

WOMEN IN THE PROFESSORiate IN AUSTRALIA

Kate White
Victoria University

1. INTRODUCTION

Being a female in senior academia in Australia is a hard road to travel, and it can be harder still to even reach that point. While the number of women professors in Australia has increased over the last decade, universities still have a disproportionately small number of senior women. Probably the best analogy to describe women's representation is the leaking pipeline (Baringa, quoted in Caplan 1993, p. 173). While female participation rates are high at undergraduate levels — in many disciplines over 50 percent — their participation rates in research higher degrees decrease significantly (White & Birch 1999). As postgraduate research is the traditional career path into academia, this then impacts on women's participation in academia. Women make up over half the lecturing staff in Australia, see below, but only a third of senior lecturing staff and 14.5 percent of those at professorial level.

This paper argues that while academia remains a hostile work environment for senior women, their numbers are unlikely to increase. It explores the barriers to women in senior academia and whether diversity management might be a useful management tool in higher education. If diversity management can impact on the management culture, more senior women may remain in higher education and thereby impact on that culture, while at the same time providing networks and mentoring for early career female academics.

2. THE WIDER CONTEXT

Women at senior levels in academia have not achieved a critical mass, despite the existence of equity programs in universities for the last few decades. Women in the United Kingdom constitute 7-8 percent of the professoriate, in Ireland just over 5 percent, in the United States 16 percent of those with full professorial status and in Finland 18 percent (O'Connor 2000, pp.1-2). Morley has questioned the effectiveness of public and organisational policies in bringing about change in academia. Rather, she found that mostly for women in academia "equity was simply not affecting them in either material or discursive forms. It appeared that equity and feminism were operating on quite different trajectories ... Equity discourses are not theoretically framed by feminism and are not sufficiently operating as resistance to dominant epistemologies and ideologies" (Morley 1999, p.72).

It would appear that once women reach senior levels in any organization they encounter the power of the male hegemony that is prepared to accommodate some women, but not to have their dominance challenged. Thornton comments that this structural discrimination "against feminised, radicalised, and differentiated others is a corollary of any hierarchical and bureaucratised organization, since the *raison d'être* of bureaucracy is to maintain the status quo, including the power of existing elites" (Thornton 1996, p. 290).

Kate White (Kate.White@vu.edu.au) is the acting director of the Postgraduate Research Unit, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.

The question of women achieving a critical mass in academia is perhaps misplaced. The important issue is not how many women enter the professoriate, but what impact they have on the power of the dominant male culture. As Morley warns: 'the presence of women in senior positions is not an accurate measure of organisational development, as female cannot be unilaterally equated with feminism, nor are all feminists reflexive about their location in organisational power relations' (Morley 1999, p. 75).

But organizations are unlikely to concede power to women who are admitted to senior positions. As Davis asserts, organizations should be viewed as 'social constructions that arise from a masculine view of the world and that call on masculinity for their legitimation and affirmation' (Davis 1995, p. 44 quoted in Morley 1999, p. 80). There is often confusion between an organisation's ability to adapt to the entry of senior women into its ranks and any real change in its management culture. Sinclair warns feminists not to be 'seduced by a masculinity which softens itself at the edges, which learns the language of care and consultation but uses this to strengthen the status quo. The danger is that the 'softer' and more feminine skills of leadership may be learned in order to entrench more deeply the subjugation of women and the superiority of a certain kind of masculinity' (Sinclair 1998, p. 74).

How then, can women survive and advance in the professoriate. O'Connor suggests strategies that include: keeping your head down; creating or maintaining a 'separate world'; challenging the (socially created) opposition between work and family; passing on the challenge to the next generation; tackling the 'enemy' within; naming aspects of organisational culture that are not 'woman friendly'; and exposing aspects of gendered career structures (O'Connor 2000, pp. 3-7). But Morley is more positive arguing that while the academy, like most organisations, "can be experienced as domination, ... it also offers possibilities for creativity and critical challenge" (Morley 1999, p. 191).

