



Supported by
the 7th Framework Programme
of the European Union



Gendering the **A**cademy
and **R**esearch: combating
Career Instability and **A**symmetries

Erasmus Staff Training Programme on Gender and Diversity

8.March 2016

Farah Dubois-Shaik, farah.shaik@uclouvain.be

Université Catholique de Louvain

www.garciaproject.eu



FP7 GARCIA: “Gendering the Academy and Research: Combating Career Instability and Assymetries”

Case-study and comparative research across seven European countries and research institutions:

Italy, University of Trento; Belgium, Université Catholique de Louvain; Netherlands, Radboud University Nijmegen; Slovenia, Scientific Research Centre of the Slov Academy of Sciences and Art; Iceland, University of Iceland; Switzerland, University of Lausann; Austria, Joanneum Research

- ▶ **WPI – Management**
 - ▶ **WP2 – Communication and dissemination**
 - ▶ **WP3 – Mapping national context welfare and gender regimes**
 - ▶ **WP4 – Raising awareness on gendering practices and practicing gender in organisations**
 - ▶ **WP5 – Improving gender equality in management and decision making by gender budgeting**
 - ▶ **WP6 – Tackling the phenomenon of Leaky Pipeline**
 - ▶ **WP7 – Revealing implicit gendered sub-texts in the selection processes: deconstructing “excellence”**
 - ▶ **WP8 – Project self-assessment and internal evaluation**
-



Research Institutions as Gendered Organizations

- Researching **gendered organizations** rather than the “failure” of women “drop-outs” (Beaufays and Kraiss (2005); Fassa, Kradolfer and Paroz (2012, 2013); Fusulier and del Rio Carral (2013))

Gendered organisations (Acker, 1990):

The social division of work between the sexes is translated in distinctive ways in structured institutions; in the principle of its organisation, in the habits of work at the heart of the institution. This can also be applied to scientific work and the principles around which it is organized (organizing) (see Weick, 1979; 1995) and structured (structuring)

- *Researching the practice of scientific work*
- *Reformulating research question:*

Which structures, which organisational logics and ways of functioning, which conspicuous facts in the daily practice of the scientific field exist and do they have gendered dynamics?



Researching science as a social field

- “Science” as a social micro-cosmo, with its own logic (Bourdieu, 1994).
- Social recognition and *illusio*
- In the field of research young researchers are as much *products* as well as “*autonomous subjects*”, who are moreover producing themselves as such (Beaufays and Kraus, 2005).
- *Gender in the making and science in the making: applies without restriction to men as well as to women*
- The sexual division of professional and domestic work is still symbolically reproduced and in practices.



Questioning the norms of science and scientific careers

- Merton (1942): we can no longer restrict the analysis of social situations in the domain of research and higher education solely to the work place, or to the institute itself, or the establishment in which the activity is exercise.
- To be tackled is that there is still prevalent in today's postindustrial society a “**myth of separate worlds**” (Kanter, 1977), which is also present in the university environment.
- The scientific “ethos” and the functioning of science as it is shaped and working today, essentially does not take into account, or clandestinizes the “carer” aspect of young researchers (Fusulier & Dubois-Shaik, 2015)
- **Interference of life spaces** is really experienced by researchers in their daily lives (Fusulier & De Carral, 2013)



The scientific ethos and the greedy institution

Greedy institution (Coser, 1974; Fusulier & del Rio Carral, 2013):

- The university institution and its ethos imply a figure of the researcher who is entirely engaged or involved in his or her work.
- This implication presupposes the presence of an other figure in the background, implicit, but nonetheless essential: that of the carer who is obliged to provide a temporal availability for the daily activities of care, household and of reproduction of persons, and other activities associated to private life.
- There is an involvement in multiple greedy institutions, which is usually on voluntary basis (university, family etc.)
- The current organisation and sexual division of productive and reproductive labour has become obsolete.

Scientific ethos:

- *self-fulfilling prophecy* of socialization in the scientific field (Dubois-Shaik, Fusullier, 2015)



Spatio-temporal agency for young researchers and work/life interference

- ▶ Fusulier and del Rio Carral (2012) identify three types of spatio-temporal configurations:
- ▶ **a logic of integration,**
- ▶ **a logic of conciliation,**
- ▶ **a logic of conflict.**

These are associated with researchers' life situations (being single, living with a partner, having children or not...) and highlight gender dynamics.



Some pre-existant conceptual pillars and interrelated phenomena

- **“Bread-winner” versus” carer”** (Kanter, 1977, Fusulier, 2012)
- **Greedy institution** (Coser, 1974)
- **Cooptation and old boys club** (Case, Richley, 2012)
- **Leaky Pipeline** (Alper, 1993; Meulder et al., 2012; Dubois-Shaik & Fusulier, 2015)
- **Glass Ceiling** (Alpler, 1993)
- **Sticky floor** (Booth, Francesconi, Frank, 2003)
- **Discourse** (Kuhn, 2006)
- **Scientific ethos/ incarnating the illusio** (Bourdieu, 1994)
- **Changes in policies** (Gender mainstreaming, budgeting etc.)
- **Mathilda vs Matthew effect** (Rossiter, 1995; Merton, 1969)
- **Research and taking into account gender can generate a critique towards the norms of the scientific career**
- **The spatio-temporal agency of young researchers** (Fusulier, del Rio Carral, 2012)
- **Intersectionality** (linking gender with age, social class, race etc.) (Crespi, 2007;2008) ...



