professors (Federkeil and Buch 2007); more female junior professors are childless (49%) than their male colleagues (45%). But the small difference could
also indicate a change in gender arrangements. Comparable to the phenomenon that male academics increasingly, yet still in a small percentage, are striving for more time with their families (Liebig 2010). In Austria no data about the life arrangements of male and female assistant professors exists yet. But a former study indicates that female post-docs experience the reconciliation of work and family especially during their habilitation phase as heavy burden (Buchinger, Gödl and Gwschandner 2004: 67).

Preliminary results of a currently undertaken qualitative study show that especially female assistant professors broach the issue of the narrow time window of doing the habilitation and fulfilling the agreements. One female professor claims that formally the time of maternity protection is, on the one hand, respected to expand a short-term contract. But, on the other hand, in her opinion the demand of doing the habilitation and fulfilling the qualification proofs is too much for people who have also caring duties. In her case she, as a mother, could negotiate with her head of department for a reduction of teaching load, in comparison to her colleagues without caring duties. This example shows how demands of private and paid work sphere have to be negotiated by female individuals in the ‘rush hour’ of life.

Conclusions

The establishment of new positions of assistant professors in Austria and junior professors in Germany reflects the attempt of both countries to catch up ‘excellence’ in academia. Although the countries share similar traditions of academic labour the restructuring of the career tracks differs. With the position of the assistant professor in Austria a category is established which tries to combine elements of the old career system with new requirements: In contrast to the former generation of assistant professors nowadays the habilitation and other proofs of qualification are required. First figures indicate that women are underrepresented in such promising positions. Transformations within the career system seem to build up on gendered structures. Criteria of academic excellence, for example the requirement of getting abroad for six weeks can especially disadvantage female academics with family duties.

In Germany the junior professorship is a new career track beside others on the way to a regular professorship. For the first time in Germany a tenure-track option has been implemented with the attempt to abolish the habilitation track. The proportion of women is higher within the junior professors than on regular professorships. But there are new risks connected to this track, because the habilitation is beside this position mostly still expected from the academic community.
Under the current conditions, the private lifestyle is – again or still – an important career resource to fulfil criteria of academic excellence. The new vision of an excellent, ‘scientific entrepreneur’ (Matthies 2005; Aulenbacher and Riegraf 2010) is not gender free.

On the one hand it is an upcoming question for us, if critical voices promoting alternative work- and life arrangements (for example ‘new fathers’) are heard. On the other hand it is questionable if the increased precarious working conditions in academia put more pressure on the individuals to organise their private lifestyle in a career-orientated way.

With this background we assume that the understanding of excellence have to broaden in the sense, that whole life contexts have to be taken account and career tracks have to be open for discontinuities and career breaks (Aulenbacher et al 2012; Hannapi-Egger 2012). In the long way it must be asked if under current conditions, which are in Austria and Germany characterised by an casualisation of academic work, ‘excellent’ knowledge can be produced, and if ‘excellent’ people want to stay in academe.
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Chapter 7
Gender Uncertainty in Academia

Anna Fogelberg Eriksson, Linda Schultz and Elisabeth Sundin

Introduction

This paper explores the uncertainty that gender issues release in the academic context of a Swedish VINNOVA-supported excellence centre. The Helix Vinn Excellence Centre (Helix), Linköping University, works as a case as we address the question of how researchers relate to and deal with gender issues in their research (Schultz and Fogelberg Eriksson 2010).

The aim of VINNOVA, the Swedish Governmental Agency for Innovation Systems, is to ‘increase the competitiveness of Swedish researchers and companies’. Their task ‘is to promote sustainable growth in Sweden by funding needs-driven research and the development of effective innovation systems’ (www.vinnova.se). The activities of VINNOVA comprise for example long term investment in strong research and innovation milieus and in projects to commercialise research results. One of those long term excellence investments is Helix, a research and innovation partnership and triple helix constellation (cf. Etzkowitz 2008) between Linköping University and some 20 external partners, here private companies and public sector organisations. The partnership focuses on working life development and the management of mobility – of people and ideas – as driving forces for individual and organisational learning, health and entrepreneurship (www.liu.se/helix). An interactive research approach is adopted in the research projects of Helix (cf. Johannisson et al 2008).

Ever since the start in 2006 the research programme of Helix has been described in three interrelated sub-programmes of research and innovation focusing on mobility in relation to workplace learning and competence-development; health promotion; and idea development and entrepreneurship. The sub-programmes as well as on-going and planned research projects have emerged from a series of dialogue seminars within the Helix partnership.

Three thematic issues are common to all three sub-programmes: participation in development and other organisational processes; gender
equality in development and other organisational processes; and leadership with respect to the promotion of learning, health and innovation. This creates a matrix as presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Issues:</th>
<th>Research Programmes</th>
<th>Mobility in relation to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Health Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Idea Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and Entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. The matrix of interrelated knowledge interests behind the Helix research and innovation centre. (Helix 2008)

In addition, the Operational Plan for Helix (Helix 2008) also stated that ‘Gender equality and gender issues are important parts of Helix research programme as well as of the EO (equal opportunities) strategy’ (Helix 2008: 14). So, in relation to VINNOVA, the Helix centre is required to handle gender issues – both regarding research and in terms of a gender equal organisation of the centre. Gender mainstreaming, both in the work with the partner organisations and in the internal activities, is actually one of the basic requirements for funding of this particular centre. In relation to the external Helix partners there is also a certain responsibility to focus on gender related research projects since several partners have brought gender issues to the research agenda, e.g. questions of leadership and gender in male dominated organisations. This requires gender awareness amongst the Helix researchers, not least since some of the partners, both industrial and public sector, have been asking for help and assistance with how to solve problems that are addressed in explicit gender-concepts.

A couple of years after the inauguration of Helix it turned out that even though there was consensus on the importance of gender related issues, and even though ‘everybody’ expressed a positive attitude towards gender issues, this was somehow hard to prioritise or the gender perspective hard to integrate into research projects. Other, seemingly gender neutral, questions had a tendency to attract more attention. Since several external partners had asked for research on gender related issues of mobility, one of the directors of research and a number of the researchers at Helix decided to apply for additional funding in the VINNOVA call ‘Applied Gender Research for Strong Research and Innovation Milieus’ or ‘TIGER’ which is the acronym that derives from the Swedish name of the call. TIGER aimed at integrating knowledge gained from calls
for proposals in R&D projects in areas supported by VINNOVA under other programmes. The launch of TIGER was thus a strategy of ‘adding the yeast after the dough’, i.e. a way to focus on gender issues and gender equality in the large VINNOVA investments through a separate programme. VINNOVA’s strategy when it comes to gender issues has been operationalised in several calls under the umbrella programme ‘Needs-Driven Gender Research for Innovation’. TIGER was one of those calls.

Helix was granted funding from the TIGER-call, for the research project ‘The mobility of gender – gendering mobility for learning, health and innovation’. The aim of this particular project is to enhance the gender awareness and to develop gender equal patterns of interaction and organisational structures within Helix. The project has an interactive research approach and is planned in two steps. The first step consists of two projects that contribute to the visualisation of the relevance of gender in the development, sustainable growth and competitiveness of Helix. These two projects focus on leadership and gender, and innovation and gender. In addition, the research and innovation partnership has been surveyed in two interview studies. The results from these projects should generate adequate measures and further research within the partner organisations of Helix (step 2).

Aim and outline of the paper

The aim of the paper is to explore and discuss the uncertainty that gender issues release in the academic context of an excellence centre.

In order to do so we present a mapping case study where we concentrate on the research and researchers of Helix, i.e. the university partner of the triple helix constellation, although there is a close connection between the internal activities and the research and the activities done with and for the partner organisations. The study investigates if and how gender aspects are part of the on-going research projects within Helix and how researchers relate to and deal with gender issues in their research. The empirical material is based on interviews with 35 participants (senior researchers, research fellows and doctoral students) at the centre (Schultz and Fogelberg Eriksson 2010). In the paper we describe how gender issues bring uncertainty to the fore and how the research staff handles it.

In the subsequent part of the paper we clarify some of the concepts we use and how we wish to frame our topic. The methods used in the mapping study are described thereafter, followed by the result of the study. The paper ends with a discussion on the implications and aftermath of how the results may be contextualised.
Concepts and analytical entries

Potentially, several concepts and research fields would have to be defined and surveyed in order to frame the topic of the paper. The presentation here is limited to the concepts that relate to gender, gender equality and gender mainstreaming. We also comment shortly on gender in relation to research and in academia.

Here gender conceptualises the social and cultural construction of the relationship between women and men, behaviour and tasks of women and men, as well as what is considered as ‘female’ and ‘male’ (Acker 1990; Broadbridge and Hearn 2008; Korvajärvi 1998). Gender is continually produced and reproduced through actions and interactions over time in practices (Gherardi and Poggio 2002; Martin 2003) and is thus something that people do in everyday activities in which they participate and interact with others (Acker 1990, 1999; West and Zimmerman 1987).

The official Swedish definition of gender equality implies that men and women have the same opportunities, rights and obligations in all areas of life. Since the mid-1990s official Swedish gender equality policy has been directed towards gender equality integration or gender mainstreaming, i.e. that a gender equality perspective, likewise all decision-making and all processes in an organisation should characterise all political areas. The official definition of gender mainstreaming follows the one of the Council of Europe: ‘the (re)organisation, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes, so that a gender equality perspective is incorporated at all levels and at all stages, by the actors normally involved in policy-making’.

Several theoretical gender studies discuss and problematise which premises gender equality work is based on, and what the consequences of gender equality work might be for women and men. Gender equality work can, for example, be carried out on the basis of apprehensions that, basically, men and women are both alike and different. The starting point of similarity or difference between women and men can bring very different consequences for women and men in organisations (Billing and Alvesson 1989). The complementary view of women and men in gender equality work can contribute to the recreation of existing power relations. When women and men are expected to be very different and hence complement each other, the power dimension disappears. By analogy with these arguments some critics claim that gender equality work can contribute to gender-stereotyped perceptions of women and men being recreated. Others maintain that gender equality work can contribute to women having to adapt to a male norm, e.g. being able to participate in
working life on conditions based on a traditional man’s role (Marshall 1984; Sundin 1992).

The resistance to gender equality work that may come up in organisations has also been described (see e.g. Cockburn 1991; Pincus 2002). Since work for gender equality implies change, this work may face both cultural and institutional resistance. The resistance can be both active and passive (Pincus 2002). Resistance can take various forms and be expressed in various ways: disinterest, lack of time and indifference (often pronounced by men, but also women); fear (often faced by women) of being recognised as hysterical or mad; fear of losing one’s position; fear of meeting resistance; and the habit and convenience of subordination (Amundsdotter 2010).

Now turning to gender in academia, as in the title of our paper, this may refer to different intersections of gender and academia. Jeff Hearn and Liisa Husu (2011) suggest at least three intersections, or relations, between gender and academia:

- gendered individuals in science: who does science? (cf. Harding 1986: ‘the women question in science’). This relates to the number of women and men within academia, quantitative gender equality.
- gendered organising of science: how it is managed, organised and practiced within organisations
- gendered knowledge in science: the role of gender for the construction of scientific knowledge (cf. Harding 1986: ‘the science question in feminism’).

Proponents of gender in the broad sense thus use different angles in their argumentation. Schiebinger and Schraudner (2011) argue that ‘gender mainstreaming now needs to be expanded to include gender analysis in basic and applied research’ in order to achieve gendered innovations (2011: 158). Rees (2011) adds to this argument by stating that not only does research have to take gender into account but the gender equality of institutions is crucial in order to achieve scientific excellence.

Relating to the intersections of gendered knowledge and science, are the various analytical entries that gender may offer to research. A general definition of ‘gender research’ would be ‘that it is the large field where it is problematised how gender, that is cultural and social sex, is “made”, constructed, arises, is formed – on different levels, in different spheres, in culture and society’ (Ganetz 2006: 13). Gender research then put gender in the centre of research and as focus of projects (Thurén 2003). Research with a ‘gender perspective’ implies that that gender and its social construction, along with other perspectives, are key when it comes to formulation of research problems, theorising and the analysis
of data. When considering ‘gender aspects’ in research, it implies that gender does not play a very prominent part in the analysis, rather that the gendered dimensions remain to be found. Concentration on ‘sex as a variable’, not as an analytical category and without use of gender theories or research, is not defined as gender research, perspective or aspect in relation to the previously presented definitions. The approach of ‘sex as a variable’ is however still a very important and relevant basis for further studies (Ganetz 2006). Numerous researchers focus on women and men as empirical categories combined with gender as an analytical category.

In the interviews and when we discuss the mapping study we use ‘gender aspects’ in a more broad sense than Ganetz definition. To be able to include all kinds of issues related to gender and to men and women we asked the researchers if they could see any gender aspects in their research projects, in their research questions and in their empirical data. In this context gender aspects was used as an overarching concept. Throughout the paper we frequently also use the term ‘gender issues’, which here encompass precisely gender issues in a very broad sense. In the paper we use the categories as described by Ganetz in the presentation of the results from the mapping study when we categorise the research projects within Helix.

Methodology – conducting the mapping study

A qualitative case study is presented in the study, describing if and how gender aspects are part of the on-going research within Helix. Case studies have the advantage that they make possible to gain in depth knowledge about situations and the certain interpretations that people make in a specific context (Merriam 1994). One of the critical comments about case studies is about how results from a specific case may be interesting to a broader, or general, context. An argument for the usage of case studies would then be to claim that they may contribute to an understanding of phenomena which are not solely specific. The results from case studies can be interesting also for other situations and contexts via analytical generalisations:

... to imagine possibilities, to broaden and enrich the repertoire of social constructions that are available to practitioners and others. We can also add the interest that ethnographic studies show for cases that demonstrate the rich variations in human behavior, pointing to the possibilities for our own society. (Kvale 1997: 212, our translation)

By focusing on the specific case, even the general in the case can become visible, for example the dynamics of organisational change and the prob-
lems relating to the introduction of a gender perspective. We argue that there might be reason to assume that the case might represent something more general.

The main purpose of conducting interviews was to investigate and survey if and how gender, gender aspects and aspects of sex, i.e. differences between men and women, are dealt with and part of the research of Helix. Primarily the interviews focused on discussing if the projects considered gender aspects or differences between men and women, that is, if gender was part of the projects’ design. At the same time it was also of interest to discuss the projects more generally regarding gender and men and women. Even if gender wasn’t part of the design there might be aspects of gender and gender differences that the researches had observed or seen in their projects, and those aspects were also of our interest.

Furthermore the interviews worked as an inventory of ideas regarding further studies on gender within Helix. This inventory is however not part of the results presented in this paper.

In total 35 interviews with 19 men and 16 women were conducted, discussing 45 different research projects within Helix. Essentially the study can be seen as total in the aspect that the interviews covered all the on-going (and even some of the finished) research of Helix during the time of the study. For more details of the interviewed see table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewed categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers (with a PhD)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project assistants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All interviews were recorded and the central parts were transcribed. The non-transcribed parts of the interviews were primarily oriented towards placing the research and the researcher in a context, and these parts were summarised. The transcriptions and the summaries have then formed the ground for further analysis and synthesis. The quotes used in this paper have been somewhat revised from spoken to written language. When the quotes contain information that can reveal the identity of the interviewed that information has been replaced with X or Z. The contents of the interviews have first been organised in categories regarding their character when it comes to gender perspectives, gender aspects or sex as variable. In the next step the result has been organised in themes, which derive from the interviews. The themes can be said to deal with
the researchers’ positions or views regarding applying gender and gender perspectives in their research projects.

Results – dealing with gender

The main focus of the interviews is the researchers’ different projects and the gender aspects or possible gender aspects of these projects. In total 45 projects (the majority of which were on-going, a few finished and a few in the planning phase) were discussed. Of these, eight had a distinct gender perspective in the sense that gender was being used as a theoretical and analytical standpoint in the analysis and the descriptions of the empirical findings (Ganetz 2006).

In eleven of the projects sex was treated as a variable in the empirical material and in the case that differences between men and women showed, these were defined and described. A few projects had let the empirical data determine whether gender was going to be used as an analytical category and in the projects design there was an opening for the use of gender perspectives. Finally, 22 projects did not use gender perspectives or made comparisons between men and women.

Table 2. Summary of research projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character of research project</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project with gender perspective/gender aspects</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project with sex as a variable, differences between men and women</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects where the empirical findings decide whether gender may become an analytical perspective or relevant aspect.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project without gender perspective/gender aspects/sex as variable</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of projects</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results in table 2 above summarise what is actually done regarding research of gender aspects in Helix projects. But a big part of the interviews deals with what can be defined as the interviewees’ position or view of gender perspectives and the possibility of applying them to his/her research. In these more general discussions about gender and the interviewees’ research all of the interviewed were aware and most of them could also see that their projects or their empirical field could have gender aspects. The different positions or views towards the possibility of using a gender perspective that were seen in the material were sorted into four themes. These themes can in one sense be seen as derived from the projects and their design but in most sense they come from the researchers interest and his or her prioritisations.
The researcher positions, or views, in relation to gender as a research question can be distinguished in the following ways:

1. Interested in gender issues and applies a gender perspective in research.
2. There are possibilities to use a gender perspective in the future and/or this is decided by the empirical findings.
3. There are gender aspects but other perspectives have mainly been focused since gender is not ‘my perspective’ and/or my knowledge is not so well grounded and cannot come any further in the analysis.
4. There are no gender aspects/hard to see if it would be possible to apply a gender perspective in the project.