3. THE AUSTRALIAN CONTEXT

The imbalance of women in the professoriate in Australia in the late 1990s contrasts markedly to female participation rates at undergraduate and postgraduate level and in the lower levels of academia. Some of the factors in this imbalance are historical and others relate to lack of tenure for academics at lower levels, promotion criteria and how these are applied, how workloads are distributed within academic departments, and lack of access to information about research for early career academics.

One of the biggest factors producing this imbalance has been the emphasis in the last decade on research as the main criteria for promotion, even though universities ostensibly assert that excellence in teaching and community service are also important criteria. Other factors that have impacted on this imbalance of women at the top in academia have been new managerialism, globalisation and the redefinition of the role of academics.

3.1 Women and higher education in Australia

Changes in higher education have strengthened the nexus between research and promotion, and tended to disadvantage women academics. The mergers of colleges of advanced education with universities in Australia from the late 1980s, as a consequence of changing federal government policy, resulted in a large number of academics who were primarily teachers now being expected to do research. Importantly, research output became the key

selection criteria for promotion within universities, even though teaching, administration and community services form other key selection criteria. Within a few years this led to increasing stress for academics and some confusion about the relation between research and teaching (Hort & Oxley, 1992). In order to become research active, many employees of former colleges of advanced education were required to undertake postgraduate research.

Recent Australian literature has indicated that male, more than female, academics tend to prioritise research. They tend to apply for more grants, and they form more research collaborations (see, for example, Banks et al. 1996; Foddy et al. 1996; Bazeley et al. 1996; Deane et al. 1996; and Soliman 1998). One of the issues these studies have not explored in detail is the paucity of women on peer review committees for grant applications. Werreras and Wold (1997) pose the question of whether the harsher evaluation of women researchers is due to the paucity of women among the peer reviewers.

The Australian literature suggests that gender is a factor in women getting started in research and/or establishing a research reputation in academia. If the distribution of women in academia in Australia in the last few years is examined, a picture emerges of women being over-represented in lower levels of academia and, therefore, having fewer opportunities to gain the necessary qualifications to become research active.

Table 1: Number of full-time equivalent academic women and women as a percentage of all FTE academic staff

Year	Level A		Level B		Level C		Levels D&E	
	Nos	%	Nos	%	Nos	%	Nos	%
1996	2972	50.1	4609	40.5	1899	24.2	787	13.0
1998	2923	50.9	4424	41.9	2022	26.5	893	14.4
1999	2762	50.4	4382	42.7	2132	27.8	975	15.4

Source: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Canberra

Table 2: Number of full-time and fractional full-time academic women and women as a percentage of all academic staff

Year	Level A		Level B		Level C		Levels D&E	
	Nos	%	Nos	%	Nos	%	Nos	%
1996	3574	51.6	5021	41.6	1975	24.3	804	12.96
1998	3472	51.5	4906	42.8	2142	26.7	939	14.5
1999	3294	51.8	4908	43.4	2264	27.9	1033	15.6

Source: Department of Education, Training and Youth Affairs, Canberra

Tables 1 and 2 above indicate that women are over-represented at Level A and particularly under-represented at Levels C, D and E. Level A is below lecturer level, Level B is lecturer, Level C is senior lecturer, and Level E is associate professor and professor. Looking at the **number** of full-time equivalent (FTE) academics and the actual number of female academics, rather than **percentage** — between Table 1 and Table 2 — indicates that at level A and B there is a sizeable number of women academics who work less than full-time. While the proportion of women at senior lecturer and associate professor/professor level in Australia is higher than Leonard (1998, p. 8) indicated in her recent survey of trends in higher education in England, the representation of women is still unacceptably low.