Reframing the research questions on “leaky pipeline”

We propose re-building the approaches to researching the “leaky pipeline” :

- By researching the ***functioning and experience of the pipeline(s)*** rather than simply the “leaks” (organizational analysis)
- Firstly, by looking at ***structural and socio-demographic conditions and modalities of scientific careers***
- Secondly by examining ***science as a way of life***, which constitutes a belief in a scientific field and in a process of ***sensemaking (Weick, 1995)***.

(based on Beaufays and Kraiss, 2005; Fassa et al., 2013 and Fusulier & del Rio Carral, 2013)



(WP3): Gender and Welfare regimes

Example Belgium: : DISTRIBUTION WOMEN AND MEN:

- Girls in **majority in higher and university education**, with higher graduation rates.
- But: access to **doctorate still remains male** in the majority;
- But: a **horizontal segmentation between 'male' tracks of studies** (sciences and technology) **and female** (human and social sciences) is still reproduced.
- The labour market has also **been strongly feminized, but here too classical phenomena of horizontal segmentation** (between sectors and trades) and **vertical** (employment and responsibility levels) are present, although they are decreasing.
- an **unexplained 10% gender pay gap** is still present.
- Female employment in Belgium has a large **part time character**.

FAMILY POLICIES:

- ▶ **Familial policies supporting work/family conciliation** pursue two logics:
 - a logic of **decommodification** via measures dealing with working hours (reduction, interruption, leave for familial reasons, etc.) and
 - **defamilialization measures** notably via early childhood care and education, and service-vouchers.

POLITICAL MEASURES:

- ▶ Institute for the equality of women and men , constitution, Intermediate bodies (social partners, syndicates etc.), Helsinki Group's European recommendations, European Charter for Researchers, "Women and Sciences" Committee , Universities appointees for Gender



WP4: Raising awareness on gendering practices and practising gender in organizations

- ▶ to reveal and deconstruct the leading ideologies of the traditionally supposed gender asymmetries with an emphasis on the organizational logic of research institutions (gender sub-texts)
- ▶ to indicate sources of women's inequalities and to disaggregate - at the organisational level - the seemingly homogenous group of "women in science" by intersections and functions (age, nationality/ethnicity, citizenship status, etc.);
- ▶ to map material and administrative conditions that make difficult women's success in academia and research (STEM/SSH fields);
- ▶ to analyse different matrices of implementing gender equality principles in scientific research structuring (norms, practices and experiences) at the organisational level, with a particular focus on early stages of career;
- ▶ to develop organisationally diversified strategies to increase the awareness of the importance of integrating a gender perspective in policy making, research and students' curricula in academia.

Methods: Policy analysis, Desk-based research, Statistical mapping, Curricula and Project discourse analysis, Semi-structured Interviews (20 Interviews, thematic analysis)



WP6:Tackling the Phenomenon of the Leaky Pipeline

- Researching **gendered organizations** (Acker, 1990) rather than the “failure” of women “drop-outs” (Beaufays and Kraiss, 2005; Fassa, Kradolfer and Paroz, 2012, 2013; Fusulier and del Rio Carral, 2013)
- ▶ By researching the **functioning and experience of the pipeline(s)** rather than simply the “leaks” (organizational analysis)
- ▶ **Identifying effective recommendations** in order to combat instability starting from the **early stages of the career**
- ▶ Examining and targeting the **most precarious categories of researchers**

Methods: Document analysis, Statistics UCL, survey quantitative analysis (trajectory/profiles, multi-variate), semi-structured interviews (trajectory/life history/ideal-type and thematic analysis):

Comparing 3 groups: (40 interviews per country, 20 female and 20 male, 20 ELI and 20 IACCHOS)

- ▶ A) Researchers in pre-tenured or not tenured positions (10 interviews)
- ▶ B) Researchers (in UCL pre-tenured or not tenured) who have « moved » (20 interviews)
- ▶ C) Newly tenured researchers belonging to grade C (10 interviews)

Survey and Interviews on: **Trajectory; Organisational culture and work experience (type of work/tasks/environment/conditions/relationships/satisfaction); work/life balance; health and well-being; professional perspectives**



WP7: Revealing gender practices in the selection process: deconstructing excellence

- Examining gender practices that constitute the barriers for women to become part of or be eligible for the (permanent) staff:
 - Identify **formal criteria** that represent the ideal candidate
 - Identify **actual criteria** applied in selection process
 - Reconstruct **process of ascribing excellence**
- Analyse **gender practices in recruitment and selection of C/D level positions**

Methods: Policy and document analysis, semi-structured interviews (20 male and female with participants of recruitment committees, STEM/SSH), focus groups, workshops



Some results from GARCIA, and
some propositions...