In relation to the first position, interested in gender issues and applies a gender perspective in research, there were eight projects that had a gender perspective or had an aim to study gender aspects. These projects were mainly focused on leadership and gender; women as entrepreneurs; and the public sector and its transformation. It can also be mentioned that the same researcher ran four of these projects in collaboration with others. The following quote captures this position:

My perspective is that in all relevant and interesting questions or topics within behavioural sciences and social sciences it is possible to apply a gender perspective. It could be more or less fruitful but it is always possible. I always have a gender perspective from the beginning. I have it with me all the time, for me it is not possible to use it a little bit or to apply it later on. For me the gender perspective is there from the start.

There were also several researchers who let their empirical data determine whether a gender analysis could be fruitful or not. This view concerns the second position, possibilities to use a gender perspective in the future and/or this is decided by the empirical findings:

In the xx-project both men and women were part of the empirical data and I did a simple comparative analysis to see if there were any important aspects or apparent differences regarding sex that I needed to deal with. But I couldn’t see any big differences between men and women on that level. Gender didn’t show as an essential aspect and then I felt that it is difficult enough to combine the x-perspective and the z-perspective so I made a limitation in that case.

There seems to be an order of priority between different perspectives of analysis were the gender perspective in most cases end up not being prioritised. Mainly because the researcher first hand has studied other issues and used other perspectives. Because of the interactive research model
used in Helix, the partnership of Helix also have some influence over which questions and perspectives is being used. The interactive model enables for the researcher to get unique insight to the field of research, and to different issues and problems within that field. At the same time this could also mean that the researcher in some cases has to adjust to which perspectives to use. One of the interviewed says that a gender perspective would be interesting and fruitful in one of the projects. But the organisation that they study isn’t open for a gender perspective being used. The interviewed thinks that maybe it can be done later in the project when aspects that the organisations finds central and important has been lifted and analysed by the researchers.

The majority of the interviewed had not, for different reasons, chosen to enlighten gender issues. This is the third position: There are gender aspects but other perspectives have mainly been focused since gender is not ‘my perspective’ and/or my knowledge is not so well grounded and cannot come any further in the analysis:

I’m first and most interested in other aspects. The gender perspective is not ‘my perspective’.  
I don’t have sufficient knowledge of gender theories to make any analysis of gender aspects in my research  
I’m not sure that a gender analysis would be fruitful in this type of project.

The interviews show that the most common reason for not using a gender perspective in the projects of Helix is that the researchers have other research questions or interests. In first hand the researchers use and are interested in other perspectives. Several of the interviewed emphasise the importance of gender perspectives in research and even though they themselves don’t use gender it doesn’t mean that they don’t find gender and gender analysis interesting.

In the x-projects there is no gender dimension in the design of the projects. The projects that I primarily have worked with have focused on industrial work based in process- and engineering industry. If you then should think about differences between men and women – that has not been current – they aren’t that many women in those types of organisations. But on the other hand I haven’t chosen to apply a gender perspective that deals with masculinities either – it hasn’t been my main interest. For me it has always been about studying X and X. I don’t know if I have those types of glasses on that often. But if I would put the (gender) glasses on I would of course look at interactions, on divisions of labour and those things. But I couldn’t say that I have done that. You would look at policies and approaches, on artefacts and symbols at the workplace. I think I could activate it, put
the glasses on so to speak but I haven’t applied those (gender) types of perspectives.

Finally there were several of the researchers who expressed an uncertainty when it comes to gender perspectives and gender theories and how to apply them to their own research. They argued that there are distinct aspects of gender in their projects and in their field of research but since they don’t have sufficient knowledge in gender theories they haven’t used these types of perspectives.

I think that for us who are not gender researchers there’s an uncertainty about what gender research really is. It is not that simple that you just include men and women as a variable in a survey. I’m wondering if it maybe has something to do with method, with approach? I think that there are several people who can be a bit uncertain about what gender analysis really is. You have to be able to ask the right questions from right perspective when your about to focus on gender. In all issues like this, the question of gender is important but we haven’t pursued them very well I should say. I my self is not so good at gender perspectives. In this field it is very common to do comparisons based on sex but it stops there and that you can hardly call gender research.

There are some of the interviewees who find it hard to see that it would be fruitful or possible to apply a gender perspective in their projects, position four. The main reason for not seeing gender aspects in their research is that they cannot see that the research question as such would comprise any gender aspects. They find it hard to see that their topic could be related to gender in any sense. But it should be emphasised that these researchers still are open to the possibility of finding gendered dimensions and that they themselves may be the reason for not being able to identify the gender aspects. One of the interviewees says:

In the research projects I find it hard to identify gender aspects, but they are present in the organisations. It is possible that there might exist gender issues also in the projects, but I find my research interest to be gender neutral, that gender is not applicable. But it is possible that my limited knowledge of gender theories makes me blind.

**Discussion – dealing with uncertainty**

The mapping study or survey presented in this paper investigated if and how gender aspects were part of the on-going research projects within Helix and how researchers related to and dealt with gender issues in their research. What can we then say about the results of the mapping
before we move on to the exploratory aim of the paper, i.e. to discuss uncertainty in relation to gender issues?

To start out, we wish to take a positive stance. During the interviews the majority expressed that gender perspectives, gender aspects, or sex as a variable are important dimensions of Helix’ research. None of the researchers expressed an explicit disinterest for research regarding gender or gender equality issues. Even those who found it hard to see if their own research had anything to do with gender at all displayed an openness towards gender issues and the possibility of expanding their analyses to include gender aspects – with some help from those with gender expertise. Several of the researchers expressed an interest in learning more about gender or how to integrate a gender perspective in their own research. The openness that the researchers displayed can of course be related to the Helix policy that gender is part of the issues that the research projects should give attention to. In this sense, Helix may perhaps be understood as a unique excellence centre in its’ openness to gender issues.

In a situation where all interviewees know that gender issues – in one way or another – should be at least touched upon in each research project it is not surprising that almost everyone display a positive attitude towards it. Even so, a recurrent theme in the interviews was the uncertainty that this particular thematic issue released. A positive attitude is in itself not enough to completely embrace a gender perspective.

There are a number of uncertainties that are released as gender is put on the agenda. Uncertainty is expressed by the interviewed researchers but there are also other dimensions of uncertainty present that the authors of the paper have identified.

We use ‘uncertainty’ as a lens through which we wish to interpret and discuss the findings of our survey of the research projects within Helix. Uncertainty is released amongst both senior research fellows and doctoral students as the issue of gender in research projects is brought up. We have deliberately chosen uncertainty as it is both more vague than and not as firm, fixed or harsh as resistance. To be uncertain about something is neighbouring to being insecure, unsteady, undecided, indefinite, undefined.

The uncertainty can initially be interpreted in relation to the demands of acting or taking a politically correct stance in relation to gender equality or gender as a research question: where and what are the limits of the accepted internal academic discourse on these issues?

Uncertainty can also be interpreted in relation to the field of gender studies. Several of the senior researchers recollected stories of rejected research applications where they had tried to incorporate a gender per-
perspective or gender aspects in the applications but were rejected with reference to poor conceptual development and poor theoretical framing. This might be understood in relation to the institutionalisation of gender studies, where hegemonic developments of ‘proper’ ways to conduct gender sensitive or gender aware research is developed (Liinason 2010). Amongst doctoral students, there were also stories on how gender related issues in their thesis projects had evoked ‘high voltage’ reactions, again relating to different ways of defining and applying a gender perspective.

Of the 45 research projects that were described and investigated in this survey there were 8 projects that in a clear and concrete way addressed gender. In the light of the research program of Helix it may be relevant to ask whether this is a reasonable amount of projects. Or would it be reasonable that more projects would address gender issues? Is it so that the gender issues have been left behind? Since Helix is a partnership regarding working life there are – in reality – numerous needs relating to gender an/or gender equality. These questions do not have immediate answers. To give a fair account whether gender issues have been underprioritised within Helix we should make a comparison with the other two thematic issues (leadership and participation). This comparison was however not part of the mapping study presented in the paper. The uncertainty remains in relation to how to value the categorisation of the projects.

In the interviews the researchers reported that there are always a number of complex choices that a researcher has to face. This particularly concerns the initial work, where compromises and adaptations might be necessary. Not least when working in close collaboration with the partnership and empirically driven research as is the case within Helix. There are several aspects that influence a researcher as he or she plans and develops different research projects. For example this involves specific guidelines and demands of different calls of research funders. In the case of Helix this relates finding research issues that are relevant and fruitful both to researchers and partner organisations. The interactive research of Helix means that the relevance and importance should be shared by both so-called practitioners and researchers. Is the interactive research model influencing the place and space of the issues relating to gender and gender equality? Would more research projects address gender issues or use a gender perspective if solely researchers were to decide the research topics? (Or vice versa, i.e. if the partner organisations were to decide topics?) It is hard to determine how much the interactive research model influences the development of the research problems but it is reasonable to assume that the partners do, to a certain degree, influence the perspectives and which aspects that the researchers are to address.
Above these external conditions for research within Helix there are a number of internal factors that influence the projects. Researchers often develop their research in accordance with the theoretical frame and the theoretical positions that the researchers adhere to. These standpoints are primarily grounded in personal interests and the research areas and fields that the researcher keeps to.

When it comes to empirically driven research within working life and organisations it seems as if one researcher primarily focuses a certain kind of organisations, for example, only public organisations or only production companies. In these cases the research area, i.e. the empirical domain, and the research questions might actually enforce each other and keep the researcher within the same field. The temporal dimension also influences these processes; there were several researchers who stated that they would like to expand into other theoretical (empirical?) fields and perspectives – if only they had the time. It is hard, if not impossible, to go deep into several fields of research as a researcher. This effects the choices that researchers make regarding theoretical perspectives, empirical material, and research questions, which also has an effect on how the research projects develop.

The external and internal circumstances that were related in the above sections are probably obvious to most researchers. These, and other factors, were mentioned as choices and aspects that influence the researcher and the projects that they engage in. It was also made obvious during the interviews that even if the researchers were able to see and recognise gender aspects or dimensions in their research projects/empirical material they would still not go ahead with closer analyses or problematisations of gender aspects. Could it be, that in the ‘crowd’ of analytical perspectives and alternatives, the gender perspective always or often ends up in the less (or under-) prioritised group?

In the mapping study there is no one who express a direct resistance or show that they aren’t interested in research that concerns gender issues. At the same time, however, they chose to not to use the gender perspective or to ‘postpone’ it to ‘the future’. Other perspectives and other issues are prioritised in relation to gender and gender equality. Is the consequence that the gender issues end up getting separated from the main stream, and are handed over to somebody who is expected to deal with the gender issues in a better way?

One topic that came up in a number of interviews was whether a gender perspective may be a more ‘charged’ subject when compared to other subject matters. Some interviewees also mentioned that it might be extra hard to enter that field of knowledge, which might represent another factor that effects the space and place of a gender perspective within He-
lix. Several researchers mentioned uncertainty in relation to conducting gender analyses since they did not feel that they knew the subject field or were enough informed. Hence, a question for further discussion within Helix is then how researchers who are interested and who see and recognize gender aspects can be encouraged to highlight these in their own research. Several researchers claimed that they wanted more knowledge on gender theories and that they needed to learn what to look for in their empirical material in order to discover gender aspects. The visualisation of gender aspects gives insights on the relevance and impact of gender, but in order to visualise these aspects there must be both awareness and knowledge.

1. The uncertainty that gender issues bring to the fore influences both research projects and researchers. Four positions or ways of handling the uncertainty were identified amongst the research staff:

2. One group chose the gender track as their main focus or academic career track, i.e. can be seen as part of the institutionalisation of gender studies.

3. One group could identify gendered aspects, but chose to postpone it, or let the data decide whether it should be analysed further

4. One group saw the relevance of gender in research but chose not to get involved in this since it seems to be particularly tricky

5. One group cannot see the immediate relevance

Concluding remarks

In the paper we wished to explore uncertainty both as an empirical finding of our mapping study of how researchers related to and dealt with gender issues in their research, and as an ‘in-between-position’ as we interpreted the findings. Being uncertain while analysing, commenting and interpreting the findings implied to take a not clearly and solely positive position, nor a clearly and solely critical position coloured by the much reported resistance that gender issues and gender equality efforts have evoked in various organisational settings. Our intention is to further investigate whether ‘uncertainty’ may help us to identify crucial intersections where we can find new pathways to advance the analyses of gender in academia.
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Chapter 8
Gender, Impact Assessment
and Research Funding

Inger Jonsson

Introduction
The aim of this paper is to draw attention to some questions that deserve to be addressed concerning the role of gender in relation to the assessment of impact of research. There has been a growing pressure from the political sphere stressing the need of value for money from investments in research. As a consequence a growing number of evaluations are undertaken in order to measure the impact and benefits of science, not only for science but also for society in general. The way this trend influences the research systems makes it important to look into questions like: What consequences has the presence/absence of a gender dimension in the planning and implementation of impact assessments on strategic planning and prioritising made by research institutions? Should assessment reports include insights into gendered outcomes?

Research systems in transformation
Research systems globally are undergoing transformations that include a large number of both independent and interrelated elements. National contexts influence the ongoing process but some general trends can be observed that has been characterised in different ways, such as a transition from Mode 1 to Mode 2 or as the emergence of a ‘Triple Helix’ relationship between universities, government and industry, etc. The changing social contract between science and society, between the universities and the governments have given rise to discussions and concern for the future role of the universities and the researchers and not the least the status of basic research. The more pessimistic view is not shared by all, however, and some points to the way the universities after all have adapted and survived through history (see for example Elzinga 2012; Martin 2012; Whitley 2011).

Central to the ongoing development is the increasing focus on accountability, often considered a part New Public Management, and an ambition to prove that public spending on research gives value for mon-
ey. The great hopes set on research to contribute to sustainable growth and to address the ‘great challenges’ have further accentuated the interest in keeping track of the outcomes and effects of research. As a consequence evaluations of various kinds have become a common feature of daily life in the higher education and research sector. Research is not only, however, evaluated according to how it might benefit the society, it is also assessed on the basis of how it contributes to enhancing scientific development. Scientific excellence is awarded prizes, get articles published, etc, but has furthermore always been a yardstick for prioritizing what research to fund as public resources are limited. The element of competitiveness seems to have intensified and so have the discussion about what we should mean by excellence and how it best can be measured (see for example Elzinga 2012; Martin 2012; Whitley 2011).

In many ways these two parallel trends are intertwined and central in shaping the research systems as evaluations (intentionally or unintentionally) tend to influence the behavior of the organisations and the individuals that are evaluated. This is for example acknowledged in a RAND report for HEFCE ‘Because the REF will drive the behaviour of the HEIs, it will be important to be very explicit about the criteria for assessing impact.’ (Grant 2009: V). In this respect evaluations can be understood as a form of intervention and an instrument of control and the following recommendation concerning the introduction of new policies is therefore highly relevant also for evaluations: ‘New policies need to have a gender impact assessment to assess whether they will have an effect on men and women in different ways, and if so, whether they are justifiable’ (European Commission 2012b: 27).

As we will see it is mainly the assessment of scientific impact that until now has been discussed from a gender perspective. This study will argue, however, that the growing interest in measuring the societal gains of research makes it important to expand the analysis of the possible gendered outcomes also to this kind of wider impact evaluations.

Impact assessment and methodological approaches

The focus on excellence, on outcomes and accountability as well as the increased competitiveness has had as a consequence an increased interest in methods for measuring and comparing impact of research. (The following is based on ESF 2012a and ESF 2012b). What impact assessment is about is to establish the effect of a certain intervention – in this case public spending on research. It can be difficult to distinguish impact assessment from other types of evaluation as for example goal-oriented evaluation, which pay attention to the fulfilment of the stated aims for the intervention rather than intended or unintended effects.
a strict meaning an impact assessment should establish a counterfactual position – what would have happened if the intervention had not taken place – in order to identify and measure the effects. To do this outside a laboratory setting is very difficult and demands methods other than RCT or quasi experimental designs. Studies focusing on the impact of research therefore often use a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods to establish effects on science or on society.

Table 1. Examples of different methodological approaches to impact studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative</th>
<th>Quantitative</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td>Bibliometrics</td>
<td>Network analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical tracing</td>
<td>Econometric/Statistical methods</td>
<td>Case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benefit-cost case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercialisation tracking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A common feature for the impact studies focusing on the effects of research is an ambition to identify and develop indicators that can tell us something about how science affect science and about the interaction between science and society. Two problematic issues are of special relevance in this context. First we have the question of attribution – how to link progress in science and in society to certain achievements in research? The difficulties associated with attribution have made the concept contribution a more attractive alternative for this kind of impact studies. (It is far easier to establish that specific research findings have contributed to the development.) The other issue concerns the problem with the time lag, which can be considerable between the original research findings and the scientific or social impact, and a lot of studies try to deal with this. Another challenge is furthermore to find the relevant level – micro or macro – for the impact assessment. Should the focus be on the outcomes from individual research projects or rather on research fields, departments or research institutes?

Science for science

Peer review is maybe the most commonly used evaluation model in the academic context, above all for ex ante evaluations of research applications etc., but also for ex post evaluations of for example larger research programs (ESF 2009). It is furthermore made use of when applications for academic positions are assessed and last but not least by scientific journals in the assessment of articles for publishing (which should be noted in relation to discussions concerning bibliometrics).
Considering the central role of peer review it is inevitable that it has been criticised and called into question but mostly with the intent to improve the quality of what is seen as the best method after all (see for example ESF 2011; Donovan 2007b; Besselaar 2012). The critique has focused on several different aspects whereof only some with relevance for this study will be mentioned here.