3.2 The impact of new managerialism

Morley talks of the 'misery' of new managerialism and its 'constant preoccupation with finance, measurement, marketing and accountability' (Morley 1999, p. 189). It has had a negative impact on the work patterns and pay rates of Australian women academics. As Lafferty and Fleming explain, the new managerialism in universities has led to implementation of market-derived principles that contradict those of gender equity: "in the restructured university, as women remain concentrated in the lowest positions, the shift from collegial to managerial decision-making has entrenched the gendered character of university power relations" (2000, p. 262). Because managerialism contributes to the predominance of women in the lower levels of academia, it has also led to growing casualisation of the female academic workforce. This has been investigated by Probert et al. (1998), who surveyed 3831 academic staff at 18 Australian universities in 1996. They found a significant disparity between the income of men and women in academia resulting, in 1996, in men earning \$439.31 more than women per fortnight on average (Probert et al. 1998, p. 36). They found that there was little support for the argument that men and women divide their time for teaching and other aspects of their work — such as administration and research — differently (Probert et al. 1998, p. 59) (although Foddy et al. [1996] argued that men were more likely to focus on research, rather than teaching and administration). Rather, they found the main constraints on women academics were those of family responsibilities. These had a direct impact on income for women 'because they are far more likely to have to reduce their hours of work or delay the start of their careers' (Probert et al. 1998, p. 62) These findings resonate with the experiences of those women in the professoriate at a newer Australian university, discussed below, who had to fit work around their family responsibilities often because of the inflexibility of the workplace (White 2000b).

Probert et al. also found that women start at a lower level of appointment and are significantly less likely than men to have a PhD. They argued that women's concentration in the lower levels of academic classification also explains their lower ratio of continuing employment. They found that academics in contract positions were more likely to be at level A than level B and, in 'sandstone' universities, more likely to be female (1998 p. 46; p. 62).

The position of women in academia needs to be considered in the wider context of the new managerialism in the workplace. It has been one end-result of a broad process of the rise in universities of manager-leaders shaped by government, 'adept in shifting the reflexivities of autonomy between university-as-knowledge and university-as-corporation' (Mollis & Marginson 2000, p. 27), and more general organisational restructuring in the workplace that has seen the emergence of a 'core' of permanent workers, a contractual fringe of professionals, and a further group of temporary or casual works (Spearritt 1999, p. 44). There is also a danger that the managerialists, rather than the academics, will come to define the nature of the university (Stanley 1997, p.198).

3.3 Globalisation and redefinition of the role of the academic

The portrait of the twenty-first century senior manager, writes Spearritt (1999, p. 44), is one who travels regularly, has lived in two or more countries, manages workforces in several countries, is results driven and endures high pressure. This trend to a highly mobile global manager makes it more difficult for women to advance in management in general. Spearritt

noted the trend of companies to rely on technical skills and past performance in selection criteria for the international manager, criteria that tend to advantage men (Spearitt 1999, p. 44) Moreover, many companies are reluctant to resolve problems of expatriate career couples, despite the growth of dual-career partnerships and to promote women on different country assignments because managers doubt women's long-term commitment to corporations (Spearitt 1999, p. 44).

Globalisation has been widely embraced by Australian universities as a result, Mollis and Marginson (2000, p. 19) explain, of Australian government policy to open up universities to globalisation, especially market pressure: "Self-globalisation became one of the driving forces of institutional autonomy". In future the very notion of the university may be under challenge as distance learning, cyberspace and the information superhighway may reduce universities to electronic networks (Morley 1999, p. 191). Australian universities actively recruit students to their onshore campuses and at the same time have moved to set up campuses throughout Asia and, more recently, South Africa. Senior academic managers, therefore, are required to be extremely mobile. This can place additional pressures on female managers. Ramsey (1999) examined the impact of globalisation on women managers in higher education. She asserted that men were more likely to have international consultancies and networks and be invited to international conferences. A second area in which men were initially moving faster internationally, according to Ramsey, was 'the academic entrepreneur moving offshore with programs, with consultancies with research development and with major projects not normally associated with university work' (1999, p. 3).

This increasing globalisation of higher education in turn redefines the role of the academic. For lecturing and senior lecturing staff it means that they are expected to spend at least part of every year teaching offshore. It also means steadily increasing administrative and service work, together with teaching and trying to fit in 20 or so hours a week for research. For academic managers it means they are expected to be, as Ramsey asserts, business entrepreneurs foremost and academic research and leadership becomes a lesser focus.