Résultats préliminaires: WP7

What emerges for the case of UCL STEM/SSH, :

An overarching tension confronting criteria and demands of young candidates in recruitment processes of D- and C-level posts that are more general and what can be called **“competition-based”, internationally referred criteria and more local and institutional nomination-based requirements** (Dubois-Shaik et al., 2015)



Some results from quantitative and qualitative analysis of “leaky pipeline and interrelated phenomena”

Quantitative Report results:

- ▶ Feminisation of students in SSH and STEM fields,
- ▶ Bottle-neck of leaky pipeline situated at postdoctoral level,
- ▶ many female teaching assistants without permanent positions,
- ▶ few women professors and few women at leadership level:
- ▶ interrelated phenomena: leaky pipeline, sticky floor, glass ceiling



Some results from qualitative analyses of « leaky pipeline » and interrelated phenomena

Qualitative results from interviews (across countries, see garcia reports):

- ▶ **Group postdocs:** Female and male interviewees both experience difficulty to gain access to permanent positions, male interviewees do not feel this to be an obstacle for building family life/ have more support from life partners/have more mobility, female interviewees with children have a harder time, female interviewees have lesser (female) mentors/support/lack of support from family/have more restricted mobility/less access to internal and external networks: more male “engaged” and “optimistic” profiles, more “ambivalent” rationale female profiles
- ▶ **Group assistant professors:** Male and female interviewees both experience pressure to fulfill 3/4 pillars: project-hunting, supervision tasks, building teaching programmes, publications, male interviewees have sufficient support from internal and international networks, females have restricted access to internal networks, have harder times juggling work and family life, but most females have support from life partners, in some cases partners with more flexible professions or work, some females are very mobile but with many adjustments: male and female “ambivalent” rationale profiles
- ▶ **Group movers:** both female and male interviewees experienced lack of institutional support for permanent positions, most male interviewees felt that research/academia was too “dog-eat-dog” and felt this was detrimental for family balance/health/social interaction, most females felt lack of support by supervisors/colleagues and detrimental to family building and balance: female “ambivalent” and male “distant” rationale profiles

A professional bureaucratic model at University

- ▶ Example X: 1) a *centralization on the level of support* of administrative and technical services in favor of the central management. The policies and structures show that the logistic support is increasingly *centralized to cater to central management*: Services, commissions and HR that aid central management decision-making.
- ▶ 2) a *de-centralization of logistic support toward the two pillars of the hierarchical line*, research and teaching. This means that increasingly institutes, centers, faculties and schools have less logistic personnel, infrastructure and financial resources for their logistics in their units, and the individuals in the operational center, the academics and researchers, have less financial resources at their disposal for logistics and for research and teaching.
- ▶ The other side of this coin is that they are given a relative autonomy in the structuring of research or teaching and of managing their resources and of governing their own units. Within this kind of schema however, the outcome of this is that 3) increasingly the *individuals have to cater for themselves* in this complex bureaucratic system, as much operating in an informal and negotiating way, in order to A) manage and administer to their work and B) in order to advance in their careers. (Mintzberg, 1982; Dubois-Shaik, Fusulier, 2016)



Interrelated results from other WPs

- ***Decentred and auto-regulation*** of departments and research centres, with lesser support from administration towards research and teaching
- with ***lesser funds*** from state for teaching and research with competition between universities,
- ***non-transparency*** of recruitment processes and ***double barriers*** through competition and nomination criteria, with gendered implications
- ***power of internal networks, gatekeeping*** (Brink and Benshop, 2012) and nomination-based local criteria,
- no mentoring or other support programmes,
- ***discursive*** but still non-implemented gender equality policy on all levels (leadership, teaching, research, collaboration, recruitment).



Some reflections and propositions....

- ▶ Professional bureaucracy models, where administration caters more to central governance rather than to research units and to researchers/academics, who become “managers” and “auto-agents” in administration of research: the disadvantage of women who “get stuck” in these tasks for example, or who lose time doing a lot of bidding, and admin.: **the need to have administrative support and funding allocation for research centres and teaching units.**
 - ▶ The way collaboration works: male bastions, old boys clubs: the need to promote a **collaboration culture** that takes into its “wings” female and male postdoctoral as well as doctoral researchers, whilst having an **open door culture**; the possibility to **have peer mentoring programmes** amongst colleagues across hierarchy, to be able refer to administrative and technical staff for help
 - ▶ **The transparency of budgeting, of project applications, of modalities and status questions in scientific/academic careers and tasks.**
 - ▶ **Mobility:** the need to go abroad, the facility to do so with families and children, child care and housing provisions, the access to family services and the local facilities and schools, language centres, social circles and clubs etc. The difficulty for mothers, for giving birth, medical care. Expenses and subsidies. The difficulty of shuttling to and fro. The need to build Cvs and research experiences abroad, mentoring programmes that include mobility aspect; career advice and collaboration between universities
 - ▶ **Research projects and teams and sensitizing toward gender and diversity:** taking into consideration in research units or centres about how to work on research projects: the help of administrative and technical staff and how to include in research project budgets as well as in university budgets: the ability to allocate budgets to administration services for use in research projects.
-