The gate-keeping role of the peer reviewers is a central issue that has been discussed and the importance of a gender perspective has been highlighted (European Commission 2009: 35–51; Husu and Cheveigné 2010; European Commission 2012a). That the gender balance of review panels is monitored and that a gender perspective is observed when external individual experts are engaged for assessments are important steps forward. This is something that was mapped in the European Commission Report ‘The Gender Challenge in Research Funding. Assessing the European national scenes’ (European Commission 2009).

More longitudinal and comparative studies that make use of this kind of information would give valuable insights into changes over time and differences not only between different disciplines, different research councils but also between different national contexts. The ones that already exist seem not to give an unambiguous answer to the question whether women are discriminated or not. One meta-analysis based on 21 studies shows that men had statistically greater odds of receiving grants than women by 7% (Bornman et al 2007; Bornman et al 2009) while another comes to the conclusion that a gender effect was lacking (Marsh et al 2009). (For other examples see Brouns 2000; Melin 2007; Norström 2007, 2012; VR 2010 and also Besselaar whose study concerning possible nepotism gives valuable methodological input Besselaar 2012).

Quantitative studies can thus contribute to answering the question if there is a gender bias in the peer review assessments of research applications, but if we want to know how possible biases arise we need studies of another kind. More promising for advancing our knowledge of the peer review practice are therefore qualitative studies that are looking more closely at the peer review processes. An important example is the study ‘How professors think’, by Michele Lamont, which let us take part in the meetings of some multi-disciplinary panels. The analysis of the dynamic in the groups shows clearly how varying disciplinary cultures and different standards concerning the concept of excellence influence the assessments of research applications (Lamont 2009; see also Gemzöe 2010). Another example is an intervention conducted by the Swedish Research Council with the aim to try new methods for monitoring and improving the gender balance in relation to research funding. Specially
trained gender observers have closely followed and analysed the communication taking place in the meetings of the different peer review panels assessing research applications. Results from the first round of this intervention indicate for example that the variations in the factors that were considered important for the reviewing clearly had implications for how female and male researchers were assessed and consequently for the outcome of the funding decisions (Andersson 2012).

Bibliometrics, including citation index, has become one of the most commonly used methods to assess impact of research and it has even been discussed if it can make peer review redundant. That quantitative indicators lend themselves more readily to comparisons than qualitative is probably an important reason for its popularity. What is primarily measured by bibliometrics is the impact of research on the scientific development in specific fields but also in general. It is furthermore often seen as an indicator of excellence. The increased use of bibliometrics has not, however, been favorably received by all and it has been heavily criticized for not doing justice to HASS research that has other publication patterns than STEM research. Other kinds of methodological objections, like how citations are used, have also been raised and discussed (see for example Butler and McAllister 2009; Donovan 2009).

To what degree the identified differences in male and female researcher’s publication patterns are an effect of gender discrimination seems to be inconclusive. Projects that aim to develop tools for a gender mapping of bibliometrics can maybe provide a basis for further studies into this matter (Wilson 2012). Another line of analysis is raised in an article that seeks the explanation to gendered bibliometrics in women’s and men’s different conditions for taking part in science and for participating in the labour market in general (Ceci and Williams 2011).

While acknowledging the potential of bibliometrics one must bear in mind, however, that it is far from the objective measurement that the advanced statistical methods might lead us to believe. Articles published in highly ranked journals have as a rule been assessed by a peer review process – a well-established method it is true but as we have seen not without objections.

Track records like publications, citation indexes and the like are, furthermore, seldom the sole basis for assessment and bibliometric impact might be balanced against other factors. A study of the funding of different Swedish Centres of Excellence has for example shown that female researchers with a high bibliometric impact could be passed over with reference to other criteria (Sandström et al 2010). The importance of paying attention to how excellence is conceptualised in operational terms is highlighted in another article on Centres of Excellence. (Hell-
ström 2011). It is argued that excellence ‘… is emerging as the integrating glue for the governance of science’ and as such a boundary object for the academic world and the policy makers’ (Hellström 2011: 118). The way this analysis is homing in on how excellence was defined in the actual evaluation processes seems to offer a useful approach also for addressing gender questions in relation to science assessments.

Science for society and policy

The methodological challenges associated with impact assessment are even more accentuated when it comes to measuring research impacts on society, especially as the focus has shifted from mere economic impact to a broader approach. Impact on society could be of an instrumental character like political decisions, official guidelines and new technology, and of a more conceptual kind such as changes in the ways of thinking and in a broad sense impact leading to welfare and public health improvements, sustainable environment, cultural developments, etc. One part of both the methodological challenge and the intense debates concerning how to account for societal impact is that it includes not only applied sciences but also basic research.

The increased interest in impact assessment in this broad sense has resulted in a large number of development project, meta-analysis, reports discussing best practices, etc. Among these could be mentioned HERAV-ALUE, EURECIA, REF 2014, STAR METRICS, ESF MOFora on Evaluation and the many projects initiated by RCUK (ESF 2012a; ESF 2012b; EURECIA 2012; HERAVALUE; STAR METRICS; REF 2014a; RCUK 2007; ESRC 2007; ESRC 2009).

The search for appropriate measurements has been aiming for quantitative methods, alike the assessment of science for science, which would give a basis for follow-ups and comparisons. The many studies have, however, resulted in an insight that the quantitative methods, how sophisticated they may be, are inadequate to capture the full impact that science might have for society. This has led to a growing focus on more qualitative methods, to case studies and to pay more attention to the interaction between science and society and the possible pathways to impact. There is, furthermore, a trend to develop methods that are customized to suit different disciplines, different types of impact, different aims for the assessment, etc. (BIS 2010; Grant et al 2009; Kearnes and Wienroth 2011; Hughes and Martin 2012; Hughes and Kitson 2012; Donovan 2007a; Donovan 2007b; Bozeman and Sarewitz 2009; Ramberg and Knell 2012; Lane 2009; Lane 2010; Lane and Bertuzzi 2011; Levitt et al 2010; Go8 2011; McIlwain 2010; Molas-Gallart et al 2011; Molas-Gallart and Tang 2011; REF 2009; REF 2010a; REF 2010b).
Gender and impact assessment

So far there are few, if any, studies that are addressing questions concerning the science for society kind of impact assessment from a gender perspective – which might have to do with that it is a relatively new feature of the research systems. The importance of looking into this issue is emphasized by the fact that societal impact, or at least demonstrated pathways to impact, seems to be becoming an indicator for the distribution of (research) funding to the higher education institutions. The likelihood that such a development will influence the conditions for the university management and researchers are of course very high, which was acknowledged, as we have seen, in a report for HEFCE concerning the UK REF 2014 (Grant 2009). The upcoming REF in UK is one example where this kind of impact will be a significant indicator in the quality assessment than earlier but there are others. In Australia an assessment of societal impact is undertaken as a complement to the regular quality assessment of the universities, and in Sweden the possibility that societal impact will be included as an indicator for the distribution of funding to the universities in the future has been mentioned (Go8 2012; Prop 2012).

What many of the science for society kind of impact assessment studies have in common is (for references to the impact assessment studies see ESF 2012b, but also studies listed at the websites of ESRC and RAND EUROPE):

- A focus on developing methods for assessing the impact of research on society
- Research Councils are often involved as intermediates for implementing policies concerning publicly funded research
- The impact assessment studies are mostly performed by external expert evaluation organisations like RAND or Technopolies that are engaged as consultants
- Gender aspects are almost entirely absent in the methodological discussions

An exception to the last point is REF 2014 where gender equality is given special attention in form of an Equality and Diversity Advisory Panel. This panel shall provide advice for the process and there are furthermore criteria and working methods for the REF panels that are designed to support the aim to promote equality and diversity (REF 2014b). That panel members are central gatekeepers in the system was mentioned earlier and it is therefore crucial, like here, to have guidelines and to monitor the development. It is not clear to what degree this also is true for the
many impact assessment studies performed by external consultants. It might be the case that the consultants are implementing the same guidelines for gender equality that applies to the organisation that commissioned the study. Judging from the published reports there are, however, very little explicitly references to a discussion concerning for example gendered balanced panels in relation to the assessment process and the outcome. This is therefore definitely a subject that deserves a more comprehensive study for further analysis.

There are, however, more aspects to this than the composition of the assessment panels and equality guidelines for their work. The information concerning equality and diversity in the REF also refers to guidance on submissions that set out ‘... requirements for institutions to develop, document and apply a code of practice on the fair and transparent selection of staff for their REF submissions’ (REF 2014b). The importance of the selection is further highlighted in the information given by RAND Europe in relation to the special tool they have developed for the REF 2014 – ImpactFinder Tool – and it is worth citing in its whole:

The weighting for the impact assessment part of the REF will be 20 % of the total assessment in 2014, and is likely to rise to 25 % in the future. Even at 20 %, this equates to around £ 220m per year, and so constitutes a significant amount of founding for research. With so much riding on a positive outcome from this new assessment method, it is imperative for universities to be able to successfully identify and present their most impactful research. It is equally important that universities are able to consider strategies for managing the implications of the REF associated selection and implementations process on their talent pool and research activity. (RAND EUROPE 2012, compare Whitley 2011: 374–375).

This statement is important as it clearly acknowledges and draws attention to the earlier discussed fact that evaluations not only study what has happened but also have a significant influence on the actions of the organisations and persons that are the subject for the assessment. It will therefore be interesting to follow the REF 2014 process to see how this request for a strategy will be handled by the organisations involved.

As meritocracies the universities are often considered as organisations that stand free from the influences of other factors, something that is refuted by a lot of studies, however. The academic world is on the contrary characterized by assessments where academic merits are interwoven with individual characteristics, access to the right networks, etc. Gender has proved to be one such influential factor. The gendering processes are often very subtle and hard to demonstrate without research that looks closer into what is going on. This kind of studies gives us invaluable
knowledge about the workings that are going on at the department level and makes it also possible to discuss differences between different disciplines with their special conditions. The understanding of universities as gendered organisation should, furthermore, be a starting point for studying changes, for example changes induced by the implementation of reforms and interventions (see for example Berg et al. 2012; Dryler et al. 2011; European Commission 2012a; European Commission 2012b; Husu 2005; Lindgren et al. 2010; Matthies and Matthäus 2010; Moritz 2012; Palmér 2012; Riefgraf et al. 2010).

It might still be too early to observe and analyse the consequences of the general increased interest in societal impacts of research. It would be interesting though to see some studies looking more closely into the discourses and the designs of impact evaluations and discussing the assumed logics from a gender perspective. Studies that address questions like: What consequences has the presence/absence of a gender dimension in the planning and implementation of impact assessments on strategic planning and prioritising made by research institutions? Should assessment reports include insights into gendered outcomes? What about the intermediary role of research councils as boundary organisations?

When researchers should not only be excellent but also are supposed to ask themselves ‘if my research is successful, who might do something with that? Where might it have an impact? And how am I going to actually make sure that happens?’ what consequences might this have in a gendered organisation? (Kearnes and Wienroth 2011: 167; compare Morley 2007).
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Chapter 9
The Conditions of Agency in the Institutionalisation of Feminist Pedagogy in Finland

Kirsti Lempiäinen

Introduction: institutional conditions

In this paper, I will analyse the institutional conditions and development of feminist teaching. (I use here Women’s Studies (WS), Gender Studies (GS) and Feminist Studies (FS) as synonyms, despite their different connotations). This institutionalisation is effected through curriculum work, planning and teaching situations, in interaction with students and colleagues.

The birth of the new feminist pedagogical training is linked to discussions concerning the neoliberal management of universities. Many feminist scholars have criticised this form of management, which has been victorious in universities since the 1990s (e.g. David 2011; Naskali 2010; Weber 2010). The old faculty structures have been replaced, and new ways of governing have been introduced in order to increase productivity. At the same time, bureaucracy has strengthened its hold in the form of monitoring systems that are constantly renewed. When productivity in teaching mainly refers to the number of students who graduate, a researcher has to ask her/himself how much time and other resources s/he wants to invest in teaching.

I link my analysis of the conditions of feminist agency to the example of an educational initiative called Women’s Studies University Pedagogy, which started as a national programme in 2005 organised by the Women’s Studies (WS) network HILMA in Finland. Women-specific pedagogy and teaching has been one of the interests of women’s movements for more than 100 years: the form of this pedagogical training may be new, but the pedagogy itself is not (see Hiltunen 2000). Although I approach university education from an action-theoretical position, it is clear that new institutions or new forms of agency are not generated entirely from scratch through action (Archer 2003; Garcelon 2010). There are structures of the organisation (university) that limit and restrict newborn institutions, although I will not discuss them here.
The aim of my paper is to study the conditions of the process of institutionalising university pedagogy, rather than to study institutionalisation as such (on institutionalisation, see Liinason 2011: 55–57). I try to document my own experiences as part of a critical analysis of feminist pedagogy by asking which features of feminist agency help to create and construct an institution.

First, I will briefly describe the data and methodological approach. Second, the context of the teaching of feminist pedagogy will be described through a discussion of universities in Finland today. Third, I will analyse interviews with feminist academics in order to draw conclusions about the elements that are most crucial for building a new form of training. Finally, I will discuss and reflect on the contradictions and successes of feminist pedagogical training in Finnish academia.

Interviews with feminists and autoethnography

The material for this paper consists of interviews with feminists in Finnish academia, and of an autoethnography in which I concentrate on my own experiences of and reflections on the planning and development of feminist pedagogy in Finland. The first part of the data (n=20) was gathered for my study Feminist Agency in Academia (2006–2010), in which I used chain interviews as a data collection method. The first interviewee, Liisa Rantalaiho (University of Tampere) suggested the next interviewee, who suggested the next, and so on; the last interviewee was Leena-Maija Rossi (University of Helsinki). The themes of the interviews included different phases of study, research, teaching, feminist politics and so on. We dealt with both the difficult and the good or easy points in the interviewee's academic life. I was more interested in the field of feminism in academia than in the individual life stories as such.

In my view, the chain interviews produced a very specific kind of knowledge, and the method is reminiscent of the so-called snowball method. The feminists interviewed also constructed the chain by taking the methodology of the study into account. This included, for example, the desire to create variety within the group of participating researchers and teachers; the question of the representation of different research areas and disciplines; and a multiplicity and variety of academic career paths. Thus the interviews themselves were in part a sort of raw analysis of the field of feminism in academia. The feminists interviewed also reflected upon my concepts: for example, ‘career’ was opposed and negotiated. A similar phenomenon is familiar from other interview studies with highly educated informants (Warren 2002: 87–88). When I came to transcribe the interviews, I made searches for terms related to Women’s Studies (or Gender Studies), feminism, education, teacher/teaching,
student/studying and institution/university. I also read the transcripts in their entirety with the intention of including rather than excluding material for analysis.

I experienced the birth of academic feminist pedagogy together with Päivi Naskali, Kirsti Saarikangas and Aino-Maija Hiltunen. We have discussed and planned feminist pedagogy training, curricula, evaluation and development over the last six years. I call this adventure autoethnographic work. It was not intended to be part of a research project, an autoethnography; but the notes and observation made in teaching situations, our numerous meetings and memos, students’ feedback, and our desire to document our actions were all reminiscent of ethnography (see Lempiäinen and Naskali 2011). Feminist agency in our pedagogy has first and foremost meant working together, so the prefix ‘auto’ could be replaced with ‘we’ (thus a ‘we-ethnography’). Following the guidelines of autoethnography, we have reflected on our own positions and actions, although I will not go into that discussion in detail here. In sum, instead of being an outsider and a master voice, the analyst in this method is a co-witness. (On ethnography see Skeggs 1997; Coffey 1999; Richardson 2000; Gordon, Holland and Lahelma 2000; on autoethnography see Ettrone 2006)

On what grounds could one then claim that feminist pedagogical training is an institution? First, the subject has received Ministry of Education funding, and is officially validated in many universities. Second, university teachers are institutional actors. Third, participants receive a diploma on completion of their feminist pedagogical training. Some of the participants on the courses have emphasised that pedagogical training is a room of one’s own, a space separate from the rest of academia. By naming the subject ‘an institution’, I am also referring to the fact that with feminist pedagogical training, feminism is also seeking approval and recognition of its actions inside academia. Next I will briefly discuss the conditions of academia in Finland today.

Getting rid of liberal ideas of civilisation

Reforms have been on-going in many European universities since 2000, although the historical roots of the reforms are much longer (Morley 2003; Hey and Bradford 2004; Davies 2005; Naskali 2010; Nikunen 2012). (In my study of gender and agency in academia, I analysed the space for actors in different positions in the university hierarchy at the University of Liverpool, the University of Milan-Bicocca and the University of Tampere. I concluded that the rise of neoliberalism, organisational changes and funding cuts have not yet limited the space for those actors who already have a more or less permanent position in their univer-
sity (Lempiäinen 2012)). Productivity and efficiency are the keywords, and although there are no really good indicators to measure academic research and education in terms of excellence, such measurements are made anyway. The UK seems to be the main driver pushing the university reforms through, and in Finland these reforms usually arrive with a slight delay. Clare Hemmings (2011: 232f) looks critically at the UK Research Excellence Framework, which has introduced suspicious new factors into institutional evaluation – such as ‘impact’, which according to Hemmings means use outside the academy. At the very same time a discussion of impact has also emerged in Finnish academia; one need not be a fortune-teller to predict its future importance for research funding in Finland as well. Interestingly, very few politicians and decision-makers seem to care about the funding of university education; it is as if teaching is detached from research. Money is generally short in the university sector in Finland. For GS and other feminist studies (FS) scholars, the circumstances are difficult. As a young discipline, GS is only strengthening its position in academia, and so it should not be compared with other disciplines in any case. At the moment it is probable that GS Masters programmes are not going to survive in all the universities where they now exist, but this is just one of the worries for GS disciplines in Finland at the moment. At the level of agents, images of a possible future, however improbable, are a form of ‘cruel optimism’ that makes promises to people and keeps them inside academia (see Berlant 2010).