4. WOMEN IN THE PROFESSORiate IN AUSTRALIA

4.1 Background

While 14.5 percent of the Australian professoriate is female, it has been estimated that only 11 percent of full professors are women.¹ The profile of the typical Australian woman professor is 51 to 60 years old, born in Australia of Australian parents, educated in Australia, attended an all-girls city school, and completed her doctorate full-time. She lives with a partner who does not work in the same field or institution, and has raised one or two children who have attended university (Ward 2000, p. 3).

¹ The Department of Education, Employment and Youth Affairs Selected Higher Education Statistics do not separate out professor and associate professor; the two categories are reported as "Above Senior Lecturer". The Australian Vice Chancellors Committee *Register of Senior University Women* (www.avcc.edu.au:80/avcc/pubs/rsuw.htm) does distinguish associate and full professors. However, this is a voluntary register and does not include all women professors. I estimate that approximately 43 percent of those listed in the register were full professors. Ward asserts that, on the basis of analysis of the register, eleven percent of all full professors are female.

A study of women in the professoriate at one newer university in Australia found that women without children were more likely to be promoted at an earlier age and had a greater research output (White 2000b).

4.2 Challenges for women in the professoriate

One of the important challenges for women in the professoriate in Australia, as elsewhere, is to impact on the highly masculinist culture of higher education. “You are just sort of ignored, very pleasantly, but you are not part of the male culture” poignantly expressed the views of several women professors at a newer Australian university (White 2000b, pp. 7-10). Being ignored, excluded, regarded as ‘light weight’, and receiving unequal treatment were recurring themes in interviews with these women; themes that resonated with Thornton’s research on women lawyers (Thornton 1998, 157-65). Some of the women in the professoriate questioned the commitment of senior management to change and to making the university more culturally, as well as gender, inclusive. Those who had uninterrupted careers and strong expectations of future promotion, were the group who were most critical of senior management — especially in regard to how they interpreted the criteria for academic promotion (White 2000b).

The exclusion of women in the workplace is recognised as a symptom of deeper problems requiring solutions focusing on the existing culture (Sinclair 1998, p. 19). An Australia-wide study of 30 women who left a private sector corporation in the early 1990s found that different treatment from senior management because they were women and not fitting into the corporate culture were the main reasons for leaving (Bellamy & Ramsay 1994). The debilitating and exclusionist male culture in Australian management is more resistant to change than in most other countries; over the past thirty years there has been little change in male, Anglo-Celtic executive profile. Sinclair explains that it is ‘supported by society’s attachment to cultural myths and icons, and it is in turn supported by a political and economic ideology of business elitism’ (Sinclair 1998, p. 53).

A similar narrow executive profile exists in management in higher education in Australia. Male managers tend to promote those with a similar profile. Thornton succinctly described the exclusionist male culture in the higher education context: “within the university, the key decision makers, or gatekeepers, ... are invariably men — white Anglo-Celtic, heterosexual, able-bodied, middle-class men. I term them Benchmark Men because they constitute the standard against which women and others are measured. In determining who should occupy positions of authority, Benchmark Men tend to favour those who most look like themselves. That is, they have historically constituted themselves as the standard” (Thornton 2000). As a result, little changes in higher education management. One woman professor commented: “the more I see the university pushing towards the gender issue, the more I see nothing is done” (White 2000b).

Given this narrow executive profile, it might be argued that no women would be promoted to senior academia. However, Lorber and Bagilhole argue that senior managers do promote token women who are ‘usually eager to fit in, and so they do not challenge ... the views, values or work practices of the inner circle’ (Bagilhole 2000, p. 9). As Lorber puts it: “that is why token women tend to be ‘one of the boys’ ” (Lorber 1994, p. 241).

Once token women are promoted into top academic positions they are made ineffectual. Bagilhole explains:

Even if a 'token' woman is allowed to enter the 'pipelines of power', they are actively discouraged in recruiting more 'like them' or from competing with men for the very top positions. In this way, men maintain their values and ideas as the dominant ones and ensure the continued success of people as similar as possible to themselves (Bagilhole 2000, p. 9).

Where women have sought to gain promotion through merit, they often receive no validation and encouragement from male colleagues and managers. When they do finally achieve a professorship, there is often no real sense of achievement (Bagilhole 2000, p. 11).

The impact of the narrow executive profile in the higher education sector, as in the corporate sector, is that women at management level tend to leave organisations and set up their own businesses (Spearritt 1999, p. 45; Geber 2000). But this trend makes it even more difficult to establish a critical mass of women in lean organizations, although there is an argument about whether this would shift the masculine culture. It also results in the loss of 'a generation of potential mentors and role models for young women in the core organization' (Spearritt 1999, p. 45). Certainly at one newer university in Australia, there are few women professors because they tend to leave the institution (White 2000b). Some perceive this exit of senior women as evidence of their inability to impact on the culture of the 'Benchmark Men' (Spearritt 1999; Geber 2000; White 2000b).

4.3 Diversity management and Australian universities

The changing nature of the Australian workforce, as discussed in 3.3 above, and the increasing pressures for managers to work in more than one country present new challenges for management in Australian universities. For women in higher education there are the additional problems of interrupted careers and attitudinal barriers.

A study of women professors in a newer Australian university found that the ability of women to advance their academic careers related to choices or lack of choices. Those who had dependent children and who did not have PhDs generally had greater difficulty in gaining promotion (White 2000b). Research on early career academics indicates that early career choices, even choices made at undergraduate level, will impact on the ability of women to advance in academia (Soliman 1998, pp. 119-200; White 2000a).

For those in the study of women professors described in the previous paragraph who had dependent children, the career advancement had often been slow (White 2000b). Certainly in management literature it has been demonstrated that the absence of dependent children, or having a supportive partner ideally working from home and/or a full time nanny or mother as child-carer, helps women reach senior management positions (Headlam-Wells & Mills 1999, pp. 11-12; Geber 2000).

Attitudinal barriers also impact on senior academic women. As Bagilhole argues, women are regarded as different in higher education 'due to men's advantage through the thriving patriarchal system and the myth of individualism promoted through their cultural hegemony' (Bagilhole 2000, p. 13). Not surprisingly then, Ward's survey of Australian professors found

that they believed women in general were subject to negative — mostly covert — discrimination in universities (Ward 2000, pp. 10-11).

Anti-discrimination legislation appears to have only minimal impact on the subtle and unsubtle discrimination that women often experience in the workplace. Spearritt comments that while Australia initially relied on such legislation to reshape organizational cultures to ensure equal employment opportunity, ‘evidence of substantive compliance with the law is thin’ (Spearritt 1998, p. 46). Bennington and Wein’s survey of employers and job applicants in Australia in relation to anti-discrimination legislation found that while it probably had a role in changing some thinking on issues of employment discrimination, “its actual impact on actual behaviours and outcomes perhaps has not been very significant. Employers in our sample indicated that they are unable to ‘find a way around’ the legislation” (2000, p. 7).

Can diversity management as a strategy for senior management in Australian universities produce greater gender equity, particularly in the professoriate? Bennington and Wein argue for multiple approaches to tackling discrimination, including a more pro-active approach to monitoring discrimination (2000, p. 7), and diversity management could be considered one such pro-active approach. However, it is important that any cultural reform embracing diversity has legislative underpinnings (Teicher & Spearitt 1996, p. 16). Smith defines diversity as the quality of being different and unique at an individual or group level, and diversity management as the recognition and effective management of each employee according to their unique attributes, background and perspective (Smith 1998, pp. 72-3).

Smith suggests six steps in sponsoring diversity management programs and initiatives. These are: formation of a diversity council in the workplace, analysis of the organization, data gathering, interventions—education in diversity, changes in culture and the management system, monitoring implementation; review and adjustment. (Smith 2000, pp. 77-8). Such diversity management programs can complement equity and affirmative action legislation, but not replace the broader legislative framework (Agocs & Burr 1996, p. 9).