If GS teachers feel the pressure to demonstrate results and be productive, there is no less pressure on feminist teachers working in other faculties. For example, at the University of Tampere the curriculum has been changed so that all students in social sciences (including in GS) are now on a joint Bachelors programme (‘the Bachelors programme of social research’). What happens is that all disciplines try to put as much of their ‘own’ subject content into the curriculum as possible. In this situation it is not easy, for instance, to defend feminist sociology or the like, and feminist knowledge might therefore vanish from the curriculum in the long run. What interests me here is the drive of feminist agency which creates and enhances new forms of action in the midst of innovations that look anything but favourable from a feminist point of view. How come feminist actors still have the energy to put so much effort and work into pedagogical training? What is feminist agency?

As happens elsewhere, in Finnish universities the importance of pedagogical expertise has been emphasised in appointments and nominations to university posts since the 1990s. Finnish GS scholars have been active in this process, but there are other reasons behind it as well. Most of the mainstream pedagogy in universities builds on problem-based learn-
ing and experience-based active learning; yet despite the importance of experience, mainstream pedagogy is mostly gender blind. Furthermore, mainstream pedagogy highlights individuality rather than a sense of community. Feminist scholars in the GS university network HILMA were planning and discussing the possibility of organising pedagogical training inside GS and feminist studies, rather than as an extra skill as it is usually taught. If the so-called new university expects and demands pedagogical excellence from teachers, feminist scholars want to influence the content of that pedagogy. Aihwa Ong (2006: 138) has argued that ‘education is a social technology – in the Weberian sense of appropriate means to an end – for constituting subjects in particular places of calculation.’ GS scholars want to make their own conditions for the calculation, and to construct an educational programme that also includes their own ideals about how to teach and learn.

The interviewees all reflected on the latest university reforms. Although the university might always have been a stiff and bureaucratic place from a feminist point of view, one scholar (S11) explained that the ‘dominant, neoliberal role of governance is very agonising and hinders creativity’. So the challenge for new forms of education is even greater. After this brief excursion through the current university ethos, I will next discuss the specificities of feminist agency which create the conditions for the institutionalising processes of pedagogy.

Our pedagogy

Establishing new things obviously requires a lot of work. In a university environment it is very often the case that not all of the plans will ever materialise. When it comes to feminist actors, they have to endure the fact that feminist accomplishments might look small or trivial to the wider public eye. Despite resistance (or sometimes supposed resistance) from the university governing system, the feminists interviewed did not question the rationale of developing feminist teaching. A feminist scholar wants to play an essential role in collaborations concerning GS teaching issues:

Those problems that were apparent in all of the departments in the relationship with feminist research are quite similar everywhere... A sort of arm wrestling was going on about the content of the curriculum... And we had meetings in the late 80s and early 90s... Scholars got together and thought about how to increase feminism in the curriculum... I was here when WS appeared... It was a fight for it to get disciplinary status... It broadened somehow into other feminist fields. (S30)
What the interviewee is saying is that she has a long history of developing GS, and that there is a we-subject in the process. Its strength was that the discipline won a place in academia, and that the discipline was not self-sufficient.

In many interviews, mundane, reflexive and modest agency emerged as the ideal framework for a feminist actor (Eeva Jokinen and Marja-Liisa Honkasalo have created the concept of ‘modest agency’ (in Finnish)). Everydayness links to practice and locality, rather than to the heroism and programmatic theory often portrayed in mainstream pedagogical theories. Modest agency consisted of a subject combining work (if not a career) with a private life (for instance, childcare), which was also dealt with in the interviews (cf. Nikunen 2012). Everydayness, experience, desire, ‘living one’s life to the full’ and feminism intertwined to become a methodological guide and an ethical way of acting:

[Feminism] is meaningful... It is a considered form of justice, so it starts with everyday perception and unequal practices in upbringing and education... Perhaps, I think I have more of that sort of mundane feminism. (S15)

[Feminist research] contains a really big passion... to think of the notion of gender as such and gender theory... I would include many questions of queer research within it because it’s part of curiosity, the desire to ask what is the feminist point in that. (S14)

In WS one could find tools and... sort of arguments... Partly it has been an urge to say... different things about world that [drove me] here to WS and feminism. (S16)

Although modesty and everydayness are widely accepted ideas in the feminist community, they do not refer to separating oneself or ‘curling up’. Although the whole world might be the target of action, there is an essential sense of justice which I find most interesting. I would like to suggest that there is a strengthened tendency to create justice because of the unjust context of the ‘new university’. Critical action was considered a valuable feminist praxis as such:

Feminism is a sort of critical agency, that from the beginning one has to be aware of... In this world many things are somehow messed up, from the start, and something should be done (S12).

I was intrigued to learn how GS scholars define the place and space from which they start to act. Marginality as a location has been almost a mantra in feminist research, although when one looks at the Academy of Finland (the national Research Council system) research funding granted to GS, feminist research is not marginal at all. However, teaching resources
are not that plentiful from a financial point of view in GS units, so the strength to create new things clearly comes from somewhere other than big budgets. One interviewee actually turned the whole concept of marginality upside down by stating that marginality is a resource because in GS it also means support and sharing things. For her the marginal in fact meant ‘each other’ [S35]. Thus marginality has become another name to identify the actor’s experience of how communality is shared amongst feminists.

The next interviewee claims that being a woman, and what follows from that, is itself a resource in WS:

Quite simply the way things are done with women, that is a resource and I could not do those things and… approach [from a woman’s point of view] my research questions, if I weren’t a woman. [S14]

After a while this interviewee said that a man could be a good WS scholar as well, so it is a matter of positioning oneself. The essentiality of gender is inscribed into one’s feminist agency. The ability to struggle and the ethos of coping in difficult situations is also built into feminist action:

Perhaps the most central experience on many levels is… the possibility to act as a feminist in the university and to find one’s own protection zones, but it is troublesome and one has to be a little bit better than others to get along, and it has not become a lot easier in 20 years. (S37)

I have found identical versions of ‘doing better’ in feminist pedagogical training. In Finnish feminist discussions of methodology, ‘doing better’ translates into ‘doing otherwise’ (’toisin tekeminen’: Ronkainen 1999; Ojala 2010). In feminist pedagogy one could point to unprejudiced partnerships with traditional university pedagogical actors, web specialists and experts in university governance as an example of ‘doing [feminist pedagogy] otherwise’. Institutionalisng GS pedagogy means not just bringing in the feminist elements, but also taking seriously university pedagogy done without feminist knowledge.

A seemingly eternal theme in feminist discussions is whether creative marginality can be preserved when action is normalised and institutionalised. Isn’t the margin little by little becoming the centre, and thus becoming the kind of position against which feminists took a stand – in this case, against normative pedagogical practices?

S17: All the time the existence of the discipline [WS] is becoming more normal and normal and at the same time it is also neutralised…
K: Well, is feminism disappearing as well?
S17: I think that because I'm aware of this question it wouldn't disappear... I want us to be safe. I want us to integrate. And at the same time I think that from the viewpoint of content we are taking care that we are perhaps the most critical discipline to be found in this university. I don't want it to disappear anywhere. (S17)

There has to be a sort of edge somewhere. And in that way I hope that WS would never die back and become very institutional. (S25)

Critique is one method for distancing GS from other disciplines in the university. What is more, in the institutionalisation of feminist pedagogy there are also inner tensions that teachers want to keep alive. Normality or acceptability (being ‘safe’) is a tedious goal for feminist research which also criticises so-called normal research. Critique must be directed at oneself as well: the discipline has to be the ‘most critical’, a subject with ‘an edge’. The same principle is linked to feminist pedagogy: the content is continuously open for criticism. There is an ongoing negotiation about what good feminist pedagogy is about and how it should be taught. One may conclude from the interviews that the institutionalisation process as such is not opposed. Ideally, a feminist institution is only ever partly established.

Feminism and care

The feminist field consists of generations whose theoretical interests may contradict one another. One may represent queer studies, another women-specific research, another critical masculinity studies, and so on. However, in teaching situations the different approaches seem to draw closer to each other. Whatever the positioning, the responsibility of a feminist teacher is to support and help her/his students. One interviewee was moaning about the loss of time that means that ‘one loses research almost altogether.’ At the same time, she was also happy that she could empathise with and take part in her students’ work and get to know new areas such as queer studies (S34). GS teachers are sometimes supposed to be interested in their students’ lives as such:

Here... there are these women, who work hard and nurture by taking care of the students and things like that... What follows is that these female students then drop out when they have families and children. That I have seen happen many times and have had to fight for these people. (S23)

A feminist teacher from time to time takes responsibility for a student’s livelihood or life more generally. This finding is congruent with my own experiences in the WS community, where taking care has meant provid-
ing good supervision, mentoring applications for research funding, and helping students to get temporary posts. In feminist pedagogy we have discussed the idea that when a teacher takes on this sort of ‘taking care of everybody and everything’, s/he burdens her/himself enormously. That is why the new GS pedagogies stress that one should also spare oneself when possible. GS scholars do not want to be part of a process of institutionalising actions which will backfire on their agents in the long run. Indeed, a few interviewees spoke of serious exhaustion, illness and stress, which unfortunately are not rare in academia. From another angle one could also ask whether the ideals of feminist teaching – combining research, teaching and life – can coexist in a traditional institution, even in theory? Does action based on care mean maintaining critical potential, or integrating people more tightly into the feminist community and its habits?

Raija Julkunen (2010: 286) urges us to remember the criteria of justice presented by Nancy Fraser (1995). According to Julkunen (ibid.), we should attend to poverty, special vulnerability, economic interdependence, marginalisation, the male norm, and equality between men and women. Feminist teachers reflect upon many of these concerns in their actions. On the one hand, by taking care of students’ (and colleagues’) life situations, feminist teachers are trying to lessen vulnerability and create bonds between people in order to help students find their place in academia. (On feminism and social justice, see Azmanova 2012.) On the other hand, they are burdening themselves and idealising feminist agency.

The feminists interviewed questioned many of the high standards of WS. In the next extract, the wish for alternative WS paths is expressed rather frankly, compared to the rest of the data: ‘In WS there is an inner demand that one should give up something – the only way is to proceed as if one always has to be [a certain type of] scholar’ (S18). In other words, there is a mission inside GS academia. This interviewee also mentioned that feminist researchers in Finland could take clearer stands on social questions, and could try to exert more influence outside academia. When it comes to pedagogy, this would require knowledge of how to act or intervene in society:

Feminist research is such... Of course people bring in the political function or political aspect into it then. (S32)

I can’t... really separate what is the feminist part and what is the other. I have worked a lot in women’s groups. And I have done that for about 30 years. And do it all the time... (S30)
The way politics is linked to research affects the choices made in teaching as well. Because of her/his theoretical commitment, the feminist agent is more or less ready to create new orders and change old ones – a precondition for any process of institutionalisation, and for all emancipatory action in academia. It must be noted that many of the feminist agents are active in multiple civil society arenas at the same time. For them, feminist pedagogy goes hand-in-hand with Freirean critical pedagogy, in which empowerment is fundamental (see also hooks 1994; Husu 2001; Mohanty 2006). Empowerment involves a critique of the fact that universities have become sites of production:

[This] academic institution... could be seriously changed and renewed... to think many things... but of course it links to the welfare state and public funding and the steering of public funding... and on the other hand, seeing university more narrowly as an educational institution... and research that serves quite pragmatic ends, and then again the support for research excellence... (S14)

The interviewee here was not judging competition as such, but she was raising her worries about competition for diminishing resources and the enforcement of particular values. When quality of teaching is the goal, feminists too are striving for the ‘top’.

Feminist ways of action

I have analysed the data from interviews with feminists, and backed up my analysis with my own observations about the elements of feminist agency that are considered important and helpful for creating new forms of pedagogical training. Starting from praxis, the quest is to localise pedagogical knowledge, and this quest must constantly negotiate with the university framework (neoliberal or otherwise). Pedagogy thus reaches out from the seminar rooms and lecture halls towards a better understanding of society, and of the academia that is embedded in it. Many features of feminist academia should be changed. We should not, for instance, accept current ways of working: ‘sleep less and work harder’ is not an answer that should be given to future generations of teachers when they ask how to cope (cf. Acker and Armenti 2004).

Fortunately, there still are vivid contradictions within feminist thought – patterns of dissonance, one might say with Rosi Braidotti (1991). Although the feminist ethical way of acting in everyday working life, or in life in general, would favour a sort of modest agency, such acts might themselves open up new horizons in academia and society. In action feminists locate themselves both in the margins or protection zones, and in the centre, with all other actors. The institution exists in its own right,
a feminist institution rather than a field of action within other fields of action. Dialogue, critique and reflexivity about power positions have been major issues in the institutionalising process. In terms of my own position, as a feminist pedagogy teacher and researcher I could call myself an empathetic observer. I am a distant actor who takes care of things but does not have a particularly ‘taking care’ attitude towards students. How to find a suitable balance between distance and closeness is certainly one of the things that every teacher and researcher has to solve by her/himself.

A lot of the motivation behind feminist action can be explained in terms of justice. The desire to do the right thing in the ambivalent context of universities as sites of production and fields of competition gives rise to new discussions of the values of feminist academia and the morality it stands for. What sorts of feminist norm are involved in action? A simple answer would be: togetherness, respecting otherness, and creating space for those in disadvantaged positions.

Institutionalising feminist pedagogical training implies that such training will form part of the more permanent graduate programmes of universities. With project-like courses we can easily target programmes according to identified needs. But as Kristiina Brunila’s (2009) study on equality projects shows, after a while our own voice might not be heard in the way we would like it to be heard. This is also true of feminist university pedagogy, in which two different discursive orders are linked under one umbrella: the formal requirements of university pedagogy, and feminist critical viewpoints on pedagogy. As momentous as I see the institutionalisation of feminist pedagogical training, the idea that as a feminist actor I might be consolidating the results-oriented approach in academia is repulsive. This does not mean that quality would not matter – quite the opposite.

Feminist pedagogy means producing feminist knowledge in which hope, passion and desire go together with applicability and usefulness. As a pragmatic actor I see the institutionalisation of feminist education, including pedagogy, as crucial, because remaining outside of wider developments, in the position of the very marginal, might have a great impact on future activities. Feminist teachers and researchers receive support and reinforcement of their own education in a situation where the very existence of humanities or social-science disciplines is questioned from time to time. The actors are allowed to identify themselves along the ethical lines of feminism – at least for short periods of time – and they can feel the power of the community. In the process, their positions as feminist actors are legitimised.
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Part III: Interventions
Chapter 10
Structural Transformation to Achieve Gender Equality in Science

Evanthia Kalpazidou Schmidt

From ‘fixing the women’ to ‘fixing the organisation’ policy

Adding women’s perspectives to the research process has increasingly been recognised by the European Union as a tool to enhance creativity and innovation, while reconsidering theories of science as being neutral and universal. Since the introduction of the 7th European Framework Programme for Research (FP7), emphasis was put on capitalising on the experience and knowledge gained in the last ten years of activity, in view of enhancing the strategies and the quality and impact of the actions implemented (European Commission 2010).

During the course of the FP7, the need gradually emerged to launch integrated projects with a wider scope, able to address the multi-dimensional nature of the gender and science issue, avoiding simplistic monodimensional approaches. In particular, the shift was irreversibly made away from the ‘fixing the women’ approach, to make them fit in dominant research cultures, towards the more structural approach ‘fixing the organisation’. In this context, the strategy of pursuing structural change in research organisations was defined and launched in 2010, aimed at implementing the best systemic approaches to increase the participation and support the career advancement of women researchers. Programmes encouraging actions geared at drastically changing science and technology related work environments and cultures were therefore increasingly promoted and funded.

A structural changes approach

One of the first projects assigned in the frame of the new European Union strategy was the Structural Transformation to Achieve Gender Equality in Science (STAGES) project, rooted in two other European projects on gender equality. The first of these projects, Practicing Gender Equality in Science (PRAGES no year) pursued the objective of collecting, analysing and benchmarking programmes and initiatives oriented at gender equality in research institutions, singling out the most successful, and provid-
ing recommendations through a set of guidelines regarding their possible adaptation and transfer to other contexts. The second project Women’s Careers Hitting the target: Gender Management in Scientific and Technological Research (WHIST no year) tested coordinated concrete actions by putting collected knowledge at work. WHIST applied the PRAGES guidelines as a tool for designing and steering relevant initiatives in research institutions, such as the European Space Agency, the Fraunhofer Institute and Aarhus University.

The STAGES project has been designed with the general aim to launch structural change strategies addressing the many and interconnected layers of the problem of gender inequality in science. These strategies are implemented to build consensus and commitment around structural-level gender equality initiatives addressing different leadership levels and stakeholders directly or indirectly affected by change. The project has hence adopted an integrated perspective, involving human resources management in five European universities and research institutions, Aarhus University, Fraunhofer Gesellschaft, University of Milan, Alexandru Ioan Cuza University and Radboud University Nijmegen.