Some Australian writers are enthusiastic about diversity management as the way forward (Smith 1998; Spearritt 1999, p. 46). Several larger companies in Australia have embraced diversity management. Mobil Oil Australia has tied performance bonuses to successful achievement of diversity management objectives, while Hewlett-Packard’s senior executives have established a diversity and harassment advisor program and 30 trained advisors at sites around Australia (Smith 1998, p. 78; Spearritt 1999, pp. 46-7).

Certainly in higher education diversity management could recognize and celebrate difference, rather than expecting the management profile to replicate itself. This acknowledgement of difference has not occurred to date, despite universities complying with equal opportunity legislation. Higher education could do this by addressing such aspects of organizational culture as the narrow senior management profile, as part of a broad employment equity strategy designed to achieve change in that culture, employment policies and practices, and better representation of women and cultural minorities (Agocs & Burr 1996, p. 9). Diversity management could also allow universities to examine their organizational profile and set targets for promoting those groups currently underrepresented in management. However, Eveline and Todd list the criticisms of what they call ‘the managing diversity movement’: it stresses competitive advantage for organisations rather than social justices, it privileges the concerns of white males over viable challenges to racism and sexism, by fostering a focus on

the 'other' in workplaces, it ignores the power that resides with the dominant group, and its emphasis on individual differences generates and clouds the patterns of exclusion and homogeneity it is supposedly designed to address (2000, pp. 2-3).

There is no evidence of senior management in Australian universities embracing diversity management as a management tool. While diversity management could lead to a more diverse management profile in Australian university management, it could also, like affirmative action legislation, become hollow rhetoric. Diversity management, if implemented by senior management in higher education, may become merely another equity program, like affirmative action, that begs the question of how to effectively change a cunning management culture that, despite the rhetoric of diversity, does not to change at all.

5. CONCLUSION

It is clear that the narrow profile of senior management in Australian universities has a negative impact on senior academic women. A study of women in the professoriate at one Australian university indicated that they had learnt to prioritise research, to tackle the masculine culture head on and had, to some extent, reaped the rewards. But some had reached the level of associate professor only to find that they were worn out, dispirited and no longer had the energy to push on along the hard road of senior academia (White 2000b). This is reinforced in Ward's survey of women in the professoriate in Australia that found they mostly were not interested in further career advancement (Ward 2000, p. 4). Diversity management may be one strategy that could make senior management more representative of the staffing profile and reverse the pattern of senior women leaving higher education.

At a wider level, the experiences of women in the professoriate in Australia resonate with those in most other countries. To some extent, to survive, they create a separate world — a retreat to the bunker as O'Connor calls it (2000, p. 3) — and they can also relate their struggle to that of other disempowered groups in the university as part of a general struggle for social justice (Eisenstein 1984, p. 143). Most are aware that their personal experiences of discrimination relate to wider political issues of power within the university (Fuss 1989, p. 117). While these women have been, in Morley's words, 'knowledge agents, micropolitically making interventions' in the organisation as well as their teaching (Morley 1999, pp. 6-7), they have little optimism about their future careers and about the next generation of women in academia achieving any significant change (White 2000b; Ward 2000, p. 4).

REFERENCES

- Acker, S. 1994, *Gendered Education: Sociological Reflections of Women, Teaching and Feminism*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Agocs, C & Burr, C. 1996, 'Employment equity, affirmative action and managing diversity: assessing the differences', *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 21, Issue 4/5.
- Bagilhole, B. 2000, 'The Myth of Superman: A Feminist Investigation of Academic Careers', paper presented to the 2nd European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education, Zurich.

- Banks, J et al. 1996, *Establishing a Research Career*, Equal Opportunity Unit, University of Melbourne.
- Bazeley, P. 1996, *Waiting in the Wings: A Study of Early Career Researchers in Australia*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Barker, P & Monks, K. 2000, 'Striving towards gender equality in a male-dominated university using a change management model: a case study', paper presented to NAWE International Conference on Women in Higher Education, New Orleans.
- Bellamy, P. & Ramsay, K. 1994, *Barriers to Women Working in Corporate Management*, Women's Employment, Education and Training Advisory Group, AGPS, Canberra.
- Bennington, L & Wein, R. 2000, 'Anti-discrimination legislation in Australia: fair, effective, efficient or irrelevant?', *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 21, Issue 1.
- Burrows, S & Hall, S. 1999, *Raising Research Performance: Strategies used in Some Australian Universities*, Curtin University.
- Brooks, A. 1996, *Academic Women*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Burton, C. 1997, *Gender Equity in Australian University Staffing*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Campbell, K. 1992, *Critical Feminism: Argument in the Disciplines*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
- Caplan, P. 1993, *Lifting a Ton of Feathers: a Women's Guide to Surviving in the Academic World*, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Castleman, T. et al. 1995, *Limited Access: Women's Disadvantage in Higher Education Employment*, National Tertiary Education Union, Melbourne.
- Clare, J. & Haws, C. 1999, 'Breaking Down the Barriers for Women: Empowering Women to Take Part in a Research Culture', in D. Cohen et al. (eds.), *Winds of Change: Women and the Culture of Universities*, Conference Proceedings, vol.2, UTS, Sydney, pp.640-4.
- Deane, E. et al. 1996, *Women, Research and Productivity in the Post-1987 Universities: Opportunities and Constraints*, AGPS, Canberra.
- Eisenstein, H. 1984, *Contemporary Feminist Thought*, Allen & Unwin, London.
- Eveline, J. & Todd, P. 2000, The politics of managing diversity in university teaching, paper presented to 9th International Women in Leadership Conference, Perth.
- Foddy, M. et al. 1996, *Gender and Research at La Trobe University: A Quantitative and Qualitative Study*, Equity and Access Unit, La Trobe University.
- Fuss, D. 1989, *Essentially Speaking: Feminism, Nature and Difference*, Routledge, London.
- Geber, H. 2000, Follow up Study of South African Professional Women's Re-entry to the World of Work, paper presented to NAWE International Conference on Women in Higher Education, New Orleans.
-

-
- Harper, J. 1998, 'Report of the Monash University Pilot Mentor Scheme for Women', Faculty of Medicine.
- Headlam-Wells, J. & Mills, V. 1999, *Beyond the Glass Ceiling: A Study of Successful Women Manager in the UK*, University of Lincolnshire & Humberside.
- Hort, L. & Oxley, H. 1992, 'Academic Perceptions of Their Roles Pre and Post the New Higher Education Policy', *The Australian Universities Review* 2: 21-28.
- Hunt, J. 1997, *The evaluation of the Mentor Scheme for Women*, Equal Opportunity Unit, University of Melbourne.
- Inglis, L. 1999 (1), *Motives and Performance: Why Academics Research*, Working Paper 01/99, Department of Management, Monash University.
- Inglis, L. 1999 (2), *Motives and Performance of Academics*, Working Paper 33/99, Department of Management, Monash University.
- Lafferty, G & Fleming, J. 2000, 'The Restructuring of Academic Work in Australia: Power, Management and Gender', *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 21, Issue 2, pp. 257-268.
- Leonard, D. 1998, 'Trends in Higher Education in England From a Gender Perspective', paper presented to conference on Gender and Higher Education in England, Mexico and the USA, Mexico.
- Lie, S. & O'Leary, V. 1990, *Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World*, Nichols/GP Publishing, New York.
- Lorber, J. 1994, *Paradoxes of Gender*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Mollis, M. & Marginson, S. 2000, 'The Assessment of Universities in Argentina and Australia: Between Autonomy and Heteronomy', paper presented to Conference of the Comparative and International Education Society, San Antonio.
- Monash Postgraduate Association 1996, *Improving Women's Participation in Research Higher Degrees*.
- Morley, L. 1999, *Organising Feminisms: The Micropolitics of the Academy*, St Martin's Press, New York.
- Moses, I. 1990, *Barriers to Women's Participation as Postgraduate Students*, AGPS, Canberra.
- O'Connor, O. 2000, 'Resistance in Academia', paper presented to NAWA International Conference on Women in Higher Education, New Orleans.
- Probert, B et.al. (1998) *Gender Pay Equity in Australian Higher Education*, National Tertiary Education Union, Melbourne.
- Ramsden, P. & Moses, I. 1992, 'Associations Between Research and Teaching in Australian Higher Education', *Higher Education* 23: 273-295.
-