The main objective of the project is to implement self-tailored action plans geared at introducing gender-aware management at all levels in each of the participating organisations, which represent different types of research institutions. A second objective is to produce a deeper understanding of the dynamics surrounding structural change efforts by monitoring and analysing the process activated in each institution, in order to start mutual learning practices among the partners. The third objective is to launch a very practical type of dissemination, not just aimed at informing on programmes implemented and their results, but also at spreading successful negotiation strategies among universities and research institutions.

To achieve its general aim and specific objectives the project that has a duration of 4 years (2011–2014), comprises the following elements:

a. Designing of action plans to implement in the participating research institutions, using a common theoretical and methodological framework.

b. Implementation of the action plans according to the roadmaps of each research organisation.

c. Coordination and promotion of mutual learning processes among the participant organisations.

d. Ongoing and final evaluation of the initiatives developed on the basis of data and information resulting from monitoring of the action plans.
e. The production of a set of guidelines directly deriving from the structural change experience, focusing on the consensus-building strategies and assuring long-term sustainability for the actions implemented.

f. Networking and dissemination activities targeting all stakeholders.

Strategic orientations and specific actions

The STAGES approach goes beyond the state of the art by developing two interconnected paths of action. The first path is to build on the existing knowledge reservoir on how to enhance gender equality in research institutions. The strong linkage with the PRAGES project, entailing the in-depth evaluation of 109 gender equality initiatives and practices in different types of institutions worldwide, as well as the identification of concrete strategies, objectives, recommendations and lines of actions allows the design and implementation of effective action plans. The systematic set up of the PRAGES guidelines supports not only the identification of significant gender equality dimensions but addresses also the many relevant sides of the problems related to implementation of the action plans, together with their reciprocal relations, which is necessary when aiming at structural and all-encompassing changes.

The second path focuses on applying consensus-building for smooth action implementation and using conflict-management strategies and tools in order to avoid potential opposition, which constitutes one of the main contributions of the STAGES project.

Based on the analysis of women’s position within the research organisations participating in the project and the analysis of already implemented gender-oriented activities, factors enabling or hindering progress were identified and reviewed. These factors are usually related to issues such as the degree of leadership commitment, the availability of resources, the level of consensus generated, the existence of normative obstacles of different kind, the involvement of different actors in the process, etc.

The most relevant and promising actions to be undertaken were accordingly identified in each research organisation. Focus was on finding the appropriate blend of solutions that could fit the whole bundle of issues that are most relevant to the state of affairs in gender equality in each organisation. The overall approach has been to adopt the classification system of gender equality initiatives used in the Guidelines (PRAGES 2009) for gender equality in science as a common basis to identify initiatives to be implemented as action plans. This approach was adopted also in order to provide a common understanding of the risk areas, strategies and potential impact. In PRAGES, issues that were at stake were categorised into three risk areas. Actions and programmes
were likewise organised into three corresponding strategic areas as illustrated in table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk areas</th>
<th>Strategies promoting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science as an unfriendly environment for women</td>
<td>A friendly environment for women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science as gender-insensitive</td>
<td>Gender-aware science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific leadership missing women</td>
<td>Women’s leadership of science in a changing society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first strategy consists in making research institutions an enabling environment for women’s progression. Three main objectives stemming from the actions carried out by the programmes are identified: (i) promoting change in the culture and traditional behaviours of science-related work environments; (ii) supporting work-life balance; and (iii) providing early-stage career-development.

The second strategy aims to include the gender dimension in the process of research and innovation designing. Two main objectives are identified: (i) overcoming stereotypes of women and science; (ii) influencing scientific contents and methods.

The third strategy consists in promoting women in scientific leadership positions. Four objectives emerge from the analysis of the programmes: (i) supporting women’s leadership in research practice; (ii) supporting women’s leadership in research management; (iii) supporting women’s role in science communication; (iv) increasing women’s presence and weight in managing innovation processes and related science-society relationships.

The strategic areas and objectives formulated in the PRAGES guidelines along with some examples of relevant actions to implement in order to achieve structural changes in research organisations are presented in the following table.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC AREA</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Women friendly environment</td>
<td>1.1 Actions promoting change in organisational cultures and informal/informal behaviours</td>
<td>Measures pertaining to the modification of the research environment by providing awareness-raising initiatives addressing specific internal and external targets, promoting gender studies across university faculties and departments and supporting women in coping with environmental stress factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Actions promoting work-life balance</td>
<td>Provision of services facilitating work-life balance, by means of supporting access to internal and external services and the promotion of flexible working practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Actions supporting early-stage career-development</td>
<td>Measures specifically aimed at sustaining early-stage career-development for young scientists, particularly addressing the barriers that women frequently meet in that early phase. These measures include contractual arrangements supporting temporary staff, career advice, mentoring and training for early-career researchers, provision of funds for professional development and training staff in charge of hiring and promotions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gender-aware science</td>
<td>2.1 Actions challenging gender stereotypes and consequent horizontal segregation</td>
<td>Measures addressing images and representations of women and science, especially through the collection of data documenting the groundlessness of stereotypes, the use of gender-sensitive language and textbooks, as well as awareness-raising initiatives. Particular attention is devoted to fighting those mechanisms translating gender stereotypes into horizontal segregation, by attacking gender to disciplines, topics or tasks. This is done especially by addressing training initiatives of various kinds to those responsible for career development support and task attribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Actions aimed at gendering S&amp;T contents and methods</td>
<td>Actions are aimed at questioning epistemological and theoretical assumptions, methodologies and priorities. Research and dissemination activities are usually undertaken in this regard, but also curricular reform of scientific disciplines to include gender studies, institutional and organisational arrangements to increase the number of women research directors, and the dissemination of tools to support the process of gendering the design of research and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Women's leadership of science</td>
<td>3.1 Actions promoting women's leadership in the practice of research</td>
<td>Measures supporting women in attaining leadership positions in the traditional academic career, encompassing, among the others, support for mobility, delivery of specific training, mentoring, provision of dedicated funds for research, creation of reserved chairs, introduction of new institutional bodies or regulations to redress gender imbalances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Actions promoting women's leadership in the management of research</td>
<td>Measures supporting women in attaining leadership positions in research management, including tools such as direct support to access boards and committees, introduction of quota systems, creation of candidate-selection processes, lobbying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Actions promoting women's leadership in scientific communication</td>
<td>Addressing strategic communication, aiming at strengthening women's visibility and role in the communication flow among scientists and to the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Actions promoting women's leadership in innovation processes and science-society relationships</td>
<td>Measures supporting women in the management of research processes and the relationships between science and society, especially in the contexts of technological innovation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is essential to emphasize that linking activities to general objectives, and objectives to main strategic approaches helps avoiding simplification, and thus supports the process of implementing a genuine, integrated structural change. In this process the participant research organizations address all the relevant issues in the different domains affecting gender arrangements in science and technology (scientific and professional environments, scientific contents, leadership dynamics, etc.). This does not mean, of course, that every action plan addresses all problems connected with all the different areas of risk faced by female researchers. Rather, what is important is having a clear perception of the multifaceted nature of the issues that are going to be addressed in order to choose the most relevant and suitable for each research organization implementing actions.

The strategy to obtain impacts through actions, as the above mentioned, is based on the assumption that impact can be produced as a result of negotiation activities. Applied to gender dynamics in organizations, the practice of negotiation comprises all actions – at micro, meso or macro level – aimed at directly or indirectly redefining gender arrangements and the distribution of power between men and women, hence producing profound and systematic change (cf. Colonnello et al 2008). In this sense negotiation processes represent a powerful tool for change.

In the following an example of structural changes self-tailored action plan, namely at Aarhus University, is briefly presented.

**Implementing STAGES action plan at Aarhus University**

One of the research institutions implementing structural changes is Aarhus University. Initiatives geared at promoting gender equality at Aarhus University have been carried out in the framework of the mandate of a Task Force on Gender Equality, aiming at creating better and more attractive research environments for women and men, and the experiences gained in the PRAGES and WHIST projects (Kalpazidou Schmidt 2011, 2011a; Faber Tidemann and Kalpazidou Schmidt 2010) (in 2011 the Task Force was reorganised to a permanent committee, the Diversity Committee). A more systemic action plan – namely a structural change – was launched with the STAGES project, encompassing all the scientific areas, in order to achieve more comprehensive results and long-term effects.

Aarhus University is in the process of restructuring its entire organization, which could prove to be an excellent opportunity to also implement gender related structural changes. In a time of profound transformations the issue of gender equality could become one of the key elements
of structural change. In this framework, the action plan of the Aarhus University comprises a set of integrated activities, targeting all the scientific areas, geared at extending and making sustainable the results of the efforts of recent years. The approach and actions plans at Aarhus University are summarised in table 3.

Table 3. Action plan at Aarhus University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC AREA</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women-friendly environment</td>
<td>Actions promoting change in organisational culture and formal/informal behaviours</td>
<td>Documenting developments in gender equality (Nielsen et al 2012a) Communicating strategies to promote the visibility of female role-models (Nielsen et al 2012b) Organising four University-wide workshops Organising periodical training modules on gender diversity management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions promoting work-life balance</td>
<td>Establishing and managing home offices for staff Introducing flexible working hours Establishing rules for time reimbursement for PhD coordinators/assistant professors/post-doc supervisors Organising and managing dinner services to bring home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions supporting early-stage career development</td>
<td>Mentoring programme for young female researchers Career advice and training for early-career women researchers Setting up mechanisms to support temporary staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-aware science</td>
<td>Actions challenging gender stereotypes and consequent horizontal segregation</td>
<td>Organising four Faculty level initiatives on stereotypes Collection of data on horizontal segregation at Faculty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s leadership of science</td>
<td>Actions promoting women’s leadership in the practice of research</td>
<td>Establishing praxis for women’s presence in evaluation committees Establishing new rules for the evaluation of productivity Disseminating information about available opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions promoting women’s leadership in the management of research</td>
<td>Supervision of young female researchers on research management skills Direct support to access decision-making boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actions promoting women’s leadership in scientific communication</td>
<td>Communication of women’s scientific excellence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the main expected outcomes and impacts of the implementations of the tailored action plans at Aarhus University are:
• Institutional changes (such as increased participation rates of female researchers in assessment and evaluation committees, increased number of women in decision-making boards, new arrangements in managing work-life balance);

• Improved women’s participation in science (increased women’s retention and promotion rates, increased funds for professional development of female scientists);

• Knowledge generation (production of regularly updated data on gender equality);

• Changes in the work environment (introduction of practices making the work environment more friendly for female PhD students and young women researchers);

• Cultural changes (adoption of gender-sensitive language, increased visibility of gender issues, increased visibility of women’s scientific excellence, increased awareness on gender stereotypes).
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Introduction

The involvement of women in higher education is severely limited in most developing African countries. Since the late 1990s, much attention has been paid to the under-representation of women in academia. This is reflected as national and institutional spheres became aware of the importance and relevance of education and training of women and amendments in laws and regulations that include women’s rights and equality have been made. The Ethiopian government and the country’s higher education institutions underwent the same trend, including women’s rights in regulatory orders and documents. Additionally, international agreements were adopted in order to increase the participation of women in higher education. For instance, objectives of agreements such as the 1995 Beijing Platform of Action, the EFA Dakar (Education for All) and the Millennium Development Goals (Promotion of gender equality and empowerment of women) include the endorsement of equal opportunities for women to increase their participation and lessen the existing gender gaps. To do so, a number of interventions such as affirmative action and equal opportunity programs have been implemented. In higher education institutions, such interventions tend to increase the enrolment rate of female students but hardly increase the proportion of female academics.

However, if gender equality is to be realised in academia, the discourse of gender equality and equity must be integrated into the structure, policies and actions of the institution. To assess this, it is important to understand how universities are gendered organisations in which gender is present in the processes, practices, images and ideologies and in the distribution of power. As universities are currently operationalising gender mainstreaming programs, there should be an equal reference to
gender in all policies and guidelines. The handbook *Women and Management in Higher Education* states that success in gender equity policies is more assured if equity targets are set and recruitment and promotion procedures clearly enunciated (UNESCO 2002). In this particular case, written guidelines referring to the academic staff need to show equal treatment of female and male staff.

With these assumptions, this paper focuses on the regulatory documents of academic staff in two Ethiopian universities that are drafted in the English language in the years 2005 and 2007 by Senate members of the each university. This paper briefly describes interventions made to increase women’s participation, particularly in academia. It discusses two gender-related aspects appearing in legislation and reviews the content of the legislation from different perspectives. Contradictory concepts between the interventions and legislations and apparent shortcomings are also reviewed. Implications and possible recommendations, practical experiences of gender equality interventions in other countries, are included in the concluding section.

**Reforms and interventions**

Considering the paucity of Ethiopian women’s participation in various sectors within the country, the current government has issued some policies to address women’s rights and equality. The Women’s Affairs Office has been established within the Prime Minister’s Office to design a strategy that would allow women to contribute to and benefit from the country’s on-going democratisation, judicial reform and economic reconstruction processes. The 1995 Constitution of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia (FDRE) proclaimed equal rights for women and men. In this constitution, Article 35 defines the equity of women and men and recognises the right to affirmative measures for women and provides special attention to women to enable them to compete and participate in political, social and economic life in public and private institutions (FDRE 2001, cited in Lasonen 2005). In addition, the government adopted a number of international agreements that promote gender equality and participation of women in all levels of education, such as implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform Action (BDPfA), Education for All (EFA), Dakar and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). These international guidelines highlight the equal representation of women as academics and introduce a number of mechanisms to attract and retain more women in higher education institutions. Actions to be taken by governments in the Beijing Declaration include: measures to ensure that female teachers and professors have the same opportunities and equal status with male teachers and professors;
positive measures to increase the proportion of women gaining access to educational policy and decision-making power, particularly female teachers at all levels of education and also in academic disciplines that are traditionally male-dominated (BDPfA 1995).

As a result of these interventional conventions, the Ethiopian government adopted the principles of gender mainstreaming. The higher education objectives, for instance, stated in the higher education proclamation 351/2003, include the expansion of higher education services that are free from any discrimination on grounds of race, religion, gender, politics and other similar grounds FDRE (2003). The inclusion of women’s affairs representatives as university senate members is also stated in the proclamation. Similarly, the senate legislation of universities states that academic staff shall refrain from any act of discrimination against any individual or group on the basis of race, ethnicity, gender or religion. And the establishment of a gender office within the academic institutions is also declared in the legislations. Hence, the federal constitution and the institutional regulations include protection against gender-based discriminations.

However, these documents of institutions tend to be limited in addressing gender discourse and particularly women. Yet, higher education institutions have been implementing a number of interventions to increase the participation of women. These include affirmative action by lowering admission cut-off points for females, offering remedial courses, engendering higher education institutions by combating sexual harassment and violence, establishing women and gender study programs and centres and increasing the number of female academics and administrators (Bunyi 2003). In most Ethiopian universities, affirmative action is employed to increase the number of female academic staff by lowering entry cumulative points for recruitment. Moreover, interventions include the development of gender equality in employment policies to increase the staff-gender ratio and the establishment of equal opportunity or gender offices.

As Lasonen et al (2005: 59) note: ‘in Ethiopia gender mainstreaming in education has had two elements: incorporating a gender focus into planning, design and implementation, and moving towards equitable participation in decision-making processes around the reform program.’ The first element has received much attention whereas less emphasis has been placed on the second aspect, which involves issues of representation and political power within key government structures and institutions. Conversely, this paper argues that gender is not yet full incorporated into policies and guidelines particularly in addressing academics.
Hence, considering the aforementioned reforms and interventions, this paper attempts to analyse university senate legislation, which refers to guidelines for academic staff. In fact, Shaw (2004) notes policy analysis is often silent on gender issues and, for this reason, traditional policy analyses have partial and even perverse understandings of the ways in which women’s lives are affected by policies. Luke (1999, cited in UNESCO 2002) identified impediments to women’s academic career paths from cultural and structural barriers that reflect specific inequities such as:

- male managerial styles, discourse and language that shut women out;
- women’s reluctance to self-promote their achievements and capabilities making them institutionally invisible and
- the persistence of cultural values and attitudes that strongly support women’s childcare, family and domestic responsibilities as priority over career aspirations.

These concerns explain the significance of the intended analyses as women are less represented and discriminated from academia. In addition, reviews on forms of gender in regulatory texts support the analysis.

**Gender forms in legislation**

Legislation has historically been geared to the realities of a masculine way of life even if the legislation language seems to take the gender-neutral form in the course of time. The feminist movement and gender mainstreaming strategies implemented in higher education institutions bring about an understanding of gender aspects in regulatory documents, which serves as a guideline for all members of the institutions. Hence, identification of forms that portray gender features within such documents would be an important starting point. The Gender Competence Center (2010) listed language, hidden discrimination, male norms and existing situations as major concerns in legislative process. This paper discusses how the language of legislation affects the treatment of women and contains hidden discrimination.