- Ramsey, E. 1999, Address to WEXDEV Conference, 2 September.
- Reade, K. 1998, *Evaluation of a Survey of Early Career Researchers*, Equal Opportunity Unit, University of Melbourne.
- Sinclair, A. 1998, *Doing Leadership Differently*, Melbourne University Press.
- Soliman, I. 1998, *Many Routes One Destination: Profiles of Successful Academic Women*, University of New England.
- Smith, D. 1998, 'The Case for Business Diversity', *Mt Eliza Business Review*, Vol.1. No.3, pp. 72-9.
- Spearrit, K. 1999, 'Deconstructing the Challenges Facing Australian Corporate Women', *Mt Eliza Business Review*, Vol.2. No.2, pp. 40-7.
- Stanley, L. 1997, 'Knowing Feminisms and Passing Women: A Conclusion' in L Stanley, *Knowing Feminisms; On Academic Borders, Territories and Tribes*, Sage Publications, London.
- Teicher, J & Spearitt, K. 1996, 'From equal employment opportunity to diversity management: the Australian experience', *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol 17, Issue 4/5.
- Tharenou, P. 2000, *Consequences of Mentoring on Career Advancement: Does Protégé Gender Make a Difference*, Working Paper 38/00, Department of Management, Monash University.
- Thornton, M. 2000, *Nexus*, Vol. 10, No.5, July.
- Thornton, M. 1998, 'Authority and Corporeality: The Conundrum for Women in Law', *Feminist Legal Studies*, Vol. vi, No.2, pp.147-170.
- Thornton, M. 1996, *Dissonance and Distrust: Women in the Legal Profession*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne.
- Waller, P. & Grieve, N. 1995, *Women and Research*, Equal Opportunity Unit, University of Melbourne.
- Ward, B. 2000, 'The Female Professor: a rare Australian species – the who and how', paper presented to the 2nd European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education, Zurich.
- Wells, J. 1995, 'Performance Indicators in Higher Education — Government Policy and its Implications for Female Staff', *Frontline, NTEU Women's Journal*, Autumn/Winter.
- Werreras, C. & Wold, A. 1997, *Nature*, Vol. 387, 22 May.
- White, K. 1996, 'Women and Research at Monash University: An Affirmative Action Initiative', (report prepared for the Equal Opportunity Unit, Monash University).
- White, K. 1996, 'Strategies to Improve Women's Participation in Research Higher Degrees',
-

paper presented to the national Quality in Postgraduate Research Conference, Adelaide.

White, K. 1996, 'Women and Research in Higher Education', keynote address to Women and Research Conference, Central Queensland University, Rockhampton.

White, K. 1997, 'Using Networks and Collaborations to Improve Research Productivity', paper presented to Women in Science Forum, Walter and Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research, Melbourne.

White, K. 1998, 'Women and Research in Higher Education in Australia', keynote address to Workshop on Initiatives for Women and Research at Victorian Universities, La Trobe University.

White, K. & Birch, L. 1999, 'Strategies to Increase Research Output of Women in Higher Education', paper to AWORC seminar, Deakin University.

White, K. 2000a, 'Strategies for Improving Research Productivity: Women and Research in Higher Education in Australia', paper presented to NAWA International Conference on Women in Higher Education, New Orleans.

White K. 2000b, 'Being Ignored: A Case Study of Women in the Professoriate in Australia', paper presented to the 2nd European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education, Zurich

White, K. 2000c, 'The Business Case for Diversity Management', invited presentation to Department of State and Regional Development Team on Women in Management, Melbourne.

White, K., Birch, L. & Nix, H. 2000, *Implementing Strategies to Improve Participation Rates of Women in Research Higher Degrees*, Victoria University.