**Language**

Language, as explained by Davies (2002: 1), is ‘both a resource and a constraint. It makes social and personal being possible but it also limits the available forms of being to those which make sense with the terms provided by the language.’ In this particular case of the legislation, as language conceals certain information, the frequently used masculine
In fact, the language of legislation has been leaning toward the masculine even if the English language revolution has clearly offered distinct pronouns for the masculine and the feminine. However, in the last few decades amendments of policies and legislation developed or considered certain patterns as equal and fair treatment of both women and men were realised. In her book, *Guidelines for Promoting Gender Equity in Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe*, Miroiu (2003) distinguishes sexist from non-sexist language. The former excludes, offends or trivialises women or men and it can be used without intention, out of ignorance or indifference; whereas the latter ensures equal linguistic treatment that is non-discriminatory towards both women and men. As a result, the guides recommend the use of non-sexist language by using mixed forms such as *s/he* or *he or she* and gender-neutral expressions such as a replacement of ‘man’ with ‘person’. Similarly, in the 1995 Commonwealth Plan of Action on Gender and Development, the framework given for planners and implementers considers the use of gender-sensitive and gender-inclusive language as desirable component. The *Pacific Charter for Women Managers in Higher Education* also encourages the use of gender-neutral language to make the learning and working environment gender friendly (UNESCO 2002).

Furthermore, studies highlight that the usage of male language affects organisational culture. For instance, Dean et al (2009: 13) note that ‘the use of language feeds into the creation of reality in determining what is valued. Thus an organisation with male language norms consequently creates a male-normed reality, ultimately setting the bar or definition of success as imbued with male attributes.’ Therefore, since universities make amendments of polices and legislations aiming to treat women and men fairly and equally, the use of sexist language should cease.

**Hidden discrimination**

Husu (2001) cited in Rolin and Vainio (2011) argues that gender equality legislation can be efficient in targeting clear discrimination because it is easily documented. Hidden discrimination, which appears in many subtle and covert forms, is a major challenge to gender equality policy (Husu 2004: 21). She notes that such discrimination tends to be in the form of ‘non-events’: absences, silences, ignoring, subtle exclusion, invisibility and lack of support. Miroiu (2003: 24–25) gives further explanation showing that such discrimination is manifested through

- condescending courteousness – the protective and overly polite treatment of women;
• discouraging encouragement – contradictory message addressed to women about their attributes, abilities and intelligence;
• friendly harassment – sexual behaviors which seems innocent, but actually creates discomfort, intimidation and inhibition and
• collegial exclusion – women are made to feel invisible or unimportant through physical, social and professional isolation.

Hidden discrimination gives the impression that women are treated as equals, but daily practice shows that this treatment enhances the freedom of men, while increasing the responsibilities and exclusion of women. The Gender Competence Center (2010) states that legislation is often worded in a gender-neutral way, but it impacts on a reality in which gender-specific differences apply. If these are not taken into account, this often results in indirect discrimination, which brings about actual discrimination against women despite the neutral legislation language. The experience of Makerere University in Uganda provides a positive example of a higher education institution that has attempted to mainstream gender into all aspects of its management and administration. As a result, besides the induction of gender-inclusive language, the provision of services that leads to sustainable development with men and women sharing responsibilities and enjoying the benefits equitably are considered as one key element to influence success in the implementation of gender mainstreaming programs (UNESCO 2002).

In relation to the aspects of gender previously mentioned, the senate legislation – which is the main interest of this study – tends to use sexist language and show hidden discrimination. Duties, responsibilities, terms and conditions that regulate the academic staff appear mainly in masculine roles or in sexist language. For instance, it is stated ‘An Academic Staff should have served at least one term, as department head or dean or University officer or its equivalent during his University career before he applies to be a Professor’ (Hawassa University Senate Legislation, 2005: 31). This statement would have created an unclear image about female academic staff if the gender reference of legislation were not provided. Yet, the fact that the gender reference of the legislation states that the masculine terms shall also apply to the feminine gender reveals the co-existing presence of
• an awareness of the legislation language chosen and used;
• a tendency of being gender neutral,
• a practice of hidden discrimination,
• the use of gendered symbols in which the masculine gender is dominant over the feminine and
a gendered interaction in which the continuing invisibility of women is assumed.

At this level of analysis, it is not possible to know if such gender discriminatory language is used unintentionally but certainly it shows unresponsiveness to the issue. However, from an historical point of view, the use of sexist language or masculine rules in higher education legislation has been withdrawn since the 1980s. Besides considering gender-mainstreaming interventions, which aim at the equal treatment of women and men, what is reflected in the legislation seems to be a paradoxical approach.

Apart from use of sexist language, another form of hidden discrimination of women can be seen in the legislation. No single statement specifically refers to conditions of female academic staff. Hence, female academics are expected to be as productive as their male colleagues in the same way and within the same time frame. In line with this point, Dyer (2004: 26) shows a prevailing trend that, ‘in practice, universities typically required pregnant women to take off a semester without pay. However, the de facto policy encouraged women to give birth either during their research leave or during the summer.’ Therefore, their absences influenced their research, which is an important duty for promotion. Again, the exclusion in such cases contradicts gender-mainstreaming strategies. This needs to be considered as interventions aiming at equal and fair treatment of women and men are implemented.

Review of university senate legislation

The university senate legislation, which refers to duties and responsibilities and terms and conditions for academic staff, is the main focus of this paper. The legislation presents detailed statements on academic staff regulatory orders. Based on the above discussion, this section attempts to assess how women have been addressed in the legislation from two different perspectives. The first perspective asks if particular roles and guidelines for women are available in the documents. Luke (1999, cited in UNESCO 2002) and Roseberry (2006) argued that specific support for women is needed to counteract the paucity of women in senior academic positions. They highlight that cultural norms such as the gendered division of labor at home leave women accepting the greater burden of childbearing, nurturing and homemaking. For this reason, women academics have little time to be socialised into the academic norms and cultures which are essential to gain advancement within the university system. This means that institutions need to produce regulations applicable to female academics, such as maternity leave or compensation time.
Nothing like this that applies only to female academics appears in the legislation. Despite the equal opportunity ideologies endorsed on higher education institutions, this suggests that women are expected to act in the same way and to be as effective as men. Alternately, women are not really expected to pursue an academic career. Another implication is that women will need to use extra effort to enhance their academic career as a result of non-supportive institutional culture.

The second perspective in reviewing statements addressing the academic staff in the senate legislation deals with the use of gendered language. Most forms addressing academic staff use the terms he or himself even if in a few cases gender-neutral terms appeared. In fact, the gender reference index of Hawassa University Senate Legislation states that ‘unless the context requires otherwise, the provisions of this legislation set out in the masculine gender shall also apply to the feminine gender’ (2005: 2.). Similarly, Addis Ababa University Senate Legislation, (2007: 7) states ‘unless the context provides otherwise, in this legislation, provisions enacted in the masculine gender shall be deemed to include the feminine gender’. This indicates the appearance of female pronouns in the legislation is unlikely. Yet two arguments are presented as to why the inclusion of the feminine within the masculine gender is being incorrect and inappropriate.

The first argument is based on historical perspective. The use of the feminine gender within regulatory texts is not a recent phenomenon. As noted by Petersson (1998) in the mid-1200s Latin was used as the primary language of legislation, which later was changed to French when it was spoken by the upper class. Even if French was used as the language of legislation until the 1600s, it came to an end earlier than this period. Meanwhile, around 1423 the first English Bills appeared and after 1489 English was the only language of legislation. The first English language Act was applied to both sexes although only plural or masculine pronouns were used. During the Middle English period (1150–1500), pronouns had been significantly changed as the old English pronoun hé and hério were masculine and feminine references respectively. As old English ceased, the letter o was omitted from hério and he represented both masculine and feminine genders. In the meantime, she appeared to represent the feminine. Yet, pronouns such as he, his and himself were used with unclear references in the language of legislation. The feminine she was first used in laws in 1547 but not consistently. Within the Elizabethan period, both feminine and masculine pronouns were clearly stated in regulatory texts. This shows that the language of legislation treated women and men equally regardless of fewer rights and less power given to women than men. Such a pattern has been followed with some incli-
nation of using plural forms to refer to women in the mid 1700s. Eventually in 1827, the masculine rule – which abbreviates he or she as he – was declared to represent females as well. This masculine rule tends to appear persistently, even if many countries amended and drafted their regulatory texts in a gender-neutral pattern. Yet, Miroiu (2003) highlights that starting from the 1980s professional associations and universities in most Anglo-Saxon countries had guidelines using non-discriminatory languages in their regulatory documents.

Moreover, as the feminist movement grew in the west, ‘the question of drafting legislative texts according to principles of gender neutrality emerged as part of a more general policy which aimed at removing the socio-economic differences resulting from longstanding discrimination against women’ (Williams 2008: 139). Such quests, added with the newly launched gender mainstreaming strategies, prompted the use of gender-neutral language or reference to both women and men in legislation. As a result, in the last two decades many countries and organisations amended their policies and some gender impact assessment tools were developed within public authorities. The German Federal Government, for instance, employs working aids to mainstream gender in the preparation of legislations (Gender Competence Center 2010). As most higher education institutions are public authorities and undergo gender mainstreaming processes to overcome the existing gender gap within institutions, assessment of the drafting patterns of its legislation is worthwhile.

The second argument highlights the institutional prospects towards gender orientation. Institutions of higher education are expected to promote economic growth, enhance productivity, contribute to personal and social development and reduce social inequality (OECD 2009). Consequently, these institutions are expected to reject some traditionally and socially constructed inequality beliefs and norms and reflect the goal of equality within their systems. However, universities tend to be ‘gendered institutions’ which refers to ‘the presentation of gender in the processes, practices, images and ideologies, and in distribution of power in the various sectors of social life’ (Acker 1992: 567). Similarly Husu (2004) presents universities as gendered organisations that can be characterised as seemingly gender-neutral while gender is constantly being negotiated by:

- Gendered processes that produce and reproduce inequalities,
- gender divisions (hierarchies, pay),
- gendered symbols (masters, fellows),
- gendered interaction (networks, invisibility) and a
- gendered understanding of one’s place in the organisation (e.g. exclusion explained as one’s own choice).
As noted by Morley (1999) such an organisational culture explains the failure of equality discourses in the academy. These gendered processes result in complex and contradictory experiences for women.

In Ethiopian university senate legislation the inclusion of one gender into the other represents the unequal treatment of gender. In this case, the masculine gender has more power. It is a paradox that universities strive to attract and retain more women in their institutions and promote equality (as stated in the proclamation) and, at the same time, their guiding principles and procedures seem to promote inequality.

Moreover, unequal treatment of women and men in legislation can take several forms. According to Rolin and Vainio (2011) policy documents can be understood as gendering processes that aim to identify other gendering processes in organisations and define guidelines for acting against those believed to maintain and generate inequalities between women and men. They also argue that

Policy documents are symbolic gendering processes because they produce a representation of the university as an organization that aims to be inclusive, fair, and progressive. Policy documents can have paradoxical and ambiguous consequences for women in organizations. If they do not succeed in identifying those gendering processes that maintain and generate inequalities, then they can promote a false image of the organization as more equal than it is and make it even harder to identify the gendering processes. (Rolin and Vainio 2011: 30)

In line with this, DiGeorgio-Lutz (2002) confirms that women still remain a relatively voiceless minority population when it comes to defining values, goals and duty statements. In explaining the continuing lack of women in senior administrative positions in higher education, Bond (1996, cited in UNESCO 2002: 31) identifies the structure-centred paradigm which views the disadvantageous position of women in the organisational structure (i.e. few numbers, little power, limited access to resources). It is further explained that this position shapes and defines the behaviour of women and ‘the absence of policies and legislation to ensure participation of women as a result of the power structure in the workplace’ is referred to as a structural factor. This creates the ‘masculine culture’ of institutions, which Burton (1997: 18) criticises as reflecting not only values and priorities but also structural arrangements. She identifies that in universities ‘employment terms and conditions, policies, practices and reward structures (that) historically have been organised around the cluster of characteristics, attributes and background circumstances typical of men’. In general, organisational culture is viewed ‘as the production of meanings-symbols, beliefs and patterns of behaviour learned, produced and created by people in organisations. It incorpo-
rates non-material domains such as values; symbolic messages such as concrete practices and polices’ (Gherardi 1994, cited in Morley 1999: 83).

Therefore, since higher education institutions are identified as gendered organisations, the exclusion of the feminine gender or women from institutional policies seems to be a typical practice of institutions even if gender mainstreaming strategies are employed to promote equality. Miroiu (2003) refers to this as institutional sexism as it implies a complex body of social arrangements, rules, practices, procedures, laws, and policies which appear to be gender-neutral, but actually lead to unfavourable treatment of women. Yet, this is countered by experiences of some European countries. For instance, Mischau (2001) notes that in recent years, EU member states have developed different notions to promote women in academia. For instance, ‘universities in countries such as Germany, Switzerland, the Netherlands and Ireland have institutionalised affirmative action models. In these countries, specialised positions have been created, responsible for promoting women and watching over the implementation of guidelines for equal treatment in laws that regulate the universities’ (2001: 21).

According to the Gender Kompetenz Zentrum / Gender Competence Center located in Berlin, Germany and engaged in the fields of equality, anti-discrimination and diversity politics, gender mainstreaming strategies are institutionalised and, as a result, are reflected in legislation. In other words, the legislation contributes to the real promotion of equality in gender relations if gender perspectives in all legislative phases are considered (Gender Competence Center 2010). At the same time, this avoids all forms of inequity and Burri (2006) asserts that equal treatment legislation prohibits direct and indirect discrimination based on gender.

Conclusion
Legislation referring to academic staff in two Ethiopian universities was analysed from a gender perspective. The paucity of female academics in Ethiopia calls for changes to the legislation and regulations of its institutions. The senate legislation, particularly the section for academic staff, needs to be revised to deter discrimination against women in any form. Possible suggestions to alleviate such discriminatory treatment of gender in regulatory documents can be adopted from some European countries:

• The Gender Competence Center (2010) recommends that, the different lives of women and men should be taken into account during the preparation of legislation. Recognition of direct and indirect discrimination and the identification of the respective needs of women
and men are important. Hence, women also need to participate in the drafting of the legislation.

- According to Dyer (2004) before accepting a job or during the pre-tenure years, female academics can ask for written information about promotion and tenure policies. Thus, female academics, even those without tenure, can speak out about issues that affect them and will not be invisible.

Moreover, Shaw (2004) notes that as the field of higher education continues to exhibit an increased interest in issues of power, representation and social justice, it is important to understand policy formation and implementation as a series of disconnected actions between policymakers and mainstream analysts and the individuals whose lives are most affected by the policy. This conceptual frame provides further research areas and themes. In general, the structure and culture of higher education needs to strive for fundamental change that eliminates all forms of inappropriate discrimination in institutional policies and practices.
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Chapter 12
Paralysis and Fantasy – Handling Resistance When Conveying Feminist Knowledge

Anna Wahl and Charlotte Holgersson

Introduction

This paper is to a large extent based on the book Motstånd och Fantasi. Historien om F [Resistance and Fantasy. The Story of F] which we have written together with Maud Eduards, Pia Höök, Sophie Linghag and Malin Rönnblom. The sections ‘Context and interplay’, ‘Manifestations of resistance’, ‘Constructions of F’ and ‘Fantasies – a way out of situations of paralysis?’ are largely based on translations from the book while the section ‘Understanding paralysis’ is written specifically for this paper.

Issues of gender equality have been debated in Sweden for several decades. During the past 15 years, the debate has been multi-voiced, ranging from conservative to radical feminist discourses. Gender research has been institutionalised in academia along with the expansion of work for change in organisations. With this institutionalisation comes, however, a risk of losing the power perspective both in gender research and work for change. An example of this is an increasing tendency to distinguish between gender equality and feminism in the public debate. While gender equality has positive connotations and is not seen as controversial, the connotations of feminism are more ambiguous and even negative. The relation between gender equality and feminism is therefore complex both on a discursive and practical level.

This provides a challenging setting for us as feminist researchers committed to disseminating knowledge and informing work for change. As scholars in the field of gender and organisations we are continuously engaged in disseminating feminist knowledge, both through research and teaching as well as lecturers and advisors in different gender equality initiatives. Our contributions are often welcome, but just as often we face resistance. Resistance towards feminist knowledge, as we have perceived it, is not the same as academic critique that in its ideal form is both informed and constructive.
In order to better understand this resistance and its role in (re)producing gender power relations, we have collected memories of situations in which we have experienced negative reactions to our attempts to convey feminist knowledge. We have documented what happened in classrooms, lecture halls, seminar rooms, corridors, offices and at parties when feminist knowledge is presented, discussed and produced, what kind of arguments are put forward, by whom and how, how people in the room interact and what the consequences for how knowledge is viewed. We have jointly analysed these situations using the concepts of context and interplay in order to find different mechanisms of resistance. When analysing the situations we were struck by the feminist researcher’s passivity towards the resistance she meets. It was as if she was paralysed. The focus on this paper is to discuss how we can understand this paralysis. We identify both negative and positive constructions of the feminist researcher, here called F, which affect her room for manoeuvre in the specific situation. We also ask ourselves what might she have done instead and discuss how we can use fantasies as a possible way out of situations of paralysis.

A situation of paralysis

One of the situations that we find best illustrates F’s paralysis when confronted with resistance is *The Applause*. In this scene, F is a young feminist researcher who gives a lecture on gender to an audience consisting of a majority of male students at a traditional academic institution. Her lecture is the only one on gender and she knows that her subject is considered controversial. She is an experienced lecturer, but the setting makes her nervous. A while into her lecture she is interrupted by a man who says that he wants to ask a question. However, instead of asking a question he declares that according to his own experience, women and men are different and that she should not be afraid of differences but instead respect them. She has heard this type of comment many times before and knows how to respond. But at this very moment she feels weary and wonders whether he has understood anything of what she had said. When she is just about to answer, a couple of women begin to clap their hands and the applause spreads with at least half of the students joining in. She is both angry and upset but tries to appear unfazed and suggests a break. After the break, she carries on with the lecture as though nothing had happened. Much later she hears that a woman student had been so appalled by the event that she had gone home and wept.
Context and interplay

The scene above is one of several memories collected within a project on resistance experienced by feminist scholars when disseminating feminist knowledge (Wahl et al 2008). The project included six feminist researchers, two political scientists and four organisational scholars, who for many years had shared their experiences of different, often negative, reactions when conveying feminist knowledge. Our method was inspired by the writings on memory work of Haug and colleagues (1987), Widerberg (1995) and Henriksson et al (2000). In order to collect memories of resistance more systematically, we wrote down situations in which we for example felt we had failed, situation where we had succeeded, where we felt we should have intervened and new situations where we had tried to act differently. Those situations that the group felt were representative of their collective experience of resistance were then also collectively edited and interpreted. The feminist researcher in the situations was named F. This created a sense of joint ownership of each situation.

Our point of departure when interpreting the situations was that gender, power and resistance are created in continuous processes at an individual, organisational and societal level (Acker 1992; Wahl et al 2011/2001). These processes consist of human activities, i.e. what people do, say and think. They take place within material and discursive frameworks that both facilitate and delimit these activities. Thus gender relations are complex, dynamic and potentially unpredictable (Acker 1992; Halford et al 1997; Hearn and Parkin 2001). These relational processes should not be seen as haphazard, but rather as stable yet shifting. We refer to these recurring patterns of privilege and disadvantage as gender order. By gender order we mean that the notions and actions of individuals both produce and are the result of gendered power relations. Moreover, we see that power operates in multiple ways. As Halford and Leonard propose:

Power is not only mobilised by individuals, or social structures, or discourses. Power cannot be conceptualised as any type of action; or as having one effect; or as only repressive; or only productive; or as only top-down or only bottom-up; it is all of these things (Halford and Leonard 2001: 224)

When interpreting manifestations of resistance in our specific situations we used two core analytical concepts: context and interplay. Context focuses on the actual room where F was located and the symbols attached to the room. In feminist organisational theory there is a tradition of highlighting the meaning of gender segregation (see e.g. Kanter 1977; Lindgren 1985; Wahl 2003/1992) as well as gendered cultural aspects
in organisations such as language, norms and values (see e.g. Gherardi 1995). Our interpretations were guided by questions such as: Where does the situation take place? What does the room look like? Who is present in the room? Why are they there? How many women and men? Where are the persons placed in the room? What positions, both formal and informal, do they hold? What is F’s role, both official and unofficial, in the room?

Interplay focuses on the forms of communication and the interaction of individuals; how gender and power relations are activated, given form and how they are done (see e.g. Rantalaiho and Heiskanen 1997; Kvande 2003; Martin 2003). In interpretations we wanted to capture the series of interacting events that took place in a situation. The guiding questions were: Who speaks? Who remains silent? What is expressed through body language? What dialogues take place? What relations are created and recreated? What does F do or not do?

The concepts of context and interplay can be related to the four gendered processes identified by Acker (1992). The first of these is production of gender divisions: women and men are separated with regard to occupation, salary, and hierarchical position. The second process involves the creation of symbols, images and forms consciousness that explain, legitimise and confirm or contradict gender segregation. The third is made up of interactions between individuals who reproduce dominance and subordination, alliances and exclusion. The fourth process involves the perceptions held by individuals on gender and how meaning is created around and adapted to the other three processes.

These processes capture how the differences between men and women, between male and female, are created in organisations via a series of different practices, i.e. what people do and say. They are enabled and constrained by material and ideological conditions. The processes may be overt or hidden. The concept of context, as we have used it, can be compared with Acker’s first two processes of creating structures and symbols. Similarly, interplay can be said to include the third and fourth processes in Acker’s model, i.e. the perceptions and actions of individuals.

Table 1. Questions guiding interpretations of context and interplay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>INTERPLAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where is the room placed?</td>
<td>Who speaks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who is present?</td>
<td>Who remains silent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are they there?</td>
<td>What is expressed through body language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What does the room look like?</td>
<td>What dialogues take place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where are the persons placed in the room?</td>
<td>What relations are (re)produced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is F’s role in the room?</td>
<td>What does F do or not do?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manifestations of resistance

What did we learn about resistance when looking at the situations through the lenses of context and interplay? We found that resistance was manifested in similar ways in several of the situations. There was a recurring way of talking about the shortcomings of feminist knowledge. The most common accusation was that feminist research denies biology and nature. Another accusation was that feminist research was either too simplistic in its conclusions or too complicated. When described as too simplistic, feminist knowledge was accused of being biased, not based on proper empirical evidence or focusing on unimportant, peripheral issues. F was constructed as anti-intellectual and incapable of scholarly method and analysis. This rhetoric served to marginalise the field of research. Feminist knowledge was also disqualified when described as too complicated and therefore not plausible. For example, feminist theory was said to make a hen out of a feather. This critique is paradoxical since academia normally celebrates the ability to understand and analyse complex phenomena.

These different verbal manifestations were amplified by body language. A statement questioning what F had said was made stronger by body language, for example by head shaking, leaning backwards or sneering. In some situations the body language was easy to interpret, in others less so. For example, someone standing up is a more overt manifestation than someone whispering. Body language varied between men and women, where the body language of women sometimes took a more collective form through silence and applause. Moreover, lack of interest was expressed in various ways. For example, where and how a person was seated in the room can be related to the degree of a person’s interest.

Table 2. Examples of verbal and bodily manifestations of resistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERBAL LANGUAGE</th>
<th>BODY LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial of biology and nature</td>
<td>Stand up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too simple and obvious</td>
<td>Headshake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too complicated</td>
<td>Smile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biased</td>
<td>Lean backwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral</td>
<td>Silence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through verbal and body language, F was ascribed assertions, values, feelings, shortcomings and denials which served to falsify, trivialise and marginalise feminist knowledge.
Constructions of F

In our analysis we were initially focused on how resistance was manifested by participants in the situations. However, we continuously found ourselves amid reflections of how people related to F. To gain an understanding of the processes in the situations, we therefore made visible the assumptions about F that F perceived in the room. These constructions of F of course affected F herself. They affected how much room for manoeuvre she felt she had, and the expectations she met. She could not avoid notions about herself but she is capable of defending herself against them or learning to deal with them and through this influencing the process in various ways.

We identified a couple of recurrent constructions of F in our situations. These are mainly based on negative perceptions of F and we understand them as constructions of resistance. Our interpretations have been consciously simplified with the objective of displaying constructions of F drawn to their extreme. The negative constructions of F were:

Unrealistic F exaggerates in her statements of how society and working life appear. She also tends to over-interpret. She reads the significance of gender into far too much. She repudiates what is considered established and true. Her disavowal not least concerns the laws of nature. She refuses to acknowledge that biological differences between the sexes exist.

Unscientific F is unaware of scholarly issues and the importance of methodological considerations. She is not involved in 'real' scholarship, but with politics or ideology.

Uninteresting Exaggerations and negativity of the knowledge that F conveys makes her information boring and uninteresting. What she says is not really that important. In many cases what she says goes without saying.

Private person F thinks her lectures and talks are about society, scholarship, working life, culture and other important subjects, but in fact deal with her own problems. F talks on the basis of her own private opinions and experiences. Her personality shines through.

Hypocrite F is critical towards others, despite not being perfectly gender-equal herself. She should be able to give answers to all questions on women and men, gender equality and feminism, but she can’t.

Deficient What characterises F most is her inadequacies. She is unknowledgeable, naive and frequently plain and simply stupid. F has drifted into a specific field and got stuck there. She is biased in her descriptions and single-track in her interpretations. A further inadequacy is that she is over-sensitive to criticism and to relations that do not garner her sympathy.
Disloyal F has a privileged position. She should keep her criticism to herself. She is ungrateful for not being satisfied with what she has. F lacks solidarity towards other women since she pays no attention to the fact that what she says will have an effect on others. Her behaviour is irresponsible.

Available ‘Once in you can’t back out’. Taking a critical position makes you a quarry for others. F has to tolerate being sexualised, being either seen as a sexual challenge or as sexually inhibited. She is expected to be on hand, be helpful and to show solicitude.

Man-hater F does not like men. Indeed she is without doubt a man-hater. She is aggressive and extreme, both in her behaviour and what she conveys. In this way F ruins things for other women. Her type tarnishes the reputation of women.

Outdated F is negative and complaining. She is always trying to pick out problems and deal with negative aspects. Instead of possibilities she points out difficulties. She doesn’t want to change. The question is: does she want the world to change? Where are her positive examples?

Gladiator F is eager to provoke. She likes conflict and debate. F can be invited to get debate going and to provoke matters. She is just the person to use to create an entertaining debate or put a troublesome person in their place.

Meter maid F sees her task as making sure everything follows gender equality policy. She has with her a neon sign saying; ‘50-50’, always equal numbers of women and men. If you don’t follow this you get fined.
Seeing F and making her distinct was nothing we planned from the start. However, in time it became clear that resistance in situations was not solely oriented towards specific knowledge. Sometimes, the resistance against F involved ideas about women in general or specifically about intellectual women. The constructions of F revealed notions and values found in society, and these were reiterated in the venues where F produced and conveyed knowledge.

It also seemed as if F became the bearer of various, often unknown, experiences in the room. She was partly the result of previous experiences of feminism and gender equality initiatives, and partly bearer of people’s experiences of gender in society. Experiences of divorce, violence, conflict, discrimination, disappointment, anger and pain related to gender could all be projected upon F. She became the target for much that she had no idea about, but which became palpable in the situation at hand. Even women and men sympathising with the contents of what F conveyed appeared to feel that it would be too emotionally charged or risky to affirm and develop what was said. Her room for manoeuvre was thus defined by previous experiences that formed the basis of constructions of her.

We also had experienced positive affirmation in contexts where we had been invited to talk about feminist research. From these experiences
we sketched an image of F that contrasts with the negative constructions of F provided by those in opposition. One example of positive constructions of F was that she was frequently seen as someone who breaks norms. By being a pioneer and leading the way, showing how norms can be challenged, F opens the way for others. F was also considered to be strategic in her way of working for change. It was not uncommon that other people saw and appreciated F’s way of conveying her knowledge. Humour can be liberating when the gender order is described, interpreted and challenged. F could also be non-complicit, for example by taking stance against misogynistic utterances. By not smiling, laughing, making acquiescent noises or in any other way giving confirmation to sexist or discriminatory declarations can thus break the dynamics of opposition. If F does not agree with the person who jokes at the expense of women, it becomes easier for others to also distance themselves. Constructions of F as an authority in her field, as courageous in public and as incorruptible in interactions provided examples of where F was met with respect for her methodical knowledge and pedagogical capabilities. F was also seen as factual, based on research and not out to discuss her own opinions. She was also seen as in solidarity with other women since she does not go along with being ‘an exception to the rule’. She declines confirmation as ‘special’ in the sense ‘better than women in general’.

![Figure 2. Positive F (figure by David Wahl)](image)
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Understanding paralysis

During our work of interpreting the situations we experienced an increasing sense of frustration regarding how events had developed and not least F’s actions. F is frequently accommodating and seeks dialogue with the person criticising her, giving the criticism latitude and even at times legitimacy. Situations where F clearly indicates where someone has crossed the line for what she considers acceptable treatment are comparatively few. It was as if she was paralysed. Why does F accept attacks? Why does F not show that she is upset or angry? How might we interpret her defensive stance where she is disinclined to point out that she is treated in a patronising manner?

When analysing the constructions of F, we find that her room of manoeuvre is circumscribed. In particular the paralysing effect of the negative constructions of F was noticeable. But it was not only the negative constructions of F that had a paralysing effect also the positive constructions of F were possible sources for observable loss of action.

Looking behind the surface however, F is everything but passive. There are numerous things happening within F on several levels that can be analysed as multidimensional power processes related to gender order in the room directly and in society ‘outside’.

We have analysed this process behind the scenes as a combination of different aspects of considerations made by F, namely:

- Several options for action, and following risks
- Earlier experience of similar situations
- Restrictions due to negative F
- Restrictions due to Feminist code of conduct (positive F)

One of the results from our analysis of resistance is that there is a certain degree of regularity in the way that resistance appears. F meets patterns of recurring resistance related to both verbal and bodily manifestations and the interactions in the room. F is seldom taken by surprise; on the contrary F recognises the occurring resistance. This is one of the reasons behind the loss of action. F considers her options for action, one being to not react openly, and follows her options further in her mind to what usually happens. One common choice would be between 1) straightforward answers 2) ignoring the comment 3) counter argument using facts 4) ironic comment 5) naming the resistance.

F considers each of these options, and looks at the immediate consequences, comparing with similar situations she has experienced. The consequences to the above options could be 1) endless discussions without solution 2) aggression from one person 3) aggression from the group
4) loss of respect 5) provocation in the room followed by endless and tiring processes. F compares the options, and looks for possible solutions in her past and for potential support

Table 3. F’s considerations for action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F’s OPTIONS FOR ACTION</th>
<th>F’s EXPERIENCE OF CONSEQUENCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Straightforward answers</td>
<td>Endless discussions without solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoring the comment</td>
<td>Aggression from one person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter argument using facts</td>
<td>Aggression from the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ironic comment</td>
<td>Loss of respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naming the resistance</td>
<td>Provocation in the room followed by endless and tiring processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When doing this F is on other levels influenced by the constructions of F that has been mirrored in the present situation, and historically. The negative constructions of F are restricting her options for action. She calculates the risks for being seen as e.g. man-hater, unscientific, available or gladiator in relation to the action she chooses to take. The paralysis is strengthened, as doing nothing might be considered the better way ahead, but with the calculated risk of being depicted as deficient and uninteresting.

Finally, behind the paralysis F bears in mind what we have named Feminist codes of conduct, where the positive constructions of F produce other restrictions for action. What if she will end the session by feeling guilt for not challenging the gender order in the room enough, ‘selling out’ on feminism to save the situation? F is restricted by risks of failing the very purpose of the conveying of knowledge. The positive constructions of F are mirroring a potential Heroine, which is hard to live up to.

Fantasies – a way out of situations of paralysis?

What could F have done differently? By using free-flowing fantasy we started to describe the situations with other, alternative, conclusions and power relations. If the actual series of events were set aside then the relative passivity of F could be exchanged from passivity to activity. In the world of fantasy various more or less feasible strategies could be tried. In this way we would be able to problematise and reach beyond the limitations experienced in the real situations. Our actual memories of events and our identities and practices as researchers would no longer serve as frontier guards to the narrative.

In her analysis of feminist texts on utopias, Frances Bartkowski (1989) discusses the liberating possibilities contained in fictive texts. The prevailing order of things can be problematised and put into question
by feminist theoretical reasoning, she writes. A feminist fictive text can go further and create alternatives to what predominates; both new order and disorder. Fictive texts serve as an arena where power may be put into focus via narratives that test and re-assess power relations that exist and thus contribute to change. Liberation from the discourse is of course not possible. Fictive texts are also created within the order that prevails. In this way they look at the question of what women are both free and constrained to want (Bartkowski 1989: 3).

Even if we were able to create fantasies that fully enter into a utopian world the question is do we want this? In her introduction to the Swedish edition of Judith Butler’s Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity (2007), Ellen Mortensen writes that Butler expresses that we should neither seek utopias nor re-establish an idealised past. Rather, it is important to acknowledge that we always find ourselves in a symbolic structure that defines limitations and possibilities in our existence, while at the same time making new existential alternatives possible. The goal of feminism must be to challenge the limits of these existential possibilities (Mortensen 2007).

Imagining, fantasising freely, was however much harder than we thought. Even though the fundamental idea of fantasy as such was inspiring it was hard work converting it into writing. To be sure, this was at least in part due to our inexperience in writing fiction. That the fantasies took time in coming was also due to the performance anxiety that arose within us when faced with all the possibilities of the task. Now, given the opportunity of creating something ourselves, it had to be pretty good! Ideally fantasy would display a situation where the feminist/feminism would both put women in focus and deconstruct sex as a category (cf. Ferguson 1993). Furthermore, it would preferably make visible and challenge other power relations (class, ethnicity/race and sexuality), as well as be resourceful and intellectually challenging. In other words, the exercise was not an easy one.

The difficulties with writing down fantasies were also due to our awareness of that any such texts could be read by anybody, both those interested in feminist research and detractors. Thoughts of potential readers and his/her interpretations and reactions meant reality showing up again. A great deal of thought was spent on how texts could be (miss) interpreted and used politically – how they might play into the hands of various interests. There was a feeling of ambivalence towards describing events where F affirms her anger, shows indignation, acts violently or shows herself to be vulnerable. It became clear that even in our world of fantasy we were forced to relate to the constructions of the feminist in the original situations. So even in fantasy there was a requirement for
feminists to be balanced, controlled and irreproachable. By discussing why it was possible to write down certain fantasies but not others – due to their feeling either too daring or too soft – the work with fantasies also contributed to analyses of resistance and constructions of the feminist.

It would be unthinkable to carry out certain of our recorded fantasies in reality. Others, once written down, appeared as quite reasonable. What is interesting here is that none of them were seen as options in the actual situations. Instead, we were locked in an experience of resistance as paralysis. By our work on fantasy we analysed our experiences and tried – at least in thought – to act differently. We had these alternative courses of events with us into the future where we hopefully would be able to try some of them out.

So, lastly, what could a fantasy on the applause look like? One fantasy could be that F starts to cry and cannot stop crying. She then starts to accuse the students of making her cry. Her tears stream on, and soon the hall starts filling up with water. The students start begging her to stop and promise to never offend her again. She carries on and finally she swims out of the hall.
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Chapter 13
Professionalisation of Gender Equality Actors in Higher Education – A Sociological View

Lina Vollmer and Andrea Löther

Change of gender equality work

A dramatic change of gender equality work in German institutions of higher education (HEI) took place in recent years. By this time gender equality includes not only the promotion of women. People working on gender equality have to deal with a big spectrum of gender equality topics and aspects like Gender Mainstreaming, Managing Diversity or Work-Life-Balance (Blome, Erfmeier, Guelcher, Smasal and Smykalla 2005; Zimmermann 2003). There has been an increase of staff working on gender equality in HEI as well as financial resources spent on this area. In addition to elected gender equality officers, which began in the 1990s, new actors of gender change are currently being introduced into university management.

On the one hand these processes are linked to changing university governance: With the shift from academic self-governance and strong state regulation to a managerial model, including hierarchical self-steering mechanisms, external management by objectives and more competition between universities, new professions specialised in higher education management emerge (Kruecken, Bluemel and Kloke 2009; Jansen 2007). On the other hand, federal programs on gender equality, the integration of gender aspects into the ‘Excellence Initiative’ and the ‘Research-Oriented Standards on Gender Equality’ of the DFG (German Research Foundation, a leading funding organisation) which force universities to set up a gender equality concept, put high demands on the quality of gender equality in higher education.

Concerning to Meuser (2005) we witness a professionalisation of gender equality actors. This process is characterised by an increased demand for gender competence, an academisation of knowledge transfer and precursors of professional associations. For instance, in recent years, various organisations and programs have been established to meet the demand for gender knowledge and networking.
However, it remains unclear which sociological approaches can be used to analyse the professionalisation of gender equality work in higher education. There has been research using concepts of the sociology of professions to analyse the professionalisation of social work (Schuetze 1992), adult education (Fasshauer 1997) and journalism (Offerhaus 2010). There has also been a research on the professionalisation of the university management (Kloke, Bluemel and Kruecken 2009; Kruecken, Bluemel and Kloke 2010). Yet, gender equality work was not included.

The research project ‘Change of Gender Equality Structures in Higher Education’ intends to close this gap of research by applying concepts of the sociology of professions to gender equality work (see below for more information concerning the project). This paper shows how the development of gender equality work at universities is viewed from the perspective of the sociology of professions. The theoretical work presented here was needed to develop an online survey, which contained indicators of professionalisation based on sociological concepts of professions.

In the following traditional concepts of professions will first be described and examined for their suitability for usage in gender equality work. Next, so-called ‘modern’ approaches to professions will be described and suggestions for analysing the professionalisation of university gender equality work will be made with the help of these approaches.

**Traditional concepts of professions**

Although there is no standardised, uniform concept of profession to be found in the literature on sociology of professions, Mieg (2006; 2003) sets out the most important basic conditions for potential professions: There exists a socially relevant problem area with a related area of action and explanatory knowledge. In addition, reference is made to a central value of society that openly and publicly justifies a higher income and privilege. A special academic education is an important prerequisite for professions, made available through this abstract knowledge, which is indispensable for this professional occupation and, in turn, it is this knowledge that enables a profession to exclusively occupy a specific knowledge/problem area. Professional associations and professional representation also exists, which serve as organisation for the profession as well as self-monitoring by imposing codes of ethics and conduct.

This alludes to two of the three central characteristics of professions: (Expert) Knowledge and autonomy. Expert knowledge to some extent substantiates the autonomy, as a group can first demarcate itself from other occupational groups through developing a specific expertise, and claim a monopoly of competence in a specific field. This claim of professional competence and responsibility cannot be successfully im-
plemented without a foundation of scientific knowledge and methods. Aside from academic knowledge, expert knowledge is comprised of occupational knowledge in the sense of knowledge gained through experience and specific problem-solving and interpretive knowledge (Meyer 2000). A profession acquires its autonomy by delimiting an exclusive purview of responsibility. At the individual level, this serves to define the experts from the layperson, and at the collective level, this occupational group from the outside world. The profession’s autonomy is further distinguished by their independence of action in their work from organised societal forces, enabling autonomous decision making with respect to their working methods and practices. The profession also makes usage of self-recruiting, i.e. selection of personnel by members of the profession (Evett 2003; Meyer 2000). Client orientation is the third distinguishing characteristic of a profession in addition to knowledge and autonomy. Professionally performing socially licensed services for the clients and recipients entrusted to them by social mandate (Schuetze 1992).

**Applying traditional concepts of professions to gender equality work**

It quickly becomes apparent when attempting to apply the traditional characteristics of professions to actors in gender equality, that gender equality work is far from being able to describe itself as a profession. There is no uniform, standardised course of education for gender equality work. Local, community or university gender equality officers do not possess any uniform expertise, often coming into their position without any special knowledge. They acquire this over the course of their tenure in the job. Many do however have an academic degree, but in varying disciplines so that no subject-specific academisation exists. The characteristic of a profession-typical expertise does not fully apply to gender equality work (Nigges-Gellrich 2007).

Absent uniform, exclusive, expert knowledge, a field of activity cannot be demarcated from other occupational groups. Looking at the individual level, the boundaries in gender equality work between experts and laypersons are rather fuzzy because of the different educational backgrounds and the qualification profile needed for gender equality work. Apart from that gender equality work is part of university administration and therefore has no autonomous area of action, whereby, no autonomy can be granted to this sphere of activities according to the classical understanding of sociology of professions (Nigges-Gellrich 2007).

It is not possible to unequivocally state the extent to which gender equality work meets the criterion of client orientation. Are the gender
equality-seeking women (and men) at a university the clientele of gender equality officers? Though offices for gender equality at universities include an advisory function, serving, for example as drop-in centers for victims of violence against women (Blome et al 2005) the activities of gender equality officers are primarily directed at creating gender neutral university structures. Individuals as well as organisations or directorate may assume the role of client (Hughes 1965), so that the university as an organisation can be seen as a client of gender equality work. On the contrary, gender equality actors in general and gender equality officers in particular, certainly represent, first as lobbyists, the interests of women in the organisation, which, in turn, is, directed in part against the organisational structures and the interests of the university directorate (Nigges-Gellrich 2007). Due to new gender equality political demands of excellence initiatives and the introduction of performance-oriented granting of funds, universities are increasingly dependent on the success of gender equality measures (Blome et al 2005; Hetze, van Riesen and Brockmann 2004). Gender equality thereby gains significance as a goal of university decision makers and the competence of gender equality experts in reaching these objectives.

The extent to which the traditional concepts of professions are even compatible with today’s modern labor market is questionable. Not just in applying this concept to university gender equality work but also in connection with other occupational groups, very few would meet the status of a profession. Already in 1968, Hartmann noted the problem of developing the profession concept with the traditional professions such as lawyers and doctors and then to use these as the basis for assessing modern professionalisation. So according to Meyer (2000) a completely autonomous occupational group is, in reality, hardly to be found. Simultaneously, the restriction of profession status to purely client-oriented activities implies a non-applicability of the profession concept to many modern occupational groups.

‘Modern’ approaches to professions

To be able to analyse professionalisation processes in gender equality work in the following it is necessary to refer back to more flexible concepts of professions. These make it possible to examine professional actions of occupational groups integrated into complex organisations in which they neutralise the traditional criteria of professions.

Already in 1969 Mok pitted a ‘modern’ model up against the traditional model of professions. In this model a professional’s knowledge-based contribution played the main role in reaching the goals of the organisation and thereby those of society (Mok 1969). In complex, ur-
ban societies competence is discernible and controllable; as it offsets the knowledge gap to the client to a certain degree, so that the colleague’s control of professional behavior loses its decisive raison d’être (Mok 1969). In contrast, control of knowledge comes to the forefront. Mok forecasts an increase in professionals working in complex organisations, organised into vertical hierarchical structures. Simultaneously more and more members of the ‘leading professions’ such as law and medicine are working dependent in organisations. Thus the dependency on the organisation can not be accepted anymore as an exclusion criteria, while autonomy as a profession-constituting characteristic loses relevance (Meyer 2000).

Concurring with Mok, Evetts (2008) also describes the erosion of traditional profession values and their increasing non-applicability to the labor market, offering the existence of two forms of professionalism: ‘occupational professionalism,’ oriented towards the traditional concept of professions, and ‘organisational professionalism,’ which – similar to Mok’s modern model of professions – should capture how modern work is organised. In contrast to collegial authority, autonomy of working methods and client orientation; organisational professionalism is determined by rational-legal forms of authority, standardised work processes and hierarchal decision making structures. The orientation on ethics codes is replaced in the process through external forms of regulation such as accountability measures, target-setting and performance review (Evetts 2008).

The orientation of a process concept of professionalisation (Nittel 2000) allows for a closer examination of the course of development of those occupational groups which do not attain the status of a profession as well. According to Nittel, professionalisation can be understood as an individual, personal process, containing a personal change and maturation process as much as growth in scientific competence. An easy to use professionalisation concept was developed, for example, by Hartmann (1968). His process-theoretical approach has the advantage that it avoids a strict categorisation into occupation and profession, so that occupationisation and professionalisation processes could be more precisely examined. Occupationisation refers to the crossover from work to occupation, while professionalisation ensues from occupation to profession. This process takes place on two dimensions: knowledge (more precisely the systematisation of knowledge) and social orientation. The continuum of the knowledge dimension describes the growing orientation towards research results, which is very high among professions. The dimension of social orientation in professionalisation processes refers to an intensified orientation towards society and an increasing conscious-
ness of the interdependence of occupational performance for society (Hartmann 1968).

Offerhaus (2010) also advocates a concept of professions measurable on various dimensions of a continuum. She identifies two dimensions of professionalisation which could be used to make it possible to examine processes of occupational professionalisation at the macrosociological as well as the microsociological level. The two dimensions are expertisation and the well known sociological idea of dramatic realisation in self-presentation (in the style of the concept of Goffman (1958)). Expertisation of an occupation according to Offerhaus, can be understood as the development of a job-specific action structure through increasing specialisation of vocational knowledge. This process is attended by a scientification. In the course of an expertisation a dramatic realisation, a form of staging (Inszenierung) takes place, in the sense of a vocation-specific self-presentation (Offerhaus 2010). As in Pfadenhauer (2005), professionalism can be conceived of as a social labeling. Attaining professional status is only possible when an occupational group manages to become recognised as responsible and competent in a particular area. Via this self-presentation it is also possible for a vocational group to acquire autonomy and recognition through third parties independent of licenses as well as a legitimised power for defining its own sphere of activities. Another sign of professionalisation taking place is the founding of professional associations. The degree of institutionalisation of a vocational group can be read in the development of its organisations – for example the stage of development between informal vocational groups and a professional association (Offerhaus 2010).

The modern approaches presented here demonstrate a number of common characteristics. Almost all the authors emphasise the central importance of (special) knowledge creation for the professionalisation process and professional action. The incorporation into organisations and the dependence on their goals and external forms of regulation displace traditional criteria of professions such as collegial control and orientation to an ethical code. Autonomy – the core criteria of professions – loses relevance on the one side and experiences reinterpretation on the other. Thus the autonomy of a vocational group is externally possible albeit independent of state licensing through the staking out of a knowledge area and the dramatic realisation of the same. A step back should be taken from the strict concept of profession. Newer approaches in sociology of professions are oriented towards dynamic concepts or place professional actions and professionalism as profession-independent objects of investigation at the forefront. This makes it possible to analyse
occupational groups which are in the professionalisation process or have not (yet) reached the status of a profession.

**Applying modern concepts of professions in university gender equality work**

Due to varying legal conditions, the irregular structure of positions, and different background disciplines studied, university gender equality work is very heterogeneous so that we are unable to speak of THE gender equality work. The utilisation of modern, dynamic concepts of professions in this sphere of activities offers possibilities to analyse the individual developments in gender equality work and thereby include differences between universities or individual groups in gender equality work. The development of professionalisation of gender equality work can be viewed ‘in cross-section’ through the comparison of actors or working units which are at different stages of the professionalisation process.

At the individual level professionalisation can be understood as an individual and gradual competence, which is distinguished by an expansion in gender equality work related qualification and competence of the individual actors (Nigges-Gellrich 2007), whereby both scientific as well as abstract-theoretical knowledge is important. Research on municipal gender equality officers (Noller 2002) has shown that typical characteristics include: an academic education, knowledge of women’s and gender studies and feminist theory, legal expertise, and administrative knowledge as well as knowledge of personnel and organisational work. In addition there must also be a certain amount of experience available, such as with conflict resolution. This is by no means an exhaustive list of characteristics for constituting a special competence in gender equality, but may be used as a basis for examining the existence of a uniform expert knowledge in academic gender equality work. To investigate the process of creating such a specialty and also evaluate the degree of professionalisation, the degree of institutionalisation of further educational institutions for gender equality actors has to be considered as well. Also, at the personal level the efforts made by the individual actors towards further education to acquire the expertise would have to be queried.

In addition to extant expert knowledge, the routinisation and systematisation in utilising this knowledge is also important for the professionalisation of gender equality work. At the higher levels of analysis, the university level, the degree of uniformity in gender equality methods at a university, or universities in general, can be assessed by observing the systematisation of working practices of individuals involved. At the organi-
sation level, we must look at the differentiation of the action structure in gender equality work with regard to the standardisation of working practices. Following from Mayntz (1988) clearly defined responsibilities, a uniform repertoire of actions and procedures and a clear distribution of work, i.e., non-random or arbitrary delegation of tasks according to specific responsibilities and competences in the workflow speak for a high degree of institutionalisation in the gender equality work. The gender equality expertise and the related behavior and actions must be available independent of the person using it. If, for example, a uniform, reinforced, proven repertoire of practices is available for a gender equality official, every person in this office should be able to execute these practices. A high proportion of intuitive and individual actions would rather indicate a low level of standardisation of work methods.

Due to the heterogeneity of gender equality actors' knowledge backgrounds and occupational experience, creating a uniform basis of knowledge and action is particularly difficult, however necessary to some degree for the standardisation of working practice. Because up to now no gender equality-specific uniform criteria for access has yet been required by universities for gender equality officers, or for others working in gender equality (Kloke et al 2009; Nigges-Gellrich 2007), the creation of a common basis for expertise remains unlikely. Although with ever increasing offers for further education and the establishment of networks in gender equality work, common practices and procedures could develop.

With the help of the degree of systematisation of knowledge on gender equality and the proximity of this knowledge to current women’s and gender studies, a ‘Hartmannesque’ statement can be made in terms of knowledge about the state of occupationalisation and professionalisation of individual groups of gender equality actors. However, due to the large differences in gender equality structures and knowledge backgrounds of actors it is not possible to classify the entire sphere of activities of university gender equality in Hartmann’s schema.

With respect to the dimension of social orientation, according to Hartmann, the actions of those working in gender equality can be examined in terms of how they are oriented towards the goals of the organisation – that is gender equality of men and women at their own university – or in the larger context of the greater society – in this case equal opportunities of the sexes in society. Gender equality actors and special gender equality officers are part of the university administration and thereby dependent on the goals of the university. They are simultaneously responsible for the greater societal goal of creating gender justice which, in turn, compels them to sometimes work against the administration. This
makes localisation on the dimension of social orientation difficult and also somewhat dependent on the self-concept of individual gender equality actors. This can then shape and affect gender equality officers and persons at other institutions relevant for gender equality at universities differently. It can make a difference for the process of professionalisation whether universities have themselves, independently set gender equality as a goal or if this has been forced upon them, for example in the course of obtaining performance-oriented funding.

At the macrosociological level of observation, Offerhaus also views the founding of professional organisations as a sign professionalisation taking place. This represents an important link between individual work tasks and their occupational institutionalisation. The integration of gender equality officers at German universities in the BuKoF (Bundeskonferenz der Frauen- und Gleichstellungsbeauftragten an Hochschulen – Federal Conference of Gender Equality Officers in Higher Education) has a similar character of being a professional association. For example the BuKoF fulfils certain professional association typical externally and internally oriented functions, such as aggregating interests and connecting the members (BuKoF 2011). It is difficult to say at this point to what extent this integration reflects institutionalised networks or professional associations already. Connecting gender equality officers to the BuKoF/LaKoF and the influence of the associations on the content of gender equality work may, however, serve as an indicator of the degree of institutionalisation and thus professionalisation.

**Conclusion**

The sociology of professions offers a wide range of indicators which help analyse the professionalisation of gender equality work and staff. But due to the heterogeneity of university gender equality structures no uniform process of professionalisation can be assumed. A different state of professionalisation between the work units involved in gender equality and the individual actors can be expected depending on the size of the university, the form of the gender equality structures at the respective institution, the legal conditions and the relevance of the gender equality policy objectives for the university. The different sizes of the gender equality departments and offices at the individual universities also present a problem in applying professionalisation criteria. The extent to which gender equality work is practiced at a university varies strongly depending on the university size and type. Accordingly standardisation and differentiation processes must be looked at individually from university to university. So, it may be more productive to use a cross-sectional view of professionalisation which means to focus on differences...
between groups of gender equality actors and their framework conditions than on professionalisation over time. The aforementioned indicators like the professional background, the knowledge of gender studies, effort towards further education, systematisation of working practices and the competence profile allow the comparison of actors and working units which are at different stages of the professionalisation process.
